UNITED NATIONS

A

General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/41/PV.59
12 November 1986

ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 6 November 1986, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. CHOUDHURY (Bangladesh)

later: Mr. KABANDA (Rwanda)
(Vice-President)

- Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations [38] (continued)

  (a) Report of the Group of High-Level Intergovernmental Experts to review the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations
  (b) Note by the Secretary-General
  (c) Report of the Fifth Committee

- Policies of Apartheid of the Government of South Africa: [33] (continued)

  (a) Report of the Special Committee against Apartheid
  (b) Reports of the Secretary-General
  (c) Report of the Special Political Committee
  (d) Draft resolutions

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

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

86-64406/A 2856V (E)

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

AGENDA ITEM 38 (continued)

REVIEW OF THE EFFICIENCY OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL FUNCTIONING OF THE UNITED NATIONS

(a) REPORT OF THE GROUP OF HIGH-LEVEL INTERGOVERNMENTAL EXPERTS TO REVIEW THE EFFICIENCY OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL FUNCTIONING OF THE UNITED NATIONS (A/41/49)

(b) NOTE BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/41/663)

(c) REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/41/795)

The PRESIDENT: I should like to draw the attention of the Assembly to its decision taken at its meeting on 31 October, recorded in document A/41/PV.52, that the Fifth Committee should be allowed an extension of time for further consideration of the item. The Assembly also decided to take up the item again on the morning of 6 November 1986.

The Fifth Committee has since concluded its examination of the item and its findings are before the Assembly in document A/41/795. I call on the Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee to present the report.

Mr. Herijanto (Indonesia), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee, presented the report of that Committee (A/41/795) and then spoke as follows:

Mr. HERIJANTO (Indonesia), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee: I have the honour to present the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 38 (A/41/795).

In compliance with the mandate received from the Assembly, that the Fifth Committee should conduct a factual examination of the report of the Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts and submit its findings to a plenary meeting of the Assembly, the Fifth Committee engaged in a concentrated examination of the report from 16 October until last night.

(Mr. Herijanto, Rapporteur, Fifth Committee)

The findings of the Committee are contained in paragraphs 8 to 69 of section II of the Committee's report. In paragraph 70 there is an indicative list of points which the Committee wishes to draw to the attention of the plenary Assembly.

The findings of the Committee were arrived at after an intensive study involving a highly constructive and co-operative effort on behalf of all members in the Fifth Committee. At the time of adoption of the report, at the 21st meeting of the Fifth Committee, held last night, some delegations indicated that they had certain reservations with regard to parts of the report. Those statements will be reflected in the summary record of the 21st meeting of the Fifth Committee, which will be issued, as I understand it, as soon as possible.

Finally, I wish to stress that, as indicated in the Committee's report:

"The findings submitted by the Fifth Committee are aimed at assisting and facilitating the work of the General Assembly in reaching its conclusions". (A/41/795, para. 13)

The PRESIDENT: I should like to record my appreciation to the Fifth Committee for the very constructive and purposeful manner in which it has approached the report of the Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts. I should like in particular to commend the personal contribution of the Chairman of the Fifth Committee to the Committee's work.

With the submission of the findings of the Fifth Committee and the earlier debate on the subject in the plenary Assembly, we have now concluded an important phase in the consideration of this item. The question before us now is how to proceed in a practical manner towards evolving an agreement on the points on which divergence of view still seems to exist.

(The President)

In this respect, in line with my earlier announcement in the plenary meeting and the extensive consultations I have since held with representatives of different regional groups, I propose to request two or three of our colleagues who are knowledgeable and have been closely involved in the matter to assist me in contacting different groups, sub-groups and, if necessary, individual delegations, with a view to identifying areas of agreement, as well as issues on which further consultations are needed. At an appropriate early stage the results of the efforts of this contact group will be placed before a consultative group comprising essentially representatives drawn from different regions. The consultative group, in turn, will seek to narrow down the differences on different aspects of the matter and submit the outcome of their efforts for consideration by the Committee of the Whole of the plenary Assembly. It is proposed that, for practical reasons, the Assembly take up the item for final consideration after the aforementioned Committee of the Whole, has had an opportunity to examine all aspects of the matter.

I hear no objection to the proposed mechanism, therefore it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: Before I conclude, I should like to express my sincere thanks to all delegations for the understanding and co-operation they have extended to me in dealing with this subject so far. This encourages me further to believe that we shall be able to rise to the expectations of our peoples in evolving a consensus on this important item and discharge the historic responsibility that has been entrusted to us at this forty-first session of the General Assembly.

AGENDA ITEM 33 (continued)

POLICIES OF APARTHEID OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA

(a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID (A/41/22 and Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1)

(b) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/41/506 and Add.1-3, A/41/638, A/41/690)

(c) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/41/779)

(d) DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/41/L.24 to A/41/L.31)

The PRESIDENT: I remind representatives that, in accordance with the decision taken yesterday by the Assembly, the list of speakers in the debate on this item will be closed today at 12 noon. I therefore request representatives wishing to participate in the debate to put their names on the speakers list as soon as possible.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): The question of apartheid is of fundamental importance to the United Nations and deserves its closest attention. We must remember that, in the preamble to the Charter, second only to the expression of the determination to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war is reaffirmation of the faith of the peoples of the United Nations

"in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small ..."

The policies and practices of apartheid of the Government of South Africa are fundamentally in violation of this basic affirmation and are the antithesis of the principles enshrined in the Charter, and in the International Bill of Human Rights and the norms of accepted international conduct and practice.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

My delegation has carefully read the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid to the forty-first session of the General Assembly. The report is divided into four sections: the introduction, the review of the work of the Special Committee in the preceding year, the review of developments in South Africa, and the final section on conclusions and recommendations. The part that deals with the review of developments in South Africa is of special interest and, for anyone who has read it, should be cause for grave concern. The report indicates a rapid deterioration in the internal situation within South Africa. The report states that the apartheid régime has lost its ability to govern in the townships and has therefore resorted to intensified repression. The racist régime has been ruling with brutal and brutish methods and has escalated to a new height State violence against the people of South Africa. The international community will recall that the régime has been ruling under the state of emergency which was imposed on 12 June this year. Evidence from a variety of sources indicates that, under the current state of emergency, hundreds of people have been detained without trial, assaulted and tortured while in detention, and many have been killed in the course of public demonstrations. Many more of the valiant people of South Africa have even been killed while in funeral processions trying to bury other victims of the apartheid régime.

The report of the Special Committee also discloses that during the first state of emergency over 500 people were killed in police violence and nearly 7,800 were detained, including more than 2,000 children under the age of 16. The report further states that measures under the second state of emergency have been harsher than the first, in spite of the fact that the régime has tried to prevent news of the violence and brutality from reaching the outside world. We do know,

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

notwithstanding this attempt to prevent all news from reaching the outside, that between 12,000 and 16,000 opponents of apartheid have been detained without trial and hundreds have been killed.

There is no doubt that the situation is fast sliding towards an uncontrollable disaster. There is already an atmosphere of total war declared by a so-called Government on a people it purports to govern. Needless to say that this is genocide in the making, since the organs of State that are expected to protect life and property have been turned into agents of death and destruction, directed specifically against a segment of the population.

This situation is not only intolerable and dangerous but it should be totally unacceptable to the international community. I believe that the international community cannot stand by while what may end up as another holocaust is unfolding. This is why the Government of the Federal Republic of Nigeria always reacts with indignation and outrage against the atrocities perpetrated by the minority régime, internally in South Africa as well as in the southern African region generally. It is well known that the dangerous effects of the apartheid policy go beyond the borders of South Africa. The front-line States and the States of the South African Development Co-ordinating Conference have been constantly battered by South African acts of destabilization through the mechanisms of subversion, blackmail, sponsorship of surrogate armies and, in some cases, direct aggression. The South African régime has become the greatest threat to peace and security in southern Africa.

The defiance, arrogance and continuing aggression of the Pretoria régime can in part be accounted for by the support it receives from certain Western countries. The collaboration which the régime receives from those countries has

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

served to stiffen its resolve to resist any pressures for change. My delegation would have thought that apartheid in all its ramifications was so repulsive that nobody, in this or any other forum, would be seen to offer any apologia for the régime in Pretoria. Most regrettably, this is not so. Not only is a double standard applied in the degree of vehemence shown in discussions of human rights violations which is no more than child's play in comparison with the atrocities daily perpetrated by the South African régime - there is no hesitation to use the most sacred power at the disposal of the strongest Members of the United Nations in defence of the apartheid régime. In the first six months of this year alone, two draft resolutions on South Africa's aggression against neighbouring States were vetoed. In the last two years no fewer than four resolutions on South Africa have been vetoed by the same permanent members of the Security Council, namely, the United States and the United Kingdom. This exercise of the veto constitutes, in the view of my delegation, a great impediment to the eradication of apartheid not only because it frustrates the imposition of effective sanctions but also because it gives South Africa a feeling of security.

The compelling arguments in favour of sanctions are too well known. It suffices, therefore, to refer only to one - that of the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group. This is a Group, if I may recall, of truly eminent persons that was set up by the Commonwealth Heads of Government in deference to one of them that believed in the rationality of the apostles of apartheid in Pretoria. After labouring for six months with great patience, fortitude and perseverance, the Eminent Persons saw through the deceit and irrationality of Botha and his henchmen. The Eminent Persons unanimously observed that in spite of their intervention and perseverance the Government of South Africa moved consciously away from any realistic negotiating process.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

They stated in their report:

"For all the people of South Africa and of the subregion as a whole, the certain prospect is of an even sharper decline into violence and bloodshed with all its attendant human costs. A racial conflagration with frightening implications threatens. The unco-ordinated violence of today could become in the not-too-distant future a major armed conflict spilling well beyond South Africa's borders. In such circumstances the entire economic fabric of the country would indeed be destroyed. Up to now those responsible for the armed resistance in South Africa have shown great regard for innocent lives. Unless the cycle of violence is broken, full-fledged guerilla warfare as practised in other parts of the world, in which 'soft' civilian targets become prime targets in a reign of terror and counter-terror, may come to pass. In the absence of significant moves to break the cycle of violence we see the prospect as inevitable - and that in the very foreseeable future".

They went on to say:

"We are convinced that the South African Government is concerned about the adoption of effective economic measures against it. If it comes to the conclusion that it will always remain protected from such measures, the process of change in South Africa is unlikely to increase in momentum and the descent into violence would be accelerated".

The Eminent Persons also indicated that

"The question is not whether such measures will compel change; it is already the case that their absence and Pretoria's belief that they need not be feared defers change".

That is the opinion of the Eminent Persons, who spent six whole months trying to persuade the Government of South Africa that it is in its interest to take up a

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

process of genuine negotiations with the overwhelming majority of the people of that country, who are being oppressed.

In connection with the issue of sanctions, my delegation, of course, commends all those Governments which, despite the sacrifice involved, continue to take greater effective measures against South Africa. We urge them to even greater efforts. We also commend the American people for their strong opposition to the policy and practice of apartheid, which was unequivocally expressed, through their Representatives in the Congress, by the adoption of the "Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986". Lately, we have noted with great satisfaction and appreciation the intensification of the process of divestment by United States multinationals in South Africa - companies such as IBM, Coca-Cola and General Motors, and others. The selling of their stocks in South Africa is a great step forward towards the isolation of that country and the elimination of the inhuman policy of apartheid.

Those developments give cause for some optimism. There is a momentum against apartheid which is continually fuelled by concerted international opinion and which has its origin in the internal revolt of the oppressed people of South Africa and in the determination they have shown to make the supreme sacrifice, if need be, in order to win back their God-given rights.

Among the activities which the international community has undertaken this year in support of the efforts of the South African people have been the Seminar on the United Nations Arms Embargo against South Africa which took place in London in May, and the United Nations Seminar on Oil Embargo against South Africa, which took place in Oslo in June. In connection with the latter Seminar, my delegation is pleased to note that a draft resolution will be submitted on an oil embargo against South Africa - the first such draft in over a decade. I am pleased to state that Nigeria, in concert with many oil-producing and oil-shipping States, is taking an

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

active part in the preparation of this draft resolution, which we are convinced will tremendously advance the fight against apartheid.

Also in the course of this year - in June at Paris - was held the historic World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa. The Conference, by consensus, adopted a comprehensive programme of action. Specific courses of action are pinpointed in the Declaration adopted by the World Conference. I should like to draw particular attention to paragraph 47 of the Declaration. That paragraph, dealing with comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, reads as follows:

> "The World Conference notes that it is now recognized more widely than ever by Governments and peoples of the world that such sanctions against South Africa are the most appropriate and effective means available to the international community for the elimination of apartheid, the liberation of Namibia and the maintenance of peace in southern Africa". (A/CONF.137/5, para. 47)

Nigeria joined in the adoption of this consensus Declaration. The Nigerian Government therefore remains committed to the implementation of the programme of action. We call on the Security Council, which has a major role to play in this matter, to shoulder its responsibility and to convene with a view to imposing effective sanctions against apartheid South Africa.

There exists an equal need for greater material support for the oppressed black people of South Africa and for their national liberation movements. The international community should continually reaffirm the legitimacy of the struggle of the people of South Africa by making greater contributions to that people and to its national liberation movements. A similar need exists for active and

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

significant support for the front-line States and the States of the South African Development Co-ordinating Conference. My delegation notes with satisfaction the expression of intent constituted by the establishment during the Harare non-aligned summit of the Africa Fund. We call upon the international community generally to give support to this effort of the non-aligned aimed at strengthening the capacity of the front-line States to withstand South Africa's destabilization measures.

Nigeria will continue to play its modest role in such international efforts towards the elimination of apartheid. In this connection I should like to recall that, in the wake of the unprovoked South African aggression against the peoples of Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe, the Government of Nigeria gave financial assistance to the tune of $US 10 million. Also, on the occasion of the Paris World Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, my Foreign Minister announced a pledge by the Federal Government to the front-line States of $US 50 million over a five-year period.

The fact is that the independent States in southern Africa have not been enabled to reap the rewards of their hard-won independence. Those States have also been unable to undertake the tasks of the economic and social development of their peoples because of the constant, unwarranted and unprovoked acts of aggression and destabilization by the South African apartheid régime. There is an obligation on the part of the international community, therefore, to support those States.

In conclusion, the international community should, I believe, continually keep in focus three salient considerations:

First, in South Africa today there is a crisis of immense proportions. The cause of that crisis is the denial of the inalienable rights of the majority of the people of South Africa by the racist minority régime.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

Secondly, the struggle by the people of South Africa against the racist régime is legitimate. It is not only an act of self-defence against the oppression and terror of the racist régime but also an act synonymous with the struggle for freedom and self-determination.

Thirdly, arising from the ideals and prescriptions of the Charter, there is an obligation on the international community to lend its support not only to the liberation struggle but also to the strengthening of the front-line States to enable them to withstand South Africa's subversion, destabilization and aggression.

Mr. MACIEL (Brazil): The question has been raised in the past of the usefulness of debates which are of a repetitive nature or which are largely influenced by rhetorical elements. There have been those who have ventured to state that speaking over and over again on the same items without achieving any practical results serves only to weaken the credibility of the General Assembly and to render its efforts less than effective. That viewpoint is not necessarily applicable to our discussions on the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa.

Indeed, the pressure exerted through the United Nations, despite restrictions imposed by Governments close to Pretoria, has already wrought significant changes in South Africa. Not only has the racist Government been forced to concede reforms - albeit clearly inadequate ones - but, more important, the legitimate struggle of the oppressed black majority in that country has gained in significance and strength. World public opinion has led the campaign to isolate South Africa in every area, with notable success in obtaining gradual measures of divestment by transnational interests, and has mobilized forces giving rise to increasingly strong sanctions against South Africa. Even those Governments which have so far refused to adopt coercive measures against Pretoria through the Security Council are now facing internal dissent on ambivalent official attitudes towards the growing support for the imposition of sanctions as demanded by their own constituents.

We must therefore agree that our actions in the United Nations, even if finally stalemated by a veto, represent an important stimulus for the struggle waged by South Africans in search of justice, freedom and democracy. But one important question remains: How are we to translate into practical action the unanimous recognition that for far too long Pretoria has been successfully defying

(Mr. Maciel, Brazil)

the international community? That is the issue at the heart of our debate; that is the question that has so far been avoided, even though it holds the key to mandating a final blow against the practice of apartheid.

As long ago as five years ago, in 1981, the Paris International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa had indicated that

> "the Security Council should recognize that the situation in southern Africa, arising from the policies and actions of the racist régime of South Africa, is characterized by constant breaches of the peace, and therefore measures under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter must be taken". (A/CONF.107/8, para. 223)

The imposition of sanctions was then identified as

> "the most appropriate and effective means to ensure South Africa's compliance with the decisions of the United Nations". (para. 226)

The role of the Security Council has since been constantly reaffirmed by renewed appeals, including that of the Final Declaration of the World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa, held last June at Paris. On that occasion, President José Sarnay of Brazil sent a message in which he stated unequivocally that

> "The efforts of the South African people themselves form the primary resistance to racism and injustice. The wish to live in real political peace and in a climate of racial equality is a powerful force. The democratic goals sought by the majority of South Africans will certainly be attained. But apartheid will be eliminated at a different tempo, one which is contingent upon the international community's decision to strengthen the machinery and the scale of the sanctions which must be applied against the Pretoria régime" (A/CONF.137/5, p.44).

(Mr. Maciel, Brazil)

The rejection of violence and of the racial system of domination prevailing in South Africa makes it incumbent upon us to settle remaining differences of opinion and to act decisively. Let us take stock of positive developments in recent years, such as the many individual actions taken against South Africa and all measures in support of the patriotic struggle, and unanimously accept that the time has come for additional specific measures of pressure. Failure to take such measures may well be seen as weakness on the part of the Organization, and it will also certainly corroborate the fear that vested interests in South Africa are the main deterrent to actions that could accelerate the process of change.

In that respect, Brazil shares the view that the internal dialogue in South Africa must be fully representative of all the political forces in the country and conducive to the establishment of a South African State free from all racism, based on the principles of true democracy and pluralism. Brazil unhesitatingly accepts that the pursuit of those goals should now be invigorated by collective decisions adopted on a priority basis by the Security Council. Our determination, shared by the majority of Member States, now aims at ensuring that the same political will is displayed by those States that have a particular and primary role under the Charter of the United Nations in the adoption of prompt and effective action in situations that endanger international peace and security.

Mr. SARRE (Senegal) (interpretation from French): The inhuman and degrading practices of the apartheid régime, an odious and shameful system of racial segregation which is the most inhuman institutionalized form of racial discrimination, bring us once again this year to consider the apartheid policies of the Government of South Africa, agenda item 33.

Over the years, and above all this year, the minority South African racist régime - which on 12 June 1986 again decreed a state of emergency for the entire territory of South Africa - has built up its arsenal of repressive measures against the black South African majority.

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

In continuing to defy the United Nations - particularly the Security Council, its main body charged with the maintenance of international peace and security - Pretoria has established a panoply of arbitrary laws, measures and amendments by which it is intensifying and developing its wanton, brutal repression of the legitimate aspirations of the people of South Africa.

The South African Government, which has given sufficient evidence, if any were still needed, of how little importance it attaches to any offer of a negotiated solution, by defying the approach of the seven-man commonwealth Eminent Persons Group as well as the initiative of the European Economic Community, has increased its massive arbitrary repression, marked by arrests and deliberate killings of members of the anti-apartheid forces, as well as by muzzling both the national and foreign press.

The international community has reacted by condemning that escalation of arbitrary action and the worsening of an already alarming, explosive situation in southern Africa, brought about solely by Pretoria's activities, whose sad, unenviable record includes the Soweto and Sharpeville massacres and many others.

The Security Council, reflecting that general condemnation, in a statement of 13 June this year condemned the reimposition of a state of emergency, and held the South African Government responsible for the escalation of violence in that country of sweat and blood.

Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that the racist régime of Pretoria, which refuses to listen to reason, is waging a desperate war, one already lost, because the victorious outcome of the struggle and the glorious resistance of political, trade union, religious, student and other forces within South Africa is certain and imminent, as history has amply demonstrated in similar cases.

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

Outside South Africa, the apartheid régime's desperate policy is reflected in ?pied Namibia by the setting up of a so-called transitional Government and the ?king of Namibia's independence, in defiance of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

Also outside South Africa, with regard to the African countries on its borders, Pretoria has elevated destabilization, aggression and invasion into a principle of good-neighbourliness, thus flouting the inviolable principle of the Charter and international law - that of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States. The most recent acts of aggression, against Angola, Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe, prove Pretoria's determination to continue to defy the whole world and the universal conscience by trying to impose a Pax Sud-Africana on the southern part of the continent by trying - the height of irony for this country of apartheid - to dictate to the proud and independent peoples of the region the kind of régimes they should have.

The internal and external picture that I have described, from which comes the South African régime's policy of stubbornness and defiance of reason, undoubtedly shows an ever-more explosive situation in southern Africa, one which is a threat to international peace and security.

In the face of this challenge of our day, the United Nations, which last year celebrated in harmony, and with the renewal of commitment by its Members, the fortieth anniversary of the Charter that created it, is duty-bound to rally its strength and show its ability to rally in favour of just causes, in accordance with its purposes and principles.

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

The racist policy of South Africa is a serious threat to human rights, law, world peace and the fundamental objectives of San Francisco. If right and justice still have any meaning, our world Organization must act to help the black people of South Africa, which is asking only for respect for the elementary right of the human being to dignity, freedom and life.

By definition, and by its very essence, apartheid cannot be reformed. The Security Council recalled that once again in its resolution of 13 February this year on the overall situation in southern Africa, when it demanded in paragraph 7

> "the immediate eradication of apartheid as the necessary step towards the establishment of a non-racial democratic society based on self-determination and majority rule through the full and free exercise of universal adult suffrage by all the people in a united and non-fragmented South Africa".

It also demanded that

> "the racist régime of South Africa put an end to the violence against and repression of the black people and other opponents of apartheid". (Security Council resolution 581 (1986), paras. 7 and 8)

In fact, apartheid is the source of all the evils in southern Africa, and it is the duty of all Members of the United Nations and all men and women wedded to peace and justice to ensure that the inhuman and hateful system of apartheid is completely dismantled immediately.

In that regard, the only peaceful response to the situation in southern Africa and to the bloody upheavals and disruptions affecting the black people of South Africa is the imposition of economic sanctions - collective, comprehensive and mandatory - against South Africa. That alone can bring the Pretoria leaders to see reason before it is too late.

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

I am pleased to note that the debate on sanctions has improved qualitatively since the holding in Paris from 16 to 20 June this year of the World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa, which adopted a comprehensive programme of action, the central element of which is mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter.

As Mr. Abdou Diouf, President of the Republic of Senegal and at that time Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, said at the Conference, it is necessary to

"define the practical ways and means to organize, structure and intensify sanctions and make them universal, so that they may be effective and deliver the final death-blow to the system of apartheid".

That is why we commend the economic sanctions adopted by the European Economic Community, certain members of the Commonwealth, the Nordic countries and other countries, as well as, recently, the United States Congress. However, those economic sanctions must be more substantial, complete and mandatory to be effective.

We must keep up and accelerate the general irreversible trend in favour of sanctions against Pretoria - the only way to reason and wisdom, and the only path that follows the course of history.

Realism and the crusade for peace and justice in South Africa are synonymous with human rights, peace, law and morality, all values that we hold dear, and they compel us to continue to unite our efforts and above all intensify them in order to put an end to the shame of modern times constituted by the abominable apartheid policy.

In this connection, the Western Powers, and in particular those that are permanent members of the Security Council, have an important role to play. Indeed, for this purpose there is no better body than the Security Council, to which the

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

Charter entrusted the major, historic responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and which is given by the Charter all the means necessary to take action to respond to this grave challenge to the conscience of mankind.

The only way to preserve a viable future for southern Africa is to establish a régime of equality, democracy and fraternity for all. It is up to the Security Council to ensure that that way triumphs, by accelerating the concerted, consistent efforts of the international community to do away with the scourge of apartheid.

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

We must also continue to mobilize international public opinion in favour of the complete isolation and boycott of and divestment in South Africa. In this framework, I take pleasure in pointing out that Senegal, on 15 October 1986, ratified the International Convention against Apartheid in sports.

The international community is also duty-bound to demonstrate, in a concrete manner, its solidarity with the freedom fighters of the South-West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC), and in the Front-Line Countries of southern Africa, who have been victims of the policy of aggression, destabilization and retaliation for economic sanctions which has been adopted by the racist South African régime.

The international community must at last shoulder its responsibilities and demand that South Africa should free, unconditionally, Nelson Mandela and all other political prisoners, including women and children, immediately put an end to the state of emergency and abrogate legislation of racial discrimination and repression directed against anti-apartheid political and social bodies, and embark upon sincere and forthright negotiations with the legitimate representatives of the liberation movements and South African patriotic forces for the transfer of power to the majority.

Indeed, it is only in this way that a peaceful end can be put to the anachronistic idea that the South African people - which has only been demanding its elementary right to freedom, dignity and life - should continue to live under the merciless apartheid régime.

We all share the noble hope of seeing to it that the struggle for development being waged by the African continent - to which the international community, in an unprecedented gesture of generosity and in a new spirit of partnership, decided to

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

contribute through the United Nations Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development, adopted by the General Assembly at its thirteenth special session on the critical economic situation in Africa - is not compromised by the existence and continuation of apartheid and of its odious and inhuman manifestations.

Mr. THAPA (Nepal): My delegation, as usual, attaches great importance to the agenda item entitled "South Africa's policy of apartheid" and avails itself of this opportunity of expressing Nepal's strong condemnation of such an abhorrent practice. The significance of the debate on this subject in the General Assembly this year has, in our view, been enhanced by two important developments.

The first relates to the increasing repression of the racist Pretoria régime against its black majority and the other concerns the tragic recent death of President Samora Machel of Mozambique, that great freedom fighter and arch foe of apartheid. We are outraged by the first and grieved by the latter.

Believing not only in the equality of nations but also in racial equality, Nepal finds South Africa's institutionalized policy of racial discrimination totally repugnant and reminiscent of the dark days of the past. We share the view of the international community that apartheid is a crime against humanity and the source of incalculable human suffering and exploitation of South Africa's black majority. We therefore believe it must be eliminated, root and branch, from the face of the earth without further delay.

Events in and around South Africa have unfolded with some rapidity and drama since this issue was discussed here last year. As has been very graphically detailed in the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid (A/41/22, Supp. No. 22), the situation has been characterized by the unparalleled campaign of terror and brutal suppression unleased by the racist Pretoria régime against the

(Mr. Thapa, Nepal)

black population. It has twice imposed a state of emergency, granting Draconian powers to its security forces in the suppression of the freedom struggle. It has further militarized its repressive apparatus. While thousands of opponents of apartheid have been detained many, including infants, have been shot on the streets, tortured, tried, banned or otherwise harassed. South African black leaders, including Nelson Mandela, continue to be held in detention despite repeated appeals from the international community for their unconditional release.

In clear defiance of world public opinion, the racist South African régime continues to hurtle down the path of ever-escalating repression. My delegation is encouraged to note that, despite it all, resistance to apartheid has grown, become more resolute and spread throughout the State. We believe this is a potent indicator of the impending and inevitable doom of the South African racists. What has similarly encouraged my delegation is that the anti-apartheid movement has also continued to expand in the major Western countries that maintain political and economic relations with Pretoria, including that in the universities. No account of the international response to apartheid would be complete if mention were not made of the emergence of an encouraging degree of international consensus on the need to impose economic and other sanctions against South Africa to dismantle apartheid, end its illegal occupation of Namibia and pave the way for the establishment there of a multiracial representative Government.

In this context, my delegation recalls in particular that members of the movement of non-aligned countries, the Organization of African Unity (OAU), Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), the Commonwealth, the socialist States, the Nordic States and others have taken far-reaching measures with a view to the total isolation and boycott of the apartheid régime. Similarly, we welcome the recent move by the United States Congress in that direction, and

(Mr. Thapa, Nepal)

hope it will presage the application of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa as envisaged in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. A few months ago, Nepal, like so many others countries, signed the International Convention against Apartheid in Sports. The message that apartheid is intolerable to the international community has been further underlined by the expulsion of the racist régime from the International Committee of the Red Cross following a decision by the XXVth International Conference of the Red Cross in Geneva last month.

The message to Pretoria is loud, and it is clear. Will Pretoria see the writing on the wall and make belated amends, or will it, in a frenzy of continued defiance, dig its heels in and become even more repressive towards its citizens and aggressive towards its neighbours? Unfortunately, the latter seems to be more likely, in our view. Such an assessment is based, among other considerations, on its callous treatment of the initiative for a peaceful political settlement taken recently by the Commonwealth and by its continued acts of aggression, subversion, destabilization and terrorism against Botswana, Zimbabwe, Zambia and Angola. It makes us apprehensive that the source of its arrogant and bullying behaviour could be its possession of nuclear weapons, a possibility that needs seriously to be examined by all, including the initiators of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

(Mr. Thapa, Nepal)

Against this background, my delegation reiterates its endorsement of the final declaration of the Harare summit Conference of non-aligned countries and recalls with satisfaction the creation by the Non-Aligned Movement of a fund to assist the front-line States in southern Africa, following their application of comprehensive sanctions against the racist South Africa régime.

As a proud member of the Special Committee against Apartheid, Nepal calls upon the international community to endorse the general and specific recommendations of the Special Committee, the implementation of which would, in our view, serve to bring an end to the apartheid policy of South Africa, paving the way for a new and just dawn not only in South Africa but also in Namibia and in southern Africa as a whole, before it is too late.

Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire) (interpretation from French): The year that is drawing to a close was solemnly proclaimed, on 24 October 1985, during the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, the International Year of Peace. The General Assembly, aware that in this nuclear age the establishment of lasting peace on Earth is the primary condition of the safeguarding of civilization and the survival of mankind, set forth the objectives of celebrating the International Year of Peace in 1986 and ensuring the broadest possible dissemination of information with regard to the Year and its goals among all Member States of our Organization. While certain Member States of the Organization have in the course of this year enjoyed relative peace in their respective countries, such has not been the case in the African continent, particularly the southern part of the continent.

The black population of South Africa, representing more than 73 per cent of the total population, has not known peace. Throughout the year its members have been harassed, beaten, tortured, kidnapped and killed, day after day, by a minority

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

which disregards the worth of the human person, flouts the most fundamental freedoms of man and behaves exactly like the slavers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Does the white minority of South Africa need reminding that after the end of the eighteenth century the excesses of slavery brought about an abolitionist reaction, which was supported by the prohibition of the trade in Britain in 1807, in France in 1815 and in the United States in 1865, following the Civil War. Did not the French cardinal, Charles Lavigerie, devote his entire life to ending slavery in Africa.

There is no denying that the arrogance, defiance and obstinacy of the racist minority régime in South Africa are matched only by its persistent subjugation of the South African blacks, who constitute the majority of the population and are indigenous to the land, to the will and whim of the white racist minority. This contempt for the black race shows shameless ingratitude since the wealth accumulated by that minority is the fruit of the arduous labours and the sweat of the black workers, such as the miners, who have incontestably contributed to the building of the present South Africa. At the dawn of the twenty-first century, it is revolting that the black race continues to be viewed with contempt and that there is no recognition of its human dignity.

My delegation will refrain from referring to the numerous resolutions adopted by the United Nations General Assembly and Security Council and by many conferences on South Africa with regard to the racist minority régime of South Africa, or to the second declaration adopted by the World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa, held in Paris last June, for none of those resolutions or declarations will have any effect on that régime until practical measures are adopted by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the Charter.

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

My delegation appreciates the efforts made by certain States Members of our Organization to combat apartheid and hasten its total elimination so as to make possible the emergence of a democratic society that knows no distinctions on the basis of race and guarantees universal suffrage to all South Africans. The sanctions against that abhorrent régime advocated by certain Member States and even proposed by their legislative bodies, not to mention the pressure brought to bear by public opinion in certain countries on the governments of those countries, should be extended and broadened so that the heroic struggle waged by the black majority of South Africa may lead to the complete suppression of the policy of apartheid in South Africa.

It has often been reiterated that the policy of apartheid constitutes a violation of fundamental human rights enunciated in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and that it represents a serious threat to international peace and security. None of these value judgments has ever been considered by the abhorrent apartheid régime, which continues to detain, in an arbitrary and inhuman fashion, the uncontested leader of South Africa, Nelson Mandela, and thousands of blacks against whom the only charge is that they are black. The minority régime of South Africa ignores the fact that all human beings are born equal in dignity and before the law, and that the fact that any doctrine of racial superiority is scientifically false, morally reprehensible and socially unjust and dangerous.

All peoples and all races have contributed to the progress of universal civilization and culture, which constitutes the common heritage of mankind. This is particularly true of South Africa, where the racist minority has exploited to the limit the majority black race. It is hardly necessary to recall that since 1487, when the Portugese navigator, Bartolomeu Dias, was the first to sail round the South African coast and discovered the Cape of Good Hope, the black population

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

of that coast, much larger in number than today's black population - which means that a large part of them were and continue to be exterminated - was made up of Bushmen, Hottentots, Zulus and Bantus, who to this day are the true owners of the territory of South Africa.

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

The story of all liberation struggles indicates clearly that regardless of the means of oppression used to crush an uprising the fight for freedom has always triumphed because its cause is just. The Sharpeville massacres of 1960, the assassination of Verwoerd in 1966, the Soweto uprisings of 19 June 1976, Vorster's resignation in 1979 and the virulent reactions characterizing the South African black people's determination in the last two years are all a forerunner of the long liberation struggle being waged by the people of South Africa. Understanding better than anyone else that they can only rely on their own strength the black people of South Africa try to control the present stage of their revolution and defy the forces of oppression of the racist régime. They are certain of their final victory over the forces of evil.

Never before in the history of the liberation struggle of South Africa has so much courage and perseverance been so clearly as expressed in the determination of the black people to regain their dignity and fundamental freedoms. That is the price of the fight for freedom.

The delegation of Zaire is convinced that the solidarity of all peace- and justice-loving peoples with the South African blacks is in itself not enough at present, bearing in mind the intransigence and the barbaric acts on the part of South African authorities against the black people. Even comprehensive, binding and mandatory sanctions, still considered today as one of the most peaceful means available to the international community to prevail upon South African authorities to adopt appropriate measures leading to the total elimination of the apartheid system, can no longer be considered to be the most effective means of fighting that régime.

Those sanctions must be supplemented by other, more severe measures likely to bring about a radical change in South Africa. Because the régime in Pretoria has proved to be unable peacefully to settle the internal problems on its territory and

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

thus cannot be considered a régime with which one could negotiate or have a dialogue. That régime has no place in today's world, a world in which complementarity, interdependence and international co-operation are the hallmark of relations among States.

My delegation will certainly support draft resolutions along those lines. In its view, however, the international community should go beyond resolutions and adopt a more courageous and bolder attitude towards that régime, which deprives the black man of his dignity, freedom and place in society.

My delegation will have another occasion to return to this question when we consider the Namibian question, and it will express its views on the crimes committed by the racist régime in South Africa, Namibia, and within the borders of the African front-line countries with which Zaire closely co-operates.

Mr. BADAWI (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): Apartheid is an inhuman system, based on oppression and racist exploitation. It is a system that the United Nations and the international community have condemned as a crime against humanity. That crime must be fought against and the perpetrator punished.

Egypt takes a principled unflinching stand against all forms of racial discrimination violating the principles of justice and equality laid down by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination.

The racist minority in Pretoria continues to persist in its policy of apartheid. It insists on pursuing that policy with violence and barbarism against the majority of the population despite its shameful violation of human rights and despite the fact that its policy is in flagrant defiance of the United Nations Charter and its resolutions. That policy is undoubtedly the main factor responsible for the explosion of the sanguinary struggle in South Africa and the

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

escalation of violence. That violence seems to be entering a new stage of increasing tension, taking on new destructive dimensions in the region.

The racist minority in Pretoria did not stop at denying the majority of the citizens their fundamental human rights, at subjecting them to racist laws, at withholding their political rights, at denying their right to a just political representation. It went as far as to perpetrate the worst forms of terror, intimidation and repression against that oppressed people. The prisons are full of detainees against whom that régime perpetrates the worst crimes of torture and dehumanization. Violence in South Africa has reached unprecedented levels.

The current emergency laws strike blindly at the elements of national resistance in a desperate attempt to strangle and put down the increasing resistance by which the masses are confronting the racist policies and the plots of deception by the Pretoria régime.

However, this terrible human suffering of the oppressed people of South Africa has merely increased their determination. The people are united behind their leadership organization and they are a politically aware people.

Egypt salutes the struggle of our brotherly people in South Africa. We stress once again on this occasion our determination to continue providing all that we can in material and political assistance until the South African people achieves victory. At the same time we condemn strongly that racist régime for its policies and practices of barbaric oppression against the majority, which is calling for its right to justice and equality.

The abhorrent policy of apartheid is not merely a direct cause of the struggle and the violence in South Africa; indeed that policy is a real danger threatening peace and security in all of southern Africa.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

The régime in South Africa continues to pursue its provocative, aggressive measures against the independent African States whose only crime is to open their borders to refugees escaping the terror and the oppression of that régime. Refugee camps have not been excluded from attack. The structure and resources of those States were subjected to acts of aggression, destruction and sabotage at a time when they were in dire need of mobilizing all their means, material and human resources, to face the challenges of economic and social development. Those aggressive practices are but a clear indication of the State terror being perpetrated with arrogance by South Africa in the region. It pays no heed to international will. It denies the principles of right and justice in such a way as to pose a grave threat to peace and security, a threat that goes beyond the borders of the region to wider circles in Africa and the world at large.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

The situation in South Africa, to our deep regret, is showing no improvement and indeed no promise of improvement. On the contrary, all the indications are that the situation has reached a very grave stage which requires new, decisive and effective measures. The United Nations has adopted many resolutions and recommendations in which it has condemned South Africa for its policy of apartheid and called upon it to put an end to that policy. The United Nations has renewed the expression of its grave concern about the explosive situation in South Africa, a situation which is due to the policy of apartheid. The United Nations has condemned the use of violence and oppression against those citizens who are opposing racial discrimination and has called on the ruling minority to cease immediately its ugly treatment of the majority who reject its racist policies, and to respect and guarantee their fundamental right - to establish a democratic society. The United Nations has rejected the manoeuvres aimed at perpetrating the rule of the minority and declared them null and void. Our Organization has always reaffirmed the legitimacy of the struggle of the oppressed people to put an end to apartheid and establish a non-racial State. In the face of the defiance of the racist régime of Pretoria of its resolutions and recommendations, the Security Council, in its resolutions 418 (1977) and 558 (1984) prohibited trade with South Africa in weapons and military equipment, and prohibited any co-operation with South Africa in the field of the production and development of nuclear weapons.

Despite all this, the report of the Secretary-General and the Contact Group continue to inform us that the racist Government is not prepared to negotiate or to undertake any change in its policies - indeed, it does not even accept the establishment of a democratic system or the undertaking of a programme of reform to put an end to apartheid. Furthermore, the racist régime has gone so far as to refuse any possibility of a peaceful and just settlement of the struggle through

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

negotia[illegible]h the real representatives of the majority of the people, but has demonstrated its intransigence by imposing a state of emergency and escalating the acts of violence and force against thousands of people who are opposing apartheid.

Despite broad international unanimity in considering apartheid a crime against humanity, that crime is still being perpetrated with impunity, and the perpetrator is still able to obtain the necessary means. The peoples and Governments of the world today are aware that the imposition of sanctions against racist South Africa is the only remaining peaceful way available to the international community to put a final end to the apartheid régime. The national and international efforts undertaken by an increasing number of States have, despite their importance, proved insufficient to contain the danger of the escalating tension in South Africa, and hence more effective measures are now needed. The Security Council must therefore shoulder its responsibility by imposing comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter. Egypt hopes that the Security Council will be able to overcome those obstacles which have until now prevented it from fulfilling that duty, which is imposed upon it by virtue of the responsibilities and obligations laid down for it in the United Nations Charter.

The only way to solve the problem in South Africa is by putting an end to the racist apartheid régime and establishing a democratic government and society in accordance with the principles of the Charter and the relevant United Nations resolutions, and with the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Egypt believes that this aim cannot be achieved except by moving from the stage of verbal solidarity to the stage of positive international action, by tightening the isolation of the apartheid régime and increasing pressure on the

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

racist régime in South Africa until it abides by the unanimous international will. Until then there is an increasing need to support the national liberation movements in South Africa and Namibia and to stand by the front-line African States and assist them in meeting the pressures and acts of aggression of the racist Pretoria régime.

Mr. VINGRANOVSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Once again the United Nations General Assembly is considering the criminal policy of apartheid pursued by the Pretoria racist régime in southern Africa, in violation of international law, the United Nations Charter and the generally recognized rules of civilized behaviour. The shameful system of apartheid was long ago condemned and categorically rejected by the international community. The Pretoria régime is flouting the legitimate rights of the indigenous population of the country and has established its own sway over Namibia by force; it is carrying out subversive acts of aggression against independent African countries, trying to intimidate them and subject them to its diktat, and its policy of apartheid has been described as a serious threat not only to South Africa but to international peace and security as a whole. To all sensible people it is quite clear that apartheid is the major reason for the crisis in southern Africa.

The end of apartheid will not be brought about through any transformation, restructuring, changes, or so-called reforms, but only through its complete and final elimination, which is an absolute prerequisite for the achievement of peace and stability in that region. Why, then, in spite of the growing indignation of honest people over the criminal system of apartheid, and in spite of the many demands to put an end to that unlawful system, does it continue to exist? It is quite clear that the apartheid régime can continue to exist and have its way, and

(Mr. Vingranovsky, Ukrainian SSR)

to disregard United Nations decisions and the will of the international community, only because it has the political, economic, military and other support of some major Western Powers, first and foremost the United States of America, the United Kingdom and Israel. It is merely a rhetorical question why, in spite of the criminal nature of the South African régime, there is broad co-operation with it on the part of some Western countries. The interests of imperialism and Pretoria are closely intertwined. South Africa is important to the West in political as well as economic terms. English capital investment there amounts to £12 billion sterling, and the United States has $US 15 billion invested in the economic structure of South Africa.*

*Mr. Kabanda (Rwanda), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Vingranovsky, Ukrainian SSR)

The Western Powers gain enormous profits from co-operation with South Africa and are profiting from apartheid. Assistance and support of the South African racists from the United States of America and some other Western countries and Israel, is regarded by Pretoria as direct support for its continued policy, in spite of the groundless statements of the protectors of the racists to the effect that co-operation with the racist régime supposedly has some influence on it.

The World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa, which was held this year in Paris, quite rightly pointed out in the Declaration it adopted by consensus that:

> "The policy of 'constructive engagement' has not contributed to the abolition of the system of apartheid. On the contrary, this situation has continued and the Pretoria régime is maintaining its illegal occupation of Namibia and its policy of aggression, subversion and destabilization of different sorts against the front-line and other neighbouring States." (A/41/434, para. 42)

The report of the Special Committee against Apartheid to the forty-first session of the General Assembly points out:

> "... certain Western countries, Israel and some transnational corporations, by their continuing collaboration with the racist régime, encourage that régime in its policy. This continues to be a major obstacle to the efforts of the oppressed people and the international community for the elimination of apartheid, the independence of Namibia and the restoration of peace and security in southern Africa." (A/41/22, para. 209)

There is special concern in this connection over co-operation in the military and nuclear spheres with the South African racist régime which is pursuing a policy of militarization leading to a nuclear capability.

(Mr. Vingranovsky, Ukrainian SSR)

As was pointed out in the Declaration of the seminar on an arms embargo against South Africa, which took place in London in May of this year, in spite of the imposition by the Security Council, under its resolution 418 (1977) of an embargo on arms and related military matériel against South Africa the apartheid régime finds it possible to obtain in significant quantities essential military equipment, components, spare parts and even complex facilities to produce armaments and ammunition.

The seminar also expressed concern over the fact that the appeal of the Security Council in its resolution 558 (1984) to refrain from importing arms from South Africa was not being complied with by many of South Africa's trading partners.

There is eloquent evidence in this regard in the report published by the American organization, National Activities and Research in the Military-Industrial Complex. This report gives information on the granting of export licenses at the beginning of the 1980s by the United States Department of State's Office of Security Assistance and Sales, allowing the importation into South Africa of military technologies. There is also other information on the continued co-operation with South Africa by certain Western countries and Israel. Many examples of such co-operation are given in the materials of the above-mentioned seminar and in the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid on relations between Israel and South Africa, as well as in other documents. The report of Standing Committee II of the Council for Namibia points out that:

"... the development of South Africa's nuclear capability continued to be accelerated by the collaboration extended to the apartheid régime at various levels by certain Western States, and by Israel, through assistance in uranium extraction and processing, the supply of nuclear equipment, the transfer of technology, the provision of training and the exchange of scientists. Such

(Mr. Vingranovsky, Ukrainian SSR)

collaboration, together with external financial support for the South African nuclear programme, has encouraged the Pretoria régime in its defiance of the international community and obstructed efforts to eliminate the system of apartheid and to bring to an end South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia." (A/AC.131/179/Add.1, para. 33)

The dire consequences of maintaining trade and economic relations with South Africa, in particular by supplying it with oil and oil by-products, was emphasized in June of this year at the Oslo seminar on the oil embargo against South Africa.

Concerned only with the exorbitant profits to be derived from the exploitation of the human and natural resources of the southern part of Africa and with the need to maintain the South African racist régime, bringing pressure to bear on independent Africa has become part of the policy of leading Western Governments co-operating with the Pretoria régime. They are disregarding the will and demands of the international community, including the peoples of their own countries and those of South Africa, and are preventing by all means possible the imposition of binding and comprehensive sanctions against Pretoria, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter. The imposition of binding sanctions is called for by the peoples of South Africa, the Organization of African Unity and by the United Nations General Assembly.

The World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa emphasized that:

"... the racist régime of South Africa, the only régime that practices racism as its official policy and has enshrined it in its so-called Constitution, has its roots in the same racist and bellicose ideology that provoked the Second World War and caused untold deaths and destruction. Appeasement of the racist régime therefore can only have the same disastrous consequences." (A/41/434, para. 14)

(Mr. Vingranovsky, Ukrainian SSR)

Apartheid must be fought by all possible means. It is the height of hypocrisy to condemn in words the policy of apartheid and agree to the need to eliminate it and at, the same time, to block the adoption of effective measures against it, and even deny, as some Western countries have been doing, the right of the oppressed peoples of South Africa to armed struggle against the apartheid régime.

The United States and some other imperialist Powers, along with the racist clique in South Africa, are attempting to sow doubts as to the legitimacy of the national liberation movements in southern Africa and of their struggle for freedom and independence. There is no basis for such allegations. Just as one could not deny the right of the victims of Fascist aggression during the Second World War to take up arms in their fight for freedom, it is impossible to deny the inalienable right of peoples to wage a struggle for self-determination by all available to them. International law is fully on their side.

The political report of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, at the twenty-sixth session of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, gave the bases for a comprehensive system of international security, a major component of which must be the elimination of genocide, apartheid, the proselytising of fascism, or any other racialist, nationalist, or religious exclusiveness, and discrimination against people on that basis.

(Mr. Vingranovsky, Ukrainian SSR)

The Ukrainian SSR resolutely follows a policy in favour of the complete and earliest possible elimination of the shameful policy and practice of apartheid and unreservedly condemns that heinous system. The position of principle of the Ukrainian SSR on this issue has been given in detail in statements by our representatives in various United Nations bodies and international forums, in our replies to questionnaires from the Secretary-General and in various documents, in particular, a letter to the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid. The Ukrainian SSR is in full solidarity with the national liberation movements in southern Africa, which are waging a legitimate struggle against apartheid and for freedom and independence, in accordance with United Nations decisions, a struggle which is being given political, moral and material support.

The mass media in the Ukrainian SSR furnish a great deal of information on the activities of the United Nations and other organizations in the struggle against apartheid. They keep the population of the Republic informed of the just struggle of the oppressed people of southern Africa. Throughout the Ukrainian SSR there is widespread commemoration of international days of solidarity with the struggle for independence of the peoples of southern Africa and Namibia. Many activities are undertaken and public opinion is mobilized in support of the struggle against apartheid and for the earliest possible elimination of the remnants of colonialism and racism.

The Ukrainian SSR participates actively in the intensive and fruitful work of the United Nations Special Committee against Apartheid, which, under the leadership of the experienced Ambassador of Nigeria, Mr. Joseph Garba, who is dedicated to the final elimination of apartheid and the liberation of Africa, has been making a considerable contribution to the upsurge of the anti-apartheid struggle throughout the world.

(Mr. Vingranovsky, Ukrainian SSR)

The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR played an active part from the outset in the preparation of draft resolutions A/41/L.24 and L.29, which are before the plenary meeting. Owing to a technical error, the Ukrainian SSR is not to be found on the list of sponsors of those draft resolutions. I should therefore like to state that we join the sponsors of those drafts.

The Ukrainian SSR was among the first to sign the International Convention against Apartheid in Sports. Six months after it was opened for signature, that Convention has already been signed by approximately 70 States from all parts of the world.

The Ukrainian SSR consistently advocates the speedy elimination of apartheid and fully supports the appeal of African States for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the South African racist régime. We shall continue to give assistance of all kinds to the courageous foes of apartheid. We shall vote in favour of the draft resolutions submitted in the campaign to ensure the elimination of the criminal system of apartheid.

Sir JOHN THOMSON (United Kingdom): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the 12 Member States of the European Community.

The Twelve have repeatedly made clear their revulsion at apartheid. For years we have unequivocally condemned it in all its forms and manifestations, both here at the United Nations and in many other forums. We have demanded that it be abolished. We utterly reject a system which denies opportunity or liberty to one child yet gives ordinary rights and privileges to another solely on the basis of his or her colour. Apartheid is an insult to the dignity of those it affects and a flagrant violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms set out in the United Nations Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to which we attach the highest importance. It is, in short, an institutionalized system of

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

State racism, which deprives the majority of the people of South Africa of their civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights.

Apartheid has bred hatred and violence. Indeed violence is inherent in the system. The South African authorities have reacted ruthlessly to the efforts of the large majority of the population to secure the abolition of apartheid. They have introduced some reforms, but these changes have been too few and too slow to stem the surging tide of bitterness and bloodshed in the country. They have done nothing to address the root of the problem.

As a result, the last 12 months have seen a deepening of the cycle of violence and repression in South Africa. The state of emergency, which was reimposed this year over the whole of the country, has worsened, not improved, the prospects for peaceful change. The Twelve are alarmed that the situation has deteriorated further. The state of emergency has led to the imprisonment of many thousands of people without trial and has brought much anguish and suffering into the homes of their families and loved ones. The Twelve share the widespread anxiety felt by the international community over reports of the conditions in which some detainees are being held and particularly of the use of torture. We once again condemn arbitrary mass arrests, forced resettlement and the practice of detention without trial, and call for the release of all people so detained under the state of emergency, which must be brought to an end.

Under the state of emergency the South African authorities have seriously curtailed press freedom, so that it is now impossible to report the activities of the South African security forces without heavy penalties. The Twelve view this development with great concern. We urge the South African Government to lift these restrictions on the press without delay. Freedom of information is part and parcel of the democratic process. We consider it a principle of fundamental importance, both as a basic right and as a means of promoting mutual understanding.

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

The goal of the Twelve is, quite simply, the elimination of apartheid. Apartheid must be abolished. There is an urgent need for peaceful change through a genuine national dialogue, across lines of colour, politics and religion. Violence - which has affected the black population in particular - must not be allowed to carry the day. The Twelve call for the suspension of violence on all sides.

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

Conditions must be created in which dialogue can begin and the necessary changes can be made. But such a dialogue is impossible while black leaders remain imprisoned or detained and anti-apartheid organizations are proscribed. At their meeting in Brussels on 15 and 16 September the Foreign Ministers of the Twelve deplored the fact that the South African Government was not yet prepared to take the steps to make a genuine dialogue possible. The Twelve have repeatedly called on the South African Government to release unconditionally Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners and to lift the ban on the African National Congress, the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania and other political parties. In this context we deplore the decision of the South African authorities to declare the United Democratic Front (UDF) an affected organization. This retrograde step against a leading non-violent group is contrary to the goal of genuine national dialogue.

In September 1985 the Twelve agreed on a series of measures designed to impress on the South African Government the inescapable need for fundamental reform. These were: an embargo on the export of arms and para-military equipment to South Africa; an embargo on imports of arms and para-military equipment from South Africa; a refusal to co-operate in the military sphere; the cessation of exports of sensitive equipment to the South African police and armed forces; the prohibition of oil exports to South Africa; the recall of military attachés accredited to South Africa and a refusal to grant accreditation to military attachés from South Africa; the freezing of official contacts and agreements in sports and security matters; prohibition of all new collaboration in the nuclear sector; and the discouragement of scientific and cultural agreements except where they might contribute to the ending of apartheid or have no role in supporting it.

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

In view of the deteriorating situation in South Africa, the European Council meeting at The Hague in June this year decided to take additional action. As a part of this process Heads of State and Government of the Twelve asked the British Foreign Secretary, Sir Geoffrey Howe, to undertake a mission to southern Africa. As he told the General Assembly on 23 September, he made two visits to the area in July. He sought to explain the policies of the Twelve to South Africa's neighbours and to impress on the South African Government our deep concern and the need for steps to encourage a peaceful negotiated solution to the country's problems.

In the absence of any progress in that direction the Twelve agreed at Brussels on 15 and 16 September to adopt a further package of restrictive measures on the lines envisaged at The Hague. This consists of bans on new investment and on the import of iron and steel, and gold coins, from South Africa. The Presidency will continue to seek consensus on a ban on the import of coal from South Africa on the basis of the statement made by The Hague European Council.

Coupled with those restrictive measures, the Twelve and the Community have embarked on concerted programmes of positive action designed to help the victims of apartheid both individually and collectively. Political, trade-union, management, cultural, scientific and sports contacts with the non-white community are being stepped up. The Twelve are helping those arrested under the state of emergency and, together with the Community, are putting heavy emphasis on programmes of training and education for black South Africans. This July we announced new reporting guidelines for the code of conduct for companies having branches, offices or representatives in South Africa. This code has been in operation since 1977. The new reporting format is designed to adapt and strengthen the provisions of the code in the light of developments since then. Greater emphasis has been given

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

to the role of independent trade unions representing black African workers; and companies have been asked to pay greater attention to education, training, black career-development and wider community projects. The aim of the code is to make a practical contribution to the abolition of apartheid and to promote substantial improvements in the living and working conditions of as large a number as possible of African workers.

The Twelve and the European Community are also providing substantial assistance to South Africa's neighbours. A major priority is the improvement of transport facilities in the region, a programme which is being carried out under the aegis of the Southern Africa Development Co-operation Conference (SADCC). The SADCC countries also receive development assistance within the framework of the Third Lomé Convention and food assistance from the European Community. In the past few years they have received about $1 billion a year of assistance of all sorts from the European Community and under programmes of bilateral co-operation with its member States.

As Sir Geoffrey Howe said when speaking on 23 September on behalf of the Twelve in the general debate, time is short. The Twelve earnestly appeal to the South African Government to look to the future and to accept that fundamental change is inevitable. As a first step South Africa's leaders need to make the leap of imagination which will allow a real dialogue to take place. The longer it takes for sincere negotiations to begin the more difficult it will be to achieve change by peaceful means and to avoid a bloodbath, the consequences of which would be with us for many years.

The Twelve will spare no effort to exert influence on South Africa to put an end to the intolerable system of apartheid and to establish without further delay a society with freedom and justice for all.

Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): I wish I could go directly to the subject of apartheid - which is the policy of a despicable régime and which has no place in our world. I know that we are all united in rejecting it.

First, however, I have to address myself to the question of facts. I do not have in mind the facts of apartheid, which are evident enough in their horror, as we see from newspaper and other reports that come back to us. No, I am talking about the ostensible facts contained in some of the reports and draft resolutions pertaining to this debate.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

Now there are two common techniques for twisting the facts: one is omission, and the other is distortion. Both of those techniques, I am afraid, are evident in the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid and in the draft resolution relating to Israel now before us.

Let us first look at omission. On 8 October 1986 - last month - I sent the Special Committee an official letter on behalf of my Government stating in detail our position towards apartheid. I shall read out some excerpts from that letter. First there is a statement from then Prime Minister Shimon Peres, made during his recent visit to Cameroon:

> "Israel unconditionally abhors apartheid. For the Jewish people, apartheid is the ultimate abomination. It is an expression of the cruellest inhumanity. Israel will do everything possible to eliminate this odious system."

Next, there is a statement from then Vice-Premier Shamir:

> "Israel cannot remain silent in the face of racial discrimination, wherever it may be. We reject and condemn apartheid as a political, social and economic system. We hope responsible leaders will act to create a climate such that the Government of South Africa will initiate negotiations to satisfy the legitimate political aspirations of all South Africans, regardless of race or colour."

Finally, the letter contained a reaffirmation of the Government's position:

> "Israel believes that apartheid is not reformable and that it must be abolished if greater suffering is to be averted. The Government of Israel will join the international community and the parliamentary democracies in any concerted actions aimed at the elimination of apartheid."

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

There is no mention whatsoever of that document in any of the reports of the Special Committee. By itself, the omission of any mention of Israel's policy towards apartheid is not surprising. United Nations bodies dealing with apartheid have never bothered to take into account Israel's repeated, unequivocal and powerful condemnations of apartheid. But I do not think this was a statement that could be quite so easily ignored. It was not issued in Jerusalem or in Geneva, or even made from this rostrum, where it might - let us be charitable - have been "lost" in the "research efforts" of these bodies. This was a statement that was made in a direct, specific communication from my Government to an official United Nations organ dealing with apartheid.

But omission is not the only phenomenon we are dealing with here. When you want to rig the evidence, to fix the evidence against someone and single him out for alleged wrongdoing, what you do is suppress the positive information about him, and equally suppress the negative information about everyone else. A year ago, at its fortieth session, the General Assembly inserted a new operative paragraph in its main resolution about apartheid. Paragraph 20 of resolution 40/64 A states that the General Assembly further requested

> "the Special Committee to keep the matter of collaboration between South Africa and Israel and between South Africa and any other State under constant review". (resolution 40/64 A, para. 20)

I shall deal in a moment with the first part of that paragraph, which alleges Israel's so-called collaboration with South Africa, but let us look first at its second part, the reference to collaboration between South Africa and other States - in the words of the resolution, "any other State". The main reason for the insertion of that paragraph last year was that even the General Assembly found it too difficult to ignore those "other States". Over the past few years we have

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

offered from this rostrum detailed information about the massive trade between South Africa and the leading Arab oil producers. Of course, the Special Committee, while proceding to single out Israel without the slightest hesitation, could not bring itself to name even one of those other States in its report. Nevertheless, the addition of that paragraph last year was a positive step, however small, towards a modest recognition of reality.

Now, what became of that directive intended to monitor the voluminous "other" trade? We have read the Special Committee's report carefully. There is no mention of that trade anywhere, even though it is irrefutably documented by independent monitoring and research agencies, such as the Shipping Research Bureau in Amsterdam and Lloyd's Voyage Record, all of impeccable international repute. Not a word about this trade appears anywhere. Why that is so becomes immediately obvious when one looks at this year's draft resolution. Last year's paragraph 20 has mysteriously disappeared. When I say it has disappeared, there should be no mistake about it: the part about Israel is still very much there. We are even singled out in a special draft resolution. What has evaporated into smoke is the reference to collaboration between South Africa and "any other State".

We all know why. The revelations concerning the Arab oil trade proved too embarrassing to the Arab States. They lobbied, they pressured, they harangued members to drop the matter, forcing the General Assembly, incidentally, effectively to go against its own directive. But the Arab oil trade with South Africa, while omitted from the reports, while omitted from the draft resolutions, even in indirect reference, is still very much alive. In fact, the preliminary information we have shows that it has increased significantly since last year.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

How do we know the facts of this secret trade in the first place? We do not know them simply because I am standing here and making assertions. What is the proof we have? One of the things we are trying to do in this debate is to separate assertion from fact.

In 1980 the Holland Committee on Southern Africa and the Kairos Group, a Dutch group known as Christians against Apartheid, established the non-profit Shipping Research Bureau in Amsterdam. The purpose of the Bureau was to monitor the oil traffic to South Africa. What the Bureau does is collect information about oil tankers from shipping companies and Governments and from various private intelligence sources around the world, including sources inside South Africa. This is a very long and painstaking task. There is a lag of roughly two years between the actual shipment and the report published by the Shipping Research Bureau.

We now have the most recently updated reports for the years 1983 and 1984. What the Bureau gives is details such as the name of the ship, its dead weight, its tonnage, the flag it flies under, the date of call in South Africa, and so forth. But what about the port of origin from which the tanker leaves, where it is originally loaded with oil destined for South Africa? The reports sometimes specify this, but when they are unable to do so they list the regions from which the tankers departed. By cross-checking with the voyage information in Lloyd's Voyage Records, the trade journal that monitors world-wide shipping traffic, it is not difficult to discover many of the unspecified ports of origin.

What do we find when we analyze the data for the years 1980 to 1984, the period for which we have updated figures? During that period, the Bureau was able to trace 167 oil tankers that came from the Persian Gulf to South African ports. Eighty per cent of them came in a direct route from the Persian and Arabian Gulf.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

The remaining tankers, 20 per cent, disguise their port of origin by stopping at intermediate ports, but significantly they return directly to the Persian Gulf once they have unloaded their oil in South Africa.

We can easily calculate the value of these shipments - and my delegation will distribute copies of this statement including our method of doing so, with a table and a calculation method. What do we get? We get this: In 1980 the volume of Arab shipments to South Africa was $2.1 billion, in 1981 $1.7 billion, in 1982 $1.6 billion, in 1983 $2.6 billion, and in 1984 $1.9 billion.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

Even allowing for the unlikely possibility that the Bureau misses some of the ships, Arab oil shipments to South Africa hover around an annual average of $2 billion. That means a staggering $9.9 billion - almost $10 billion - for the five-year period 1980-84.

Having done the cross-checking, we can ask a specific question: which countries supply this oil? Of the shipments we were able to cross-reference with Lloyds, we found that three countries supply 84 per cent. They are Saudi Arabia, 35 per cent; the United Arab Emirates, 34 per cent; and Oman, 15 per cent. I should point out that the tankers originating in the United Arab Emirates also stopped at Qatar and Bahrain which, along with Kuwait and a few others, account for the remaining 16 per cent of Persian Gulf shipments to South Africa.

In other words, the Arab oil producers provide the umbilical cord that nourishes the apartheid régime. It is no accident that the Shipping Research Bureau report calls it "South Africa's lifeline". The Arab oil producers do that in direct violation of the 1979 United Nations embargo on oil shipments to South Africa, to which they themselves are signatories. And they have the audacity to single out Israel for special trade links with South Africa.

That brings us to the second technique of misrepresentation, namely, distortion. As part of their effort to gain the support of African States, certain countries proclaim their solidarity with black Africa. This is, of course, a particularly curious claim, coming from the likes of Libya, which occupies a good chunk of Chad, and which has sent its killers and saboteurs to half a dozen black African countries, or from Saudi Arabia, which until recently practised official slavery and which still maintains a robust unofficial industry of indentured black servants in the heart of the Arabian peninsula, or from any of the other Arab members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), which for a

SY (Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

decade kept oil prices at astronomical levels, plundering the economies of the third world and hoarding vast riches, of which the starving Africans saw not a penny.

In return for that "support", the Arabs pressed the African States to condemn Israel. They dredge up the old canard that Israel stands out from other countries in having special ties, including economic and even nuclear ties, with South Africa.

That is flat nonsense. Our trade with South Africa is minuscule; it is about $100 million annually, as documented by independent International Monetary Fund (IMF) figures. It is barely visible compared with that of European, Arab and other States - less than half of 1 per cent of South Africa's exports and three quarters of 1 per cent of its imports. That brings us back to the Special Committee's latest report (A/41/22) - or, more precisely, to annex IV to that report. Refreshingly, that is a document that deals with facts and figures. It details South Africa's main trading partners - that is the title of the annex - in 1984-1985, based on United Nations Commodity Trade Statistics. The annex lists 13 main trading partners. Israel is not among them. Not surprisingly, the annex has a footnote. It says that it does not list certain commodities, such as gold and, of course, oil.

What about the much-touted nuclear field? Israel is repeatedly condemned for an alleged collaboration with South Africa in this area as well. We categorically deny this allegation. But what does the United Nations say about the matter? Occasionally it tells the truth. Recently, on 15 May this year, the United Nations distributed a report by a team of experts from Nigeria, Sweden, the Soviet Union, Venezuela and France who had investigated South Africa's nuclear weapons capability. The 44-page document was presented at the World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa in Paris in June. It is by far the most

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

comprehensive report ever issued by the United Nations on the subject. Certain countries are mentioned in the context of nuclear collaboration with South Africa. Again, Israel is not among them.

When it comes to South Africa, then, the assertion of a special place for Israel among the nations is exactly that - a groundless assertion endlessly repeated by those who wish not only to defame Israel, but also to deflect attention from their own furtive and enormously profitable trade with Pretoria.

The battle against apartheid has reached a historic juncture. It can either surge forward on a direct path to the total abolition of that hateful system or it can sink into the mud of falsehood and vindictiveness. This is where the campaign of vilification against Israel threatens to take it. That is why all those who are genuinely committed to the struggle against apartheid must reject with equal vigour the attempts to destroy its integrity. Omission, distortion and singling out - none of these have any place anywhere, but especially not in a struggle whose essential nobility and moral soundness deserve the utmost protection.

Mr. OSMAN (Somalia): The great attention now being given to the question of apartheid by all sections of the world community and the growing solidarity of world public opinion with the liberation struggle in southern Africa are indeed welcome developments. They are particularly gratifying to countries such as my own which have experienced frustration over the many decades when appeals by the General Assembly for concerted and effective measures against apartheid went unanswered.

Regrettably, the world community as a whole did not begin to respond appropriately to the existence of apartheid until the long-expected explosion of just anger and indignation against intolerable oppression had taken place, and until the spectacle of violent and bloody conflict between South Africa's black majority and racist minority had shocked the world.

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

Can there be any doubt now about the necessity for the total isolation of the Pretoria régime, as called for by the General Assembly's programme of action against apartheid? Each day brings new evidence of the brutality of a militarily powerful régime, determined to defend the white minority's privileged position by any means. The normally harsh suppression of any opposition to apartheid has been intensified, and even the barbarous killing of children and young people demanding their rightful place in their native land has become commonplace.

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

We are also seeing today the determination of black South Africans to make every sacrifice in sweat and blood, so that fundamental human rights may be enjoyed by all the people of that country. Unfortunately, significant change is not likely to occur in South Africa as a result of economic or political processes instituted by the régime.

It is apparent to all that the supposed constitutional and other changes introduced by the Pretoria régime are merely cosmetic changes designed to distort the situation and cover up the reality of an essentially unchanged apartheid system. Furthermore, the pronouncements of the ruling party leaders show only a blind and stubborn adherence to the status quo.

The critical situation in South Africa and in the whole of the southern African region underlines the fact that the world community is still not doing all it can to prevent a bloody and protracted racial conflict in that area. Such a conflict will not be averted unless the Pretoria régime is pressured into abolishing apartheid, releasing imprisoned leaders such as Nelson Mandela and beginning the process of establishing a just and democratic society.

My Government welcomes the imposition of sanctions against South Africa - even though of a limited nature - by a number of countries which had opposed taking such steps in the past. We particularly welcome the response of principle of the United States Congress in opposition to the intransigence of the apartheid system. However, we share the view of a wide spectrum of international opinion that the imposition of mandatory and comprehensive economic sanctions, including an oil embargo, is the only peaceful measure available to the United Nations to give effective support to the legitimate and intensified struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa.

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

The need for comprehensive economic sanctions against South Africa is reinforced by its illegal occupation of Namibia, an act of aggression against the Namibian people.

The United Nations, which has direct responsibility for Namibia's independence, must not continue to tolerate South Africa's failure to co-operate in implementing Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the sole legal basis for Namibia's independence. While that resolution remains unimplemented, the people are subjected to apartheid policies and the harsh and oppressive conditions of military occupation.

If the Pretoria régime continues to defy with impunity the decisions of the International Court of Justice and the Security Council, and the rules of international law, the credibility of this world Organization will be seriously undermined. If any doubts remain about the validity of enforcement measures against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter they should be dismissed in view of South Africa's policies of blatant subversion, occupation and brutal military aggression directed against neighbouring States. These policies of course constitute serious breaches of regional and international peace and security.

In this context it is pertinent to note that Article 50 of the Charter makes a specific recommendation with regard to the special problems of States affected by enforcement measures taken by the Security Council. Now, and in the future, the world community must give all possible assistance to the front-line States in their courageous and heroic support of the liberation struggle in South Africa and Namibia.

At several stages in the history of apartheid the world community has been challenged to take a stand against this evil system on moral, political and legal grounds. The challenge was not effectively taken up when South Africa's Nationalist Party first unveiled its apartheid plans or after the massacres of

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

Sharpeville and later of Soweto had demonstrated to the whole world the full and grave implications of the apartheid system.

At the present time, when new martyrs of apartheid are being created daily, the United Nations has an opportunity to make amends for the moral failures of the past, failures which encouraged the entrenchment of apartheid, the toleration of an acknowledged crime against humanity and the escalation of a grave threat to regional and international peace and security. Clearly the world community must go forward with increased determination and redoubled efforts, and must not fail again to do all in its power to bring peace, freedom, justice and democracy to the people in southern Africa.

Mr. EISSA (Sudan) (interpretation from Arabic): As we meet here, the African people in the south of the continent are continuing the struggle for freedom and independence which they have been waging for many years against the policies of racial discrimination of the despotic régime of the white racist minority, which is oppressing the black African majority. As a result of the continued escalation of the national liberation struggle by the African people, and their aspirations for self-determination and a State where justice and equality can be enjoyed by all, they are being subjected to various forms of oppression and terrorism by the white racist Pretoria régime. The régime is desperately trying to put an end to the national popular revolution by all the brutal and amoral means at its disposal, including detention, imprisonment and mass punishment. As a last resort, the régime has declared a state of emergency in various areas of the country, as specified in the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid.

(Mr. Eissa, Sudan)

In its attempt to stamp out the national struggle and throttle the revolution that has spread to all the African peoples in southern Africa, the racist Government of South Africa is trying to create a new situation in the area through destabilization and threats to the security of neighbouring independent African States. The aim is to cut off any form of assistance that the freedom fighters might be able to obtain.

The Government of South Africa has been able to entrench its policy of apartheid because some Western countries have not yet taken positive action to impose sanctions against the racist Government. In fact some of those States still extend political, economic and moral support to the Government of the racist régime. Their financial centres and business enterprises continue to aid and abet the Pretoria régime.

Hence it is incumbent on the international community to give every form of assistance, particularly in the political and information fields, to the freedom fighters in southern Africa so that they may put an end to that abhorrent racist policy and ensure for their people a life of freedom and dignity through the exercise of self-determination.

It is therefore necessary to ask the international community as represented by the United Nations General Assembly to take action - to bring about the immediate lifting of the state of emergency in South Africa; the withdrawal of the racist troops laying siege to the cities there; the release of all political prisoners and detainees held since the imposition of the state of emergency; the ending of the terrorism and oppression practised against the African people; the lifting of the ban on political organizations and the granting of freedom of political action; the declaration of a general amnesty for all citizens; the immediate return of African exiles who have been forced to leave their country and prevented from returning to

(Mr. Eissa, Sudan)

it; and the cessation of all political and military manoeuvres aimed at the creation of a state of instability in southern Africa, so as to safeguard the independence and territorial integrity of those countries; and, finally, to call upon intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and individuals to intensify their support for those fighting for the suppressed peoples in South Africa and their liberation movements.

The international community is called upon, in the first instance, to make the isolation of South Africa more complete, bringing all the pressures at its disposal to bear on Pretoria to end its policy of apartheid and then create the necessary conditions leading to the full exercise of self-determination by all those citizens now under the heel of the white minority, which continues to practise tyranny and oppression against the overwhelming majority of the people of South Africa.

The positive action taken by the United States legislature - in the fight against racial discrimination in South Africa is a good beginning, an incentive to others and a positive step in the right direction in dealing with the deteriorating situation in southern Africa. We hope that this action by the United States is a step that will be followed by others. We are glad to see that some of the main trading and industrial companies, universities and cultural institutions in the United States have started the much desired divestment of American capital from South Africa and the tightening of a comprehensive embargo against the apartheid régime.

I take this opportunity to call upon all the other Member States of this Organization, particularly those that still maintain trade and economic relations with the Government of apartheid South Africa, immediately to end all such relations and heed Africa's appeal for the elimination of this heinous oppression of man by man and hateful discrimination on grounds of race, ethnic origin or

(Mr. Eissa, Sudan)

religion. It is high time the Security Council imposed comprehensive mandatory sanctions on the Government of South Africa in order to force it to desist from its racist practices and policies of aggression, which contravene the United Nations Charter.

The apartheid South African Government has adamantly refused to co-operate with the international community over the past few decades. It is against the granting of immediate independence to the usurped Territory of Namibia, in spite of the expressed will of the international community. Thus, the Government of South Africa has become a constant threat to peace and security in Africa. Its repeated attacks on the African front-line States need no elaboration.

We hold the white minority régime in South Africa fully responsible for all the evils of the introduction of super-Power rivalries into the area. This has been brought about by its continued harassment of Angola and its support for rebellion and sabotage in other countries.

In order to increase the isolation of South Africa and impose mandatory sanctions on it, it is necessary for us to deal with the question of the continued co-operation between South Africa and Israel. If this co-operation proves anything, it is that there is a common racialist denominator which is manifested in the ugly racist treatment of the indigenous populations in South Africa, the occupied Arab territories and occupied Palestine, as well as the identical positions of the two Governments, which have refused to comply with the resolutions and the Charter of the United Nations. The main aspect of their co-operation concerns such highly dangerous areas as the military and nuclear, as well as their economic and trade relations, which have made Israel a link between South Africa and the European markets, particularly since the adoption of the policies of embargo and their significant effects, which would tend to force the racist State

(Mr. Eissa, Sudan)

of South Africa to abandon its racist attitude. The State of Israel has never committed itself to complying with the United Nations decisions calling for economic sanctions against Pretoria. We should like to call the attention of the States of the world to the danger of this Israeli collaboration with the white racist minority Government in South Africa, its negative effects on the international efforts to end apartheid and the dangers inherent in such racist collaboration.

In conclusion, I wish to reaffirm once again Sudan's support for the draft resolutions presented to the General Assembly and for the programme of the Special Committee against Apartheid for the continued mobilization of support and assistance for the just struggle of the peoples of South Africa to put an end to the policies of apartheid and achieve independence and self-determination.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.