



## General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

UN LIBRARY

A/42/PV.72

20 November 1987

DEC

ENGLISH

COLLECTION

## Forty-second session

## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

## PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SEVENTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Tuesday, 17 November 1987, at 3 p.m.

President:

Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic)  
Mr. KAROUI (Vice-President) (Tunisia)  
Mr. WIJEWARDANE (Vice-President) (Sri Lanka)

- Organization of work
- Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) [37] (continued)
  - (a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples
  - (b) Report of the Secretary-General
  - (c) Report of the Fourth Committee
  - (d) Draft resolution
- Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa [33] (continued)
  - (a) Reports of the Special Committee against Apartheid
  - (b) Report of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa
  - (c) Reports of the Secretary-General
  - (d) Report of the Special Political Committee
  - (e) Draft resolutions

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I wish to propose that the list of speakers in the debate on agenda item 32, "Law of the sea", be closed at 11 a.m. tomorrow, 18 November.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I therefore ask representatives who wish to take part in the debate to put their names on the list of speakers as soon as possible.

AGENDA ITEM 37 (continued)

QUESTION OF THE FALKLAND ISLANDS (MALVINAS)

- (a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (A/42/23 (PART VII); A/AC.109/920 and Corr.1)
- (b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/42/732)
- (c) REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/42/731)
- (d) DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/42/L.17)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): The General Assembly now has before it the report of the Fourth Committee (A/42/731). May I take it that the Assembly takes note of this report?

It was so decided.

Mr. GUTIERREZ (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): In his address to the Assembly at the forty-first session, the President of Costa Rica, Mr. Oscar Arias Sanchez, said the following:

"I wish to reiterate here our desire for an urgent dialogue between Argentina and Great Britain to resolve the question of sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands." (A/41/PV.9, p.16)

(Mr. Gutierrez, Costa Rica)

In that concise form a Latin American leader who had part of his education educated in England expressed the position that the Government of Costa Rica has maintained for many years on this subject and that has always led us to support draft resolutions similar to the one now under discussion. Consequently, on behalf of my Government, I reiterate that position and appeal once again for dialogue and that the door be kept open for consideration of this matter by peaceful, rational and civilized means, which are the means that must be given preference by two democratic nations belonging to different branches of the same culture.

It is the duty of all Latin Americans to support Argentina in its legitimate aspirations with regard to a part of its territory. It is a duty that stems from the common past of peoples that resulted from the expansion of Europeans into this continent. The errors committed by Spanish Americans led us to freedom divided, but those divisions, although they have been consolidated in the course of our independent existence, have never destroyed the bonds of unity that remain strong today and lead us to recognize one another as brothers. In no area are we more unified than in the struggle against the last vestiges of our colonial past - hence our solidarity with Argentina in its struggle to recover the Malvinas Islands, which we see as a necessary step to bring an end to colonialism in the American continent.

This entire effort should be aimed at negotiation as the civilized means of achieving harmony among nations - recognizing, as must be recognized, that the settlement of the situation must take into account the historical circumstances and territorial continuity, which mean that the Malvinas Islands must be considered part of Argentina, and recognizing, as must be recognized, the situation of the inhabitants of the archipelago, for whom the necessary safeguards must be provided so that they can continue to enjoy the rights which they enjoy today.

(Mr. Gutierrez, Costa Rica)

The difficulties involved in the dispute might suggest that the positions of the parties are too far apart for the possibility of success in negotiations to be envisaged. Great Britain insists that it will not negotiate on sovereignty over the islands. Argentina believes that sovereignty must be the central element of the agreements to be negotiated. However, as in every conflict, it is impossible to believe that if the parties were prepared to talk about all aspects of the dispute and devote the necessary time to negotiations it would not be possible to reach agreement.

This is a year which seems to have brought substantial advances in the process of negotiation in various parts of the world. The negotiations between the two super-Powers to eliminate part of their nuclear arsenals are about to be concluded, although it is difficult to imagine differences greater than those that exist between them, or a more delicate subject for negotiation. Similarly, the holding of a Middle East peace conference is becoming ever more likely; it is almost certain that, if not this year, next year parties that had until now been irreconcilable enemies will be brought together round a negotiating table to agree on a satisfactory end to that prolonged and bloody conflict. Finally, on a smaller scale, we recall what is happening in Central America, where the agreement of 7 August between the Presidents has opened the door to the settlement of a painful and difficult conflict to which for so many years a peaceful solution seemed absolutely impossible.

Those are good examples of important developments this year. They have in common the fact that they are notable examples of negotiation as an effective means of finding stable and definitive solutions to international problems. They should be highlighted here, since the Organization exists to serve as an instrument to promote peace, make agreements possible between nations and rule out the idea that

(Mr. Gutierrez, Costa Rica)

the only way to decide differences between nations is to resort to force, the ultimate expression of irrationality in human relations.

Therefore, the General Assembly should consider the question of the Malvinas Islands with the same conviction as in previous years, expressing its faith in negotiations, its hope that the English and the Argentines will sit around a negotiating table and end their present differences, which are a minor accident in the course of relations which in the past have been solid, strong and beneficial to both countries.

We wish to make clear our support for Argentina's position, since we see in its attempt to recover the Malvinas Islands a step forward in the eradication of colonialism. But at the same time we reiterate our faith in negotiations and our hope that through them it will prove possible to end a conflict that should not have started and every day has even less reason to exist.

Mr. ORAMAS OLIVA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): The General Assembly once again has before it the question of the Malvinas Islands. On this occasion, when we see on the horizon substantial progress in negotiations on intermediate-range missiles, resulting in a lessening of tensions, we hope that there will be an honourable solution to this sensitive problem, too, so that reason and logic may prevail. The cause is invincible, because it is sustained by the living currents of history.

Argentina has consistently shown that it seeks a negotiated solution to this dispute with the United Kingdom regarding sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands. A settlement at the negotiating table would be an important contribution to peace and stability in the southern part of the American continent. As we said recently in the Security Council, it is time colonial bonds became no more than a subject of historical research, so that we may all devote ourselves to the struggle for the material and spiritual development of the human being. Whatever the latitude of

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

his birthplace, even if it be in the most isolated part of the world, a man has the same right to life as men born in the great metropolises, regardless of religion, race, sex or language, which is why our Organization adopted in 1960 resolution 1514 (XV) to help end that chapter in the pre-history of mankind.

To appeal to the United Kingdom to resolve the question and restore sovereignty over the islands to the Argentine Republic without delay is to invoke Article 2, paragraph 3 of the Charter, which says:

"All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered."

The relevant resolutions of the Assembly indicate that the only way to end the colonial situation of the Malvinas Islands is to settle the Argentine-British dispute over sovereignty over the islands.

Argentina has extended an olive branch to the United Kingdom. And, on behalf of the peoples of the America of Bolivar and Martí, we ask that Power to accept the challenge of history and, with a vision of the future, contribute to restoring what is rightly claimed. Peace, détente, the peaceful settlement of disputes and an end to the thunder of cannons and to suffering is a deep desire of the peoples that we cannot ignore.

Mr. KAM (Panama) (interpretation from Spanish): The General Assembly has been considering the question of the Malvinas Islands since 1965. On 15 November of that year - that is, exactly 22 years ago - 15 Latin American countries, including Panama, presented a draft resolution which one month later the Assembly adopted as resolution 2065 (XX), the first General Assembly resolution on this question. As a sponsor of that draft resolution, we were inspired by the anti-colonialist calling of our people and our abiding respect for such principles as the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

(Mr. Kam, Panama)

Today, 22 years later, we reaffirm with even more vigour our adherence to those principles, which are unalterable norms of Panama's foreign policy. In keeping with those principles, forged in Panama's long struggle for the restoration, affirmation and exercise of full sovereignty over all its territory, we reaffirm Panama's firm and decided support for the Argentine nation and its legitimate right to recover the Malvinas Islands and reintegrate them within its territorial heritage.

(Mr. Kam, Panama)

Beyond the fact that resolution 2065 (XX) was adopted some time ago - on 16 December 1965 - we wish to point out the singular importance we assign to three aspects of that historic resolution. First, that resolution clearly establishes that negotiations between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom are the best way to achieve a peaceful solution to the dispute between the two countries concerning sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands. That position has been repeatedly reaffirmed by the General Assembly. The seven resolutions and the four consensus decisions it adopted on the subject are evidence of that, in particular the five resolutions approved over the past five years, thus confirming its unalterable constancy with regard to the principle of the peaceful settlement of international disputes. The international community's record in favour of a negotiated solution of the question of the Malvinas Islands must not be ignored or minimized by the United Kingdom.

The second aspect of resolution 2065 (XX) we wish to highlight is the fact that in that resolution the General Assembly deliberately avoided acknowledging, for that Territory, the right of the population of the Malvinas Islands to self-determination and limited itself to asking that the interests of that population be taken into account. Quite appropriately that position has been repeatedly reaffirmed by the Assembly. This aspect should be emphasized every time the colonial Power insists on giving precedence to the alleged right to self-determination of the population over the legitimate rights of the Argentine nation to restore its territorial integrity.

Thirdly, in 1965, 15 Latin American countries sponsored a draft resolution; that clearly indicated what is today an unquestioned reality: as a result of growing regional solidarity the cause of the Malvinas Islands is no longer the cause of Argentina alone and has become the common cause of Latin America as a whole and an element of the unity for its peoples.



(Mr. Kam, Panama)

The international community is fully aware that the dispute between Argentina and the United Kingdom over the sovereignty of the Malvinas derives from the illegal occupation of these islands by the United Kingdom through the use of force in 1833 against the territorial integrity of the Argentine nation. Argentina's sovereignty over these Islands is based on clear historical precedents and solid legal arguments put forward and documented in the United Nations during the past 22 years, and I therefore need not dwell on this.

Nevertheless my delegation cannot fail to point out that the continuation of that colonial British occupation of one part of American soil for more than 150 years provoked a conflict, indeed war, in 1982 in the southern Atlantic, as a result of British obstinacy in maintaining at all costs an outdated colonial situation in violation of the United Nations Charter and General Assembly resolutions and in open disregard of the feelings of all Latin Americans who, as I have just recalled, had made Argentina's cause their own. That shows how fragile and precarious the perpetuation of certain cases of injustice can be when the powerful of this world attribute to themselves certain rights, clinging to their superior roles and trying to perpetuate inequity rather than rectifying matters in good faith.

But we have always maintained that it is never too late to correct an error. The General Assembly has provided Argentina and the United Kingdom with an appropriate framework for resolving their dispute. The Secretary-General has stated that he is ready to assist the two Governments so that the various resolutions of the General Assembly can be implemented. However, the United Kingdom seems bent on avoiding its commitment to the United Nations Charter, which includes the obligation of Member States to settle their international disputes by peaceful means, so as not to undermine international peace and security, as well as justice.

(Mr. Kam, Panama)

In this context we urge the United Kingdom, to respect, without delay, subterfuge or pre-conditions, the relevant United Nations resolutions and the call of the international community and in good faith enter into serious negotiations with the Government of Argentina.

We congratulate the Argentine Government on its constructive attitude. It has recalled its unshakeable commitment to the search for a peaceful, negotiated solution to the problems that remain with the United Kingdom. A negotiated agreement with Chile over the Beagle Channel, its unflagging efforts in the Contadora Group, and the Support Group aimed at peace in Central America, and its outstanding work in the Cartagena consensus on a solution to the external debt crisis - all clearly confirm the ardent commitment of the Government of President Raul Alfonsin to peace, development and co-operation, which extends to the search for a negotiated settlement of the question of the Malvinas Islands.

As in past years the representative of the United Kingdom has insisted on putting forward in the General Assembly the alleged right to self-determination of the inhabitants of the Malvinas Islands in the territory and wondered whether that right had to apply to all peoples or only to some. There should be no confusion or any erroneous views on this point.

My country voted in favour of resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 and does not have any reservations whatever concerning the right of peoples to self-determination mentioned in that resolution. We emphatically declare that all peoples have the right to self-determination; but that right cannot be understood in any form as a right to decide on the future of territories that were usurped, territories that belong to others and territories occupied by force, which is the case with the territory of the Malvinas Islands.

Since the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly my delegation has clearly stated its position in this regard. At that session it stated that:

(Mr. Kam, Panama)

"The Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples itself recognizes the existence of various forms and manifestations of colonialism, all of which must be eradicated speedily and unconditionally. Therefore, each colonial case should be considered in the light of its own specific form and manifestation in the process of its decolonization, and recourse can be had either to the method of self-determination, if the conditions and circumstances make it appropriate for that population to exercise that right, or to the method of restitution of the territory to the country having sovereignty over it.

(Mr. Kam, Panama)

"In the case of the Malvinas, we are faced with the second situation since it is a case of a territory illegally occupied, amputated from the territorial entity of a sovereign State, Argentina, and inhabited by people settled there by the occupying Power. It can hardly be said, therefore, that this population should determine the future of a usurped territory which is not its own.

"By insisting on recognition of the right to self-determination of the population of the Malvinas, the United Kingdom is trying to conceal its clear purpose, which is to perpetuate its colonial occupation of the territory, using the population there as the instrument for the attainment of that end by giving them the right of veto with respect to the restitution of the territory." (A/37/PV.55, p. 12)

The Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the practices of decolonization that have evolved in recent years affirm that subjugated, dominated and exploited peoples have the right to self-determination. It is difficult to see how that right might be invoked in the case of the subjects of a colonial Power that uses them as instruments to justify the colonial presence, as in the case of the Malvinas Islands.

The philosophy of decolonization implies that the right to self-determination is applicable to a colonized people whose identity and interests are clearly separate and distinguishable from those of the population of the colonizing Power. The essence of colonialism is conflict of interest between the colonized and the colonizers, and in the case of the Malvinas there is no such conflict of interest. On the contrary, there is identity of interest between the colonizing Power and the inhabitants because they have clearly indicated their wish to remain British.

(Mr. Kam, Panama)

Yesterday the representative of the United Kingdom insisted that we cannot disregard the wishes of the population of the Malvinas Islands. But I wonder what we are to say of the population of Diego Garcia: what of their wishes, when the United Kingdom has allowed a naval air base to be installed there by the United States? The United Kingdom has rejected any idea of having that island freed of occupation. Why have hundreds of persons been deported, persons eager to return to their homeland? Why have their wishes not been taken into account?

Panama, which is familiar with colonial occupation, having known it on its own soil, has made the struggle against all forms and manifestations of colonialism a cardinal principle of its foreign policy, and it considers it patriotic daily to oppose foreign interests that block our sovereignty, independence and self-determination. The experience we have gained in our struggle against colonialism has made us aware and caused us to stand in solidarity with those other colonial peoples that are victims of injustice. And the solidarity that Panama receives enables it to do more for other peoples. We affirm here that there is but one struggle against colonialism, whether in Asia, in Africa, in Latin America or in Europe. That struggle is indivisible. So long as colonial injustice continues to exist, we shall fight for freedom and peace. That is our commitment - that and our unshakable solidarity with the Argentine nation and its sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands.

Finally, my country wishes its name to be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/42/L.17.

Mr. PAOLILLO (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): Uruguay's support for Argentina's claim of sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands has been a consistent part of my country's policy in the United Nations. An analysis of Uruguay's statements since 1965, when this item was included in the agendas of the General Assembly and the Committee of 24, clearly shows that this support has been continual and has not changed in hue or in intensity. That continuity has been prompted not only by the solidarity deriving from the friendship between our peoples, but also by unbiased conviction based on solid juridical arguments, unquestionable historical facts and powerful geographical considerations.

Uruguay's position has also been consistent in systematically stressing the need for a negotiated solution between the parties arrived at through one of the many available international mechanisms for the peaceful settlement of disputes. In the General Assembly and the Committee of 24, on the question of the Malvinas Islands, without prejudice to Argentina's position on the substance of the issue, in their positions and statements Uruguayan representatives have sought to influence the deliberations and consultations and have counselled moderation between opposing views and rapprochement between two countries with which Uruguay has maintained and continues to maintain excellent bilateral relations.

Today it is not our intention to discuss Uruguay's historic support for Argentina's sovereignty claim, which it maintains, but our constant desire to contribute, in so far as we are able, to creating favourable conditions for dialogue and negotiations between the two parties.

After the armed conflict of April to June 1982 and the establishment of the Constitutional Government in Argentina in December 1983, there emerged an

(Mr. Paolillo, Uruguay)

expectation that once the hostilities had ceased and natural avenues of communication had been opened up between the two Governments, restoration of diplomatic relations and resumption of negotiations would be imminent, or at least possible medium-term objectives. However, time continues to pass and still we have not gone beyond expressions of intention. A series of events, in particular the failure at the outset of the Bern talks of June 1984 and the British statement on south-west Atlantic fisheries in October 1986, have led to the virtual freezing of diplomatic initiatives. As a result of those events there have been only sporadic unofficial contacts, generally at the level of legislators at annual Conferences of the Inter-parliamentary Union.

Accordingly, there has not yet been any dialogue between the two Governments. The international community has persistently called for such dialogue, which is the only instrument, over and above various modalities or diplomatic procedures, that can lead to a negotiated solution of the dispute and restoration of the mutual trust and friendship that have traditionally linked the peoples of Argentina and the United Kingdom. Meanwhile, the expectations inspired by the initiatives of 1984 are increasingly giving way to feelings of frustration.

(Mr. Paolillo, Uruguay)

It is understandable that the entire international community, especially the countries of the region, should be concerned at the persistence of that area of tension with its potential of dangers and threats to peace and security. This concern has been expressed by the General Assembly in the resolutions it has adopted since the confrontation in 1982. It has also been reflected in various resolutions of the Organization of American States, such as that adopted last Friday, 13 November, which contained an expression of concern over the lack of progress in implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations.

If we compare the patterns of voting on resolutions on the Malvinas Islands since the Assembly decided, in 1982, that the item would be considered directly in the plenary meeting, we note that the majorities in favour have been growing steadily. The affirmative vote has increased year by year, whereas the negative vote and the abstentions have substantially declined. That upward tendency in the voting is a clear indication that the resolutions have been not only steadily gaining political support, but increasingly embodying a language of consensus focusing on action that no Member State can reasonably challenge; that is, the beginning of a process of negotiation between the parties, assisted by the good offices of the Secretary-General. Even the scope of that process has been framed in sufficiently broad terms so that no issue pending between the two countries should be excluded a priori. Thus, an effort is being made to provide a sphere of negotiation that does not allow for restrictive interpretations, given the very wide range of items that it may include, from initial agreement on bilateral measures for the re-establishment of mutual trust to the actual discussion on the future of the Malvinas Islands.



(Mr. Paolillo, Uruguay)

The resolutions that the General Assembly has adopted by an ever more overwhelming majority have sought simply to ensure that Argentina and the United Kingdom resolve their differences by negotiation. That is the basic, essential and unquestionable request that the United Nations should address to two States which are involved in a dispute that has lasted more than 150 years. It concerns a natural obligation that falls to each member of the international community conceived as an organized system of coexistence of nations, an obligation which, in the case of the Malvinas Islands, takes on a different dimension since it involves one of the five permanent members of the Security Council, which consequently has special responsibilities in connection with the prevention and elimination of hotbeds of international tension.

Recently, the General Assembly considered and adopted a new resolution on the South Atlantic, which was declared a zone of peace and co-operation in 1986. The South Atlantic is a vast area of growing value in political, military and economic terms, because of both the importance of its channels of communication and the volume of its fish, mineral and energy resources. Since the clash of 1982 in the Malvinas, a factor of instability has been introduced and consolidated in a critical area of the South Atlantic. That continues to affect not only those involved in the confrontation, but the entire region. It is a factor of instability added to the factors that already exist in southern Africa as a result of the apartheid régime and its illegal occupation of Namibia.

The zone of peace of the South Atlantic will not be complete so long as factors of instability or potential conflict persist. Fortunately, Argentina and the United Kingdom supported last year and are supporting this year General Assembly decisions on this item. That support implies, among other things, a shared commitment to carry out at the multilateral level in that area a policy

(Mr. Paolillo, Uruguay)

consistent with the two principal aims of the declaration: the promotion of regional co-operation and the preservation of international peace and security.

The participation of the two countries in a declaration supported by the international community and aimed at creating a zone of peace that includes the Malvinas Islands could be considered a first, significant step in the direction of rebuilding mutual trust and initiating the dialogue for which the international community has persistently called.

The need for early initiation of negotiations leading to a definitive solution of the problem is urgent also because this is a conflict whose prolongation benefits no one, not even those who persist in doubting the historical inevitability of the result of the negotiating process. This is a case, indeed, in which time is not on anyone's side. On the contrary, prolongation of the situation merely keeps alive the feelings of exasperation on both sides, separating two countries which, as in the past, have a great deal to gain from their mutual relations.

Uruguay will vote in favour of the draft resolution before the Assembly because, contrary to what was stated yesterday by the representative of the United Kingdom, we do not see in support for this draft resolution fulfilment of a ritual act devoid of content. We continue to hope that ultimately good sense, wisdom and the goodwill of the parties will prevail and that both will devote themselves to the search for a definitive solution to this problem. It is that faith that gives content and substance to the draft resolution, of which we are a sponsor, and we hope that, like similar draft resolutions in past years, it will have the massive support of this Assembly.

Mr. MOYA PALENCIA (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): For the past six years the General Assembly has insisted on the need for the Governments of Argentina and of the United Kingdom to find a peaceful and definitive solution to

(Mr. Moya Palencia, Mexico)

the question of the Malvinas Islands. In one resolution after another the General Assembly has requested the Secretary-General to continue his renewed mission of good offices in order to assist the two Governments in resolving their dispute by peaceful means. In spite of the repeated appeals of the General Assembly and the efforts of the Secretary-General, no progress has been noted during the past 12 months because one of the parties is unwilling to enter into dialogue and negotiations in order to find a speedy, peaceful and definitive solution to the pending problems, including all aspects on the future of the Malvinas, in accordance with the Charter.

This appears very clearly from the debate that we are concluding today and from the report of the Secretary-General, in which, unfortunately, he once again indicates the following:

"While both parties have in the past year shown commendable restraint and a clear willingness to reduce areas of tension, I regret that it has not yet proved possible to engage both Governments in the kind of dialogue consistent with General Assembly resolution 41/40 that I have urged in the past. I wish to reiterate my continued willingness to assist both Governments towards that end." (A/42/732, para. 6)

(Mr. Moya Palencia, Mexico)

In his statement yesterday the Foreign Minister of the Republic of Argentina, Mr. Dante Caputo, again provided evidence of the flexible and conciliatory attitude adopted from the very outset by the Government of President Raul Alfonsin in its search for a definitive solution to its differences with the United Kingdom concerning the territory of the Malvinas, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands. The international community has welcomed that attitude, which could provide an appropriate framework for genuine understanding between the parties. My country is a sponsor of draft resolution A/42/L.17.

The support of the international community for the Republic of Argentina in regard to its position in this case is in keeping with the need to comply strictly with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter in finding peaceful solutions to disputes. This support by the overwhelming majority of States Members of our Organization also forms part of its persevering efforts to put an end to any remnants of colonial domination.

However, the situation in the south-west Atlantic should not be seen in the context of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) but rather in the historical evolution of the region. In fact, as has been pointed out on numerous occasions, the archipelago was occupied by force in 1833 by the United Kingdom, a few years after Argentina had become independent with a national territory that included that archipelago. This is an additional example of the unfortunate consequences of rivalry between European Powers, which frequently resolved their differences on the backs of their American colonies. In Africa and Asia similar situations have occurred. Nevertheless, we must all bear in mind that in 1833 Argentina was already an independent republic, which the British Government itself had recognized formally and without any reservation since 1825. Argentine sovereignty over the

(Mr. Moya Palencia, Mexico)

archipelago has never been in doubt, and 150 years of illegal occupation cannot be invoked to cast doubt upon that; otherwise we would be sanctioning the acquisition of territory by force, thereby undermining one of the fundamental principles of the Charter.

Nor is it possible to claim that there is a presumed right to self-determination by the British occupiers, because that right has been exercised by the Argentine nation over the whole of its territory, including the Malvinas Islands, since the moment when it proclaimed and obtained its independence.

Practically all the Latin American nations became independent at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Ours is a history of anti-colonialism, but contemporary life has given us repeated examples of the deep-rooted tradition of finding solutions to our disputes in a peaceful fashion. The Agreement signed in Esquipulas, Guatemala, on 7 August is part of that tradition, as well as the persevering efforts of the Contadora Group and the Support Group in order to find a peaceful, negotiated solution to the Central American conflict. That is why we also firmly support the just cause of the Argentine Republic with regard to the Malvinas Islands.

On the eve of the twenty-first century the United Nations can be proud of having written a brilliant page in the field of decolonization, but that task will not be concluded if we do not find solutions to situations such as that in the south-west Atlantic.

Mr. TAVERAS GUZMAN (Dominican Republic) (interpretation from Spanish): The General Assembly is meeting once again to consider the item on the question of the Malvinas Islands. We have read the report of the Secretary-General pursuant to General Assembly resolution 41/40 of 25 November 1986 and we see with regret that

(Mr. Taveras Guzman, Dominican Republic)

conditions have not changed sufficiently for us to feel optimistic. This lack of progress towards the normalization of the situation in the south Atlantic constitutes a constant source of concern to the international community, and most especially for the entire Latin American region. It is clear that the persistence of this situation constitutes a state of tension that could affect the maintenance of international peace and security. Similarly, it is an unquestionable reality that so long as the Malvinas Islands situation has not been justly and peacefully resolved it will remain a sore point in Latin America's juridical concept.

In view of those considerations, and aware of the interest of the international community in finding a prompt and just solution to this dispute, a group of countries has submitted for the consideration of this Assembly a draft resolution which calls upon the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to initiate negotiations with a view to finding the means to resolve peacefully and definitively the problems pending between the two countries, including all aspects on the future of the Malvinas Islands, in accordance with the United Nations Charter. It may be observed that the sponsors of this draft resolution have expressly avoided reference to substantive questions at issue, in order to invite the parties to come to the negotiating table and engage in a frank and broad-ranging dialogue on their respective points of view. Accordingly, the draft resolution before the Assembly is an eminently procedural one and one which, in our judgement, is balanced and indeed objective.

We have always argued that there exists no international dispute or conflict that cannot be resolved through the means of peaceful settlement afforded by international law and the United Nations Charter.

(Mr. Taveras Guzman, Dominican Republic)

Accordingly the Dominican Republic, which unswervingly supports Argentina's just and legitimate claim to the Malvinas Islands, wishes to join the sponsors of the draft resolution before us.

In the conviction that we must emerge from the stagnation that has set in on this problem, my country, which maintains relations with both countries, appeals to the parties to resume their negotiations so as to find an honourable, lasting solution to this dispute.

Mr. BELANOGOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The discussions at the present session of the General Assembly on the various questions of our times demonstrate quite clearly that the building of international security calls for a high sense of responsibility, an unprejudiced attitude to the views of others and a readiness to seek constructive solutions to urgent problems. It is precisely this kind of approach that is called for in the case of the political settlement of the question of the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands. There is no doubt that the unsettled, unregulated conflict that is being maintained in the South Atlantic continues to be a source of international tension and a matter of concern to the international community.

The long-lasting consideration of this question in the United Nations has brought into focus the basic elements of the positions of the majority of Members of the Organization on this question. In its decisions the General Assembly has repeatedly confirmed that it is necessary to put an end to the colonial status of the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands. The international community has frequently urged the Governments of Argentina and of the United Kingdom to seek a peaceful settlement of the problem pending between the two countries, including all aspects on the future of the islands. In resolution 41/40, adopted at the last session, the Assembly again came out unequivocally in favour of seeking a settlement through negotiations on the basis of the United Nations Charter.

(Mr. Belanogov, USSR)

In spite of the numerous decisions of the General Assembly concerning the peaceful settlement of the Anglo-Argentine dispute in regard to the islands, the United Kingdom continues stubbornly to conduct a policy, based on maintaining the islands under its administration. In spite of Argentina's repeated manifestation of readiness to begin negotiations to resolve bilaterally the whole range of questions concerning the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands, no positive response has come from London so far. Moreover, the policy of new unilateral actions adopted last year has merely led to further complication of the situation. As a result the Secretary-General, in his most recent report on this question, was obliged to note that

"it has not yet proved possible to engage both Governments in the kind of dialogue consistent with General Assembly resolution 41/40 ..." (A/42/732, para. 6)

Concern is also caused by the militarization of the islands, which is continuing. The islands have been converted into a major naval and air base. The maintenance there of a large garrison and the allocation of large sums for the building of military facilities reveal the United Kingdom's desire to strengthen its position in that strategic region. The Latin American countries are quite justified in considering the situation that has been produced to be a threat to their security and to the stability of an extensive region located at the crossroads of three continents.

Such a situation is an obvious obstacle to the realization of the concept of the establishment in the South Atlantic of a zone of peace and co-operation, which is supported by the overwhelming majority of the States Members of the United Nations. In this connection it is difficult to reconcile the general political approach of the United Kingdom to the problem of the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands with its vote in favour of the resolution on the question of such a zone.



(Mr. Belanogov, USSR)

The Soviet delegation has frequently confirmed in this Hall its position with regard to the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands. The Soviet Union unwaveringly supports United Nations decisions on this problem and fully understands the position of the Movement of the Non-Aligned Countries with regard to the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands, in particular its statement concerning support for the right of Argentina to establish its sovereignty over the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands through negotiations. As was pointed out in the communique at the end of the official visit of our Minister for Foreign Affairs, Eduard Shevarnadze, to Argentina in October 1987, the Soviet Union and Argentina

"confirmed their position of principle concerning the need to reach a definitive and just settlement of the Malvinas problem through negotiations between Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on the basis of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly".

It is clear that in order to settle the question of the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands the psychology and concepts associated with the colonial era must be discarded. The unravelling of this knot of international tension demands realism, foresightedness and a readiness to compromise. It is as a manifestation of such a flexible and constructive approach that we view the appeal reiterated yesterday by the Argentine Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Dante Caputo, that this problem be resolved at the negotiating table.

We believe that in order to end the conflict in the South Atlantic negotiations between Argentina and the United Kingdom should begin as soon as possible so as to resolve the dispute between the two countries. As we see it, draft resolution A/42/L.17 is in line with this requirement and the Soviet delegation intends to support it.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I now call on representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting. I remind them that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. WIJEWARDANE (Sri Lanka): Draft resolution A/42/L.17 is identical with the resolution that we adopted last year. We see that it is a draft resolution inviting the two parties to start negotiations to resolve peacefully the differences between them, and it goes on to say:

"including all aspects of the future of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations".

My delegation assumes, therefore, that the proposals are intended to take cognizance of the question of sovereignty over the Falklands as well. We have gathered from the report of the Secretary-General (A/42/732) that, despite the discussions he has had with the respective Foreign Ministers and permanent representatives to the United Nations, he has not been able to get the parties to agree to engage in a dialogue consistent with General Assembly resolution 41/40. It seems that the difficulty in getting the parties together centres on the question of sovereignty. Looking at the question, my delegation believes that the wishes of the islanders should take precedence over other considerations.

In the case of the Falklands there appears no visible movement towards independence. We see, however, a claim by another party to exercise its sovereignty over the islands. We note that the claim had existed for some time and that it came to a head in 1982, when there was open conflict on the issue. The draft resolution that we now have before us invites the two parties to negotiate on their differences in all their aspects. We hold that dialogue is certainly more desirable than confrontation.

(Mr. Wijewardane, Sri Lanka)

My delegation, accustomed as we are to dialogue, would like to raise the question whether the views of the inhabitants of the Falklands should not also be considered in coming to a complete understanding regarding the future of the islands. My delegation would prefer that the Falkland islanders be given an opportunity to express their views on this matter before any decisions are taken towards the implementation of this draft resolution. We have heard the evidence of a few Falkland islanders who have appeared before the Fourth Committee, but we do not know whether they held a popular mandate to do so. We are not aware that by any device, such as a referendum, the islanders have expressed their wishes regarding their future political status. In the absence of a clear indication by the people of the Falkland Islands as to the kind of status they wish to have for themselves, my delegation finds it difficult to accept the proposal that the two parties should enter into a dialogue with the objective of peacefully resolving all aspects of the future of the Falkland Islands. My delegation, therefore, will not vote in favour of the draft resolution.

I wish to make it clear that our negative vote on the draft resolution will not deter us in our policy of building bridges of understanding and friendship.

Mr. ANDRADE DIAZ DURAN (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish): The international community has repeatedly stated its position with regard to the question of the Malvinas Islands, in various forums and on various occasions and expressed its support for efforts to find a peaceful and negotiated solution to this type of dispute, in pursuance of the purposes and principles set out in the Charter.

General Assembly resolution 41/40, on the Malvinas Islands, urged the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to initiate negotiations with a view to finding the means to resolve

(Mr. Andrade Diaz Duran,  
Guatemala)

peacefully and definitively the problems pending between the two countries, including all aspects on the future of the Malvinas Islands, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. Despite that appeal for dialogue and harmony, one of the parties has refused to begin talks aimed at resolving the dispute. Consequently it has been impossible to get out of the impasse, and this endangers international peace and security and, in particular, has a negative effect on the situation in the area of the south-west Atlantic, preventing the stability necessary to provide the basic conditions for the orderly and peaceful development of the region.

Guatemala wishes to express in this United Nations forum its total and unqualified solidarity with the Argentine Republic on the issue of the Malvinas Islands. As has been recognized by the International Court of Justice and the General Assembly itself, we must reaffirm the pre-eminence of the principle of territorial integrity over that of self-determination in those cases where colonial occupation has affected the sovereign territory of independent countries. It should be pointed out that Guatemala, too, has been affected by the same European Power in connection with its territory in similar circumstances, for which reason it, too, claims and affirms its legitimate rights in this regard.

There cannot be the slightest doubt that it is on historical and legal grounds that Argentina claims sovereignty over the Malvinas, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands. Hence, it is imperative that these territories be restored to it through negotiations leading to a peaceful and definitive solution by the means provided for in the Charter. We therefore support the endeavours of the Secretary-General, to whom the General Assembly has entrusted a mission of good offices, to create favourable conditions and a climate of confidence so that a just and appropriate solution to the problem may be found.

(Mr. Andrade Diaz Duran,  
Guatemala)

The Government of Guatemala agrees with the Argentine approach and proposal formulated in the statement of Mr. Dante Caputo, Minister for External Relations and Worship of Argentina, in the General Assembly yesterday. Guatemala appeals to the other party to initiate as soon as possible in compliance with the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, negotiations on this matter.

The present international climate is conducive to the peaceful negotiated settlement of conflicts of various kinds. In Central America our Governments are moving forward, with the invaluable and decisive support of the Contadora and Support Groups, in a peace-making process that will make it possible not only to dispel tension in the area, but, through dialogue and political negotiations, to overcome the crisis that we are experiencing. These processes, of course, require true political will on the part of States, so as to promote relations of friendship among nations and ensure the maintenance of international peace and security.

Guatemala wishes to join the sponsors of the draft resolution and we invite Member States to reiterate their support for the Secretary-General's mission of good offices and his appeal to the parties to initiate constructive negotiations with a view to finding the means to resolve this problem peacefully, justly and finally.

For all these reasons, Guatemala will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. HAMADNEH (Jordan) (interpretation from Arabic): We had hoped that this year would witness a peaceful settlement to the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas). My country has close ties of friendship with both parties to the dispute. Therefore, it is concerned that a peaceful settlement of this question has not yet been reached.

We hope a peaceful settlement will soon be reached, especially that there are reports on the initiation of a dialogue and fresh contacts between the two parties to the dispute. We find more grounds for optimism in the combination of Argentina's patience and wisdom and Britain's long-standing experience in devising compromise settlements.

While we have ties of traditional friendship with Britain, we share with Argentina the principles and the purposes of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. We appreciate Argentina's distinguished role in that Movement and its support and understanding of the various issues of the third world, especially the question of Palestine and the Middle East dispute.

Our vote on draft resolution A/42/L.17 will be as it was last year.

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I thank you very much for calling on me and allowing me to explain my vote regarding draft resolution A/42/L.17. In operative paragraph 1 of this draft resolution, the Assembly requests both parties:

"... to initiate negotiations with a view to finding the means to resolve peacefully and definitively the problems pending between both countries, including all aspects on the future of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations".

We believe that the British subjects who emigrated to the Malvinas, which is a piece of Argentina's territory, should not have betrayed the hospitality of the Government and people of Argentina and behave as an instrument of disrespect for

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani,  
Islamic Republic of Iran)

the territorial integrity of their host country. My delegation is not oblivious of the principle of self-determination, which is usually invoked by the United Kingdom. However, my delegation believes that, in the context of the Malvinas issue, it is not the only pertinent principle. The principle of sovereignty, which has already been violated by the settlers, is of prime importance. The resolution of all those claims and counter-claims can be best achieved through constructive and sincere negotiations.

The role of the Secretary-General in assisting the parties to reach agreement, is also elaborated in the draft resolution. In the assessment of my delegation, draft resolution A/42/L.17 has provided for all the necessary, positive means and methods, and indeed peaceful ways of solving the differences between the United Kingdom and Argentina. My delegation, therefore, will vote in favour of draft resolution A/42/L.17.

Sir Crispin TICKELL (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): Mr. President, it will come as no surprise to you, or to the General Assembly, that my delegation will vote against draft resolution A/42/L.17 in the same way and for the same reasons that it has voted against similar draft resolutions in the past. According to its sponsors, the draft resolution is purely procedural and in no way prejudices the positions of either the Argentine or the British Governments. Certainly the draft resolution has a certain seductive simplicity. Many delegations with whom I have discussed it said that it looks harmless enough. But, as I said yesterday, the significance lies not in what the draft resolution says, but in what it does not say. By calling for negotiations on "all aspects on the future of the ... Islands", it opens an agenda, which includes what the Argentine Minister for Foreign Relations and Worship said yesterday was the essence of the problem: the dispute

(Sir Crispin Tickell,  
United Kingdom)

over sovereignty. He also made it clear beyond peradventure that the only outcome of such negotiations which he could envisage would be the transfer of sovereignty over the islands from Britain to Argentina.

In other words, the draft resolution does in fact prejudice the position of one of the parties in that it supports the Argentine contention that sovereignty must be discussed and rejects the British contention that sovereignty is not negotiable. The Argentine Foreign Minister said that the framework he had proposed for negotiations would be extremely broad and extremely flexible. It could be as broad as the sea and as flexible as elastic, but the hard centre of the problem remains the same: the Argentine claim for sovereignty over the Falkland Islands.

Furthermore, the draft resolution makes no mention of the wishes of the Islanders, which are not in doubt, and their right to self-determination. Yet, in virtually every other resolution, adopted by this Organization on dependent territories, the right of the inhabitants to determine their own future is prominently reaffirmed. It is missing from this draft resolution. Why? Perhaps the key point made by the representative of Cuba has been forgotten: in short, that the inhabitants of the remotest parts of the earth have as many rights as those born in the big cities and the big countries. In fact, the rights of self-determination apply to all peoples no matter how few in number, and among them are the people of the Falkland Islands.

They have chosen a status which they passionately wish to retain. To annex the Falkland Islands to Argentina, as the Argentine Government seeks to do, would constitute a violation of a fundamental right of the inhabitants enshrined in the United Nations Charter and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the imposition of a new colonial status against their will.



(Sir Crispin Tickell, United Kingdom)

In my statement yesterday, I think I dealt with the curious argument that the inhabitants were there by intrusion rather than right. I repeat that the Falklands have been British for longer than Argentina has been Argentine. There were no indigenous inhabitants of the islands. Rather, settlers came there, as they came to Argentina, and if one country was colonized, so was the other. The only difference was that there were indigenous habitants in Argentina.

I heard with surprise the assertions of the Soviet Permanent Representative about the major naval and air base with a substantial garrison, which we are alleged to have established in the islands. First, I repeat what I said yesterday: our forces are there for defensive purposes. We had 43 soldiers there when the invasion took place in 1982; now, we are equipped to resist any new aggression, but we pose no threat to anyone. Secondly, I would very gently remind the Soviet Permanent Representative of an old English proverb, which has some relevance after our recent debate on Afghanistan, and that is, that those in glass houses should not throw stones.

Because the draft resolution obscures the two issues, sovereignty and self-determination, on which the positions of the British and Argentine Governments are opposed, it provides no basis for progress in resolving the differences between us. My Government has repeatedly said what it believes that process should be. The contentious question of sovereignty should be set aside, and the two parties should concentrate on the many practical, bilateral issues in which each has a common interest. So far, we have not had a response to the initiatives we have taken, but there is a glimmer of hope. Exchanges are in progress on a matter of importance to us both - fisheries conservation and the avoidance of incidents in the south-west Atlantic. Let us see how we might build on them.

(Sir Crispin Tickell, United Kingdom)

Yesterday the Argentine Minister for Foreign Affairs referred to his hopes for reconciliation between his country and mine. We also have such hopes. Others do too. But this draft resolution is not the way to achieve them. To the well-wishers of both Argentina and Britain, I say quite simply: Do not take sides in this dispute. Leave it to the parties to sort out their differences in sensible and realistic fashion and withhold your support from this draft resolution.

Mr. CAPUTO (Argentina): I wish to explain my Government's position with regard to draft resolution A/42/L.17. My Government will vote in favour of that draft resolution because it sets forth the very essence of what, in our judgement, should be the approach of the international community in dealing with problems, tensions and conflicts. The essence of that approach is negotiation.

Naturally, according to one's interpretation of it, there are things that the draft resolution fails to mention. However, there are many more things that the draft resolution does say, and it is those elements on which the Assembly is voting upon this afternoon. Put simply, according to draft resolution A/42/L.17, in order to resolve the dispute between the United Kingdom and Argentina, the international community, expressing itself through this Assembly, requests the initiation of negotiations. What other means are there, indeed, for resolving problems between Member States of the Organization other than negotiations?

The representative of the United Kingdom suggests that it be left to the two countries concerned to work out a solution to the problem. Then what is the use of having the Organization, what is the purpose of the Charter and what is the point of voting, if not to express the will of the international community on those issues that pose a threat to the peace and security of this planet? Is it interference in the internal affairs of Member States to express a concern for the peaceful settlement of a dispute? Is it intervention to act in accordance with

(Mr. Caputo, Argentina)

Article 1 of the United Nations Charter and attempt to bring about by peaceful means the adjustment or settlement of the dispute? We cannot say that, because if that were true, we would be questioning the very foundation upon which this Organization is built.

There is no question that there is a dispute. It is not an arbitrary or unilateral question raised by Argentina alone. The Government of the United Kingdom has on many occasions, acknowledged the existence of the dispute. In 1977, for example, a joint communiqué issued by both delegations here pointed to the existence of a dispute. Consequently, it is not something that has been invented by the Argentine Government, but something that began with the occupation of the islands in 1833.

To return to the principal argument, what the draft resolution does say is that in order to resolve the dispute, there should be negotiations between both Governments on all of the existing problems. It clearly does not prejudge the positions of either. The draft resolution does not refer to the question of self-determination or to the question of sovereignty. I would recall that, in 1985, the British delegation sought to introduce amendments to the draft resolution, pointing out that express reference should be made to the principle of self-determination. At that time, the Assembly decided against such amendment.

Ultimately, however, the Argentine delegation will vote in favour of what we believe to be the essential element in solutions to international problems. The dispute is not a figment of my Government's imagination, but, rather, a fact recognized by the international community. In view of the existence of that dispute, we believe there is only one civilized approach, namely, negotiation. Therefore, we do not understand how one can oppose negotiation when one is, at the same time, a permanent member of the body principally entrusted with safeguarding peace and security on this planet, namely, the Security Council.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the vote.

I have been asked to announce that the delegations of Colombia, Ecuador, Panama, Peru, Venezuela and Zimbabwe have added their names to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/42/L.17.

Before proceeding to the vote, I should like to inform the Assembly that the Secretary-General has reviewed draft resolution A/42/L.17 and has indicated that, at this time, he does not foresee any additional costs or programmatic changes as a result of its implementation, provision for which has been made under section 3 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989.

(The President)

Should a change in circumstances lead to additional expenditures, the Secretary-General would, with the concurrence of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, seek the necessary funding under the terms of the resolution on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses for the biennium 1988-1989 to be adopted by the General Assembly at its current session.

The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/42/L.17.

We begin the voting process. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Belize, Gambia, Oman, Sri Lanka, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Belgium, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Cameroon, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Nepal, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Solomon Islands, Swaziland, Thailand, Turkey, United Arab Emirates

Draft resolution A/42/L.17 was adopted by 114 votes to 5, with 36 abstentions (resolution 42/19).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Mr. van WULFFTEN PALTHE (Netherlands): The Netherlands voted in favour of draft resolution A/42/L.17, because its wording does not in any way prejudice the outcome of negotiations between the United Kingdom and Argentina and because it confirms the General Assembly's primary purpose of facilitating an early resumption of negotiations between those two countries on all issues dividing them.

Concerning the question of sovereignty, my Government firmly believes that any future arrangement should give effect to the right of self-determination of the inhabitants of the islands. Decolonization, such as in the case of the Falklands, must be based on resolution 1514 (XV). Under the Charter of the United Nations the right of self-determination is a fundamental one.

The Netherlands wishes to support the efforts of the Secretary-General to engage both Governments in a dialogue to resolve the differences that stand between them.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): France voted in favour of draft resolution A/42/L.17, with regard to the Malovines - as we call them in French. By that vote, my country intended to associate itself with the efforts that have been made by the international community since the conflict of June 1982 to bring about a just and lasting settlement of the dispute between two nations that are friends of France.

My delegation is convinced that only negotiations without pre-conditions and encompassing all aspects of the problem would be likely to lead to a solution in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter of our Organization, which prescribes in particular the peaceful settlement of disputes, international co-operation and recognition of the right of peoples to self-determination.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

By its vote the French delegation wishes to support the modalities proposed by the sponsors of the resolution for the settlement of the dispute by the parties concerned. It should not be interpreted as indicating my country's position on the substance of the matter.

Mr. NTAKHWANA (Botswana): Our affirmative vote for the draft resolution just adopted is a vote for negotiations. We remain convinced that a lasting solution of the Falklands/Malvinas question lies in a constructive dialogue between Argentina and the United Kingdom. It does not lie in the absence of such a dialogue or in an endless game of brinkmanship between the two parties. The resolution is, to us, a good basis for a negotiated solution. It calls for negotiations without pre-conditions. This is a sensible way to start. Therefore we encourage the parties to proceed to the conference table without delay.

Mr. TROLLE (Sweden): The unresolved dispute between Argentina and the United Kingdom over the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) continues to be of great concern to the Swedish Government.

We share the regret expressed by the Secretary-General in his recent report (A/42/732) that it has not yet proved possible to engage both Governments in talks of the kind envisaged in resolution 41/40. We support his efforts to promote a dialogue between the parties that will progressively lead to a just and lasting settlement of the question of the Falkland Islands, which lies at the core of their continuing estrangement. We continue sincerely to hope that the two Governments will be prepared soon to take further steps towards considering the full range of issues necessarily involved in this dialogue.

In our view, the resolution is a constructive attempt to promote a resumption of the dialogue between the two parties concerned without any pre-conditions and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. We believe progress can be made

(Mr. Trolle, Sweden)

through a dialogue, coupled with confidence-building measures, towards solving all the differences between the two parties. We join in the international call on them to resume such a dialogue.

There are, in my Government's view, two main principles which have to be applied to the resolution of this issue. The first is the right to self-determination. The right of all peoples in colonial territories freely to determine their own future is a fundamental principle of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The second principle is that conflicts must be resolved through peaceful means. My delegation reads the references made to the Charter of the United Nations both in the preambular and in the operative part of the draft resolution in this light.

For these reasons my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution. It goes without saying, however, that we should have preferred to vote on a text that we could all have supported.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): That concludes our consideration of agenda item 37.



AGENDA ITEM 33 (continued)POLICIES OF APARTHEID OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA

- (a) REPORTS OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID (A/42/22, A/42/22/Add.1)
- (b) REPORT OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL GROUP TO MONITOR THE SUPPLY AND SHIPPING OF OIL AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS TO SOUTH AFRICA (A/42/45)
- (c) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/42/659, A/42/691, A/42/710)
- (d) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/42/765)
- (e) DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/42/L.26 to A/42/L.32)

Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire) (interpretation from French): The General Assembly's purpose in considering each year the item entitled "Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa" is noble, since it involves eradicating from mankind that odious system, that crime against the whole of humanity: racial discrimination, taking the form of a political system. It involves the negation of human values and is a matter of prejudices based solely on the colour of the skin - in this modern age, as we approach the year 2000, characterized by the boundless possibilities offered by scientific, technological and educational knowledge at all levels.

The association of races in contemporary societies and opposition to racial discrimination in the world confirms, if proof were needed, the alignment of virtually all States Members of the United Nations on this matter. But, in spite of the progress made by mankind in recognizing the intrinsic value of each human-being, because of our capacity to comprehend or analyse all the questions posed by our existence and what is needed to improve living conditions throughout the world, the minority racist régime of South Africa continues to deny all Coloured people - whatever their level of training or education or their intelligence quotient, their civil and political rights and the most basic freedoms.

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

Is it solely to maintain their sordid economic and financial interests that the leaders of the racist minority régime of South Africa persist in perpetuating that unjust racial discrimination in South Africa, or is it simply because of their attachment to retrograde and barbaric ideas about pursuing the conquest of territories acquired by force in the last century?

If those are not the reasons, how are we to understand the attitude of a régime distinguished by its obstinacy in keeping up the oppression of the majority of the population in a grotesque, oligarchic system, devoid of all humanity, which makes no effort to introduce changes? Indeed, since the forty-first session of the General Assembly, the most recent developments in the situation in South Africa have led the international community to condemn the minority racist régime even more strongly for its obscurantism and stubbornness.

The negative developments to which I have referred may be summed up as follows. First, the state of emergency imposed since the beginning of 1985 in the 36 districts inhabited by blacks is continuing unabated, now marked by a new phenomenon that is much more cruel: the arrest and detention of black children 7 to 17 years old. While throughout the world no political charge is made against children of that age, the minority racist régime now has at least 4,500 children in its prisons.

If children 7 to 17 years old frighten the South African minority racist régime, that means that the régime is incapable of guaranteeing security in its territory, and must adopt the most extreme measures, such as the arrest of children, to ensure its own survival. That is a clear sign of the régime's vulnerability.

Secondly, the censorship imposed as much on the local as on the international press with regard to all the facts of the situation developing in South Africa,

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

... censorship that has been going on for more than two years, has been strengthened by the appointment of a person responsible for the censorship office, who has prohibited all foreign journalists from filing articles on the situation in South Africa for publication in the foreign press unless they have the approval of the censorship office.

Will the foreign press, with its desire always to be objective and impartial, tolerate indefinitely that affront to its ethics - indeed, its creed? By keeping silent, the foreign press gives the impression of being part of the system opposed to freedom of expression.

If the press resigns itself to that state of affairs, the international community should play the crucial role open to it, making the fullest use of the United Nations radio services, which could reach the majority of the population of South Africa, and of the whole world, to give complete information on the atrocities being committed in South Africa. Reorganization of those services is needed to achieve that goal.

It should also be mentioned that, for more than three years, many South African black journalists have been in detention in South Africa for having dared to denounce the crimes being committed daily by the régime's leaders.

Thirdly, in May this year, the international community watched the holding of elections for the white minority in South Africa. Despite the opposition of some minority white liberals, the elections showed that the majority of whites continue to support the extremist and racist party of Pieter Botha and are therefore not ready to accept change. They do not intend to adopt a global, objective and appropriate attitude to developments in our times, but wish, rather, to remain

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

narrow-minded and backward in their thinking. Therefore, the immoral and diabolical system of apartheid, which is always seeking to consolidate its position, cannot be changed or reformed for the time being, but must be stopped and eradicated. The international community recognizes the justice and legitimacy of the demands of the black majority, and therefore will continue to support them in their just cause. Zaire reaffirms its strong support for the legitimate struggle of the black majority which will be maintained until they achieve their final victory, even if there are some setbacks on the way to its realization, for the tide of history is irreversible.

Fourthly, the recent freeing of five black political prisoners - dictated more by their advanced age than any other reason - cannot make us forget the detention of Nelson Mandela, who has spent 24 years in prison; of Jeff Masimola, who is one of the longest serving prisoners, having served 25 years; of Mothopeng, aged 74; and of so many other black political prisoners, adults as well as children, now totalling 27,000. That figure does not take into account the common criminals, numbering 125,000, the highest number of prisoners in the world.

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya,  
Zaire)

The racist minority régime has officially admitted that it imprisons young children and the figure of 4,500 such prisoners has been acknowledged and confirmed. At present more than 30 people are awaiting execution, including a woman named Therese Ramachamula.

Fifthly, the policy of bantustanization is disintegrating steadily, for according to the latest information, the President of the State of Transkei, George Matanzima, has deserted his post as Head of State and become a refugee in Pretoria.

Sixthly, the general strike organized by the black miners' unions at the beginning of this year sounded a note of warning to the racist authorities of South Africa and forced them to reconsider the situation of miners in their own selfish interests, because the salary of a black miner is equal to one half of the lowest salary of a white miner; the black miner has only 14 days' leave a year, while his white colleague has 35 days' leave; and in the event of an accident the white miner will get five years' salary, while his black colleague will get only two years' salary. In spite of these flagrant injustices, however, the South African racists have succeeded in depriving 47,000 black workers of their jobs. But the economic structures of the régime are now shaken because not only are certain mines closed but a serious economic crisis is the main feature of the economic and financial situation of the régime, whose foreign debt is estimated at \$27 billion.

Does that mean that the few economic sanctions imposed on that régime are beginning to produce the expected results, because in spite of its mineral resources the régime has been forced to decide to suspend payment of its external debts?

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya,  
Zaire)

Forced with the cost of oppressing the blacks and of attacking neighbouring African countries, estimated to amount to nearly \$1 million a day allegedly to ensure its survival and security, that increasingly more isolated régime could become even weaker if additional sanctions were imposed against it. The moral pressure on that régime exerted by the international community has become so intense that even those countries which dared to support it can no longer do so if they are to respond to the call for justice, equity and humanitarianism.

The delegation of Zaire will continue to work as it has in the past in the various meetings of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the Francophone Summit and the non-aligned countries, and in other meetings, to condemn South Africa and to call for the establishment of a non-racial, democratic society in South Africa.

Zaire firmly condemns the repeated acts of destabilization and aggression by the racist minority régime of South Africa against all the independent front-line African States. The most recent act of aggression against Angola should also be censured.

Zaire will continue to play its part in connection with the reopening of the Bengwela road through Angola in order to increase its economic co-operation and trade with all the African States of the southern region.

It is in this context that my delegation fully subscribes to the draft resolution entitled "International solidarity with the liberation struggle in South Africa".

Mr. OSMAN (Somalia): The question of apartheid is once again a prominent feature of the agenda of the General Assembly. I am sure that we all wish to see an end to the inhumanity, the repression and the injustices caused by the systematic racism of South Africa's ruling minority - a matter which in one form or another has been the cause of deep concern throughout the life of the United Nations. Unfortunately, the crime of apartheid is still being perpetrated against the non-white population of South Africa and of illegally colonized Namibia. The racist and aggressive policies of the Pretoria régime have also seriously undermined the peace and security of the southern African region and threatened international peace and security.

In recent years Somalia has welcomed the improved climate for international action against apartheid and the surge of grass-roots support for the oppressed people of South Africa evident around the world. The imposition of limited economic sanctions and the growth of the divestment movements have been steps in the right direction. However, the challenge of apartheid is still not being adequately addressed. As we know, the minority régime continues to withhold fundamental human rights from the majority population on grounds of race and colour. It has intensified its internal policies of repression and terror and it continues to carry out acts of military aggression, occupation, destabilization and economic blackmail against neighbouring States with shocking impunity.\*

There are no grounds for complacency on the part of Member States about the situation in and around South Africa and there should be no slowing down of the momentum achieved in recent years in the international campaign against apartheid. Somalia hopes that the international community will redouble its efforts on behalf

---

\*Mr. Karoui (Tunisia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

of the legitimate liberation struggle in South Africa, particularly since the Pretoria régime has to some extent deflected the spotlight of publicity from its atrocities by imposing censorship on the news media.

The fact remains that the state of emergency is still in place, legalizing oppression and brutality; forced removals and the process of bantustanization continue unabated, and, while the world has welcomed the release of Govan Mbeki, Nelson Mandela and other leaders experience rigorous treatment in South African gaols. No dialogue with the true representatives of the majority population has been established and many other black leaders have been murdered because of their opposition to apartheid and their struggle for economic and social justice for all.



(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

The world community must also guard against the manoeuvres of the Pretoria régime, which would have us believe that its cosmetic tinkering with the constitution signifies meaningful constitutional reform. Its proposals would, in effect, institutionalize the lack of power and the disfranchisement of the non-white population.

Somalia hopes that the world community will also reject the theory that apartheid will gradually wither away as a result of economic forces. The oppressed people of South Africa have emphasized that only the total abolition of apartheid will enable them to exercise fully the right to self-determination within an unfragmented, democratic and non-racial South Africa. It is also evident that time is not on the side of peace and reconciliation. The critical nature of the confrontation between the white minority and the black majority demands that timely international action be taken to avert a long and violent racial conflict in the country and in the region.

Somalia continues to support the strong international consensus on the need for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa, including an oil embargo. These are the only peaceful and sufficiently forceful measures available to the United Nations. We appeal to the Security Council to exercise its responsibility for removing threats to peace and security by taking action against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter.

The effectiveness of comprehensive mandatory sanctions would depend, of course, on the co-operation of a small number of States that are South Africa's main trading partners. We hope that those States that have taken initial steps towards sanctions will broaden their involvement and that others will find the necessary political will to support the movement towards effective sanctions.

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

There are of course other important measures against apartheid which must also be taken by Member States. The General Assembly has before it a wide range of resolutions aimed at meeting the moral and political challenge of apartheid, and those resolutions deserve to be fully supported and faithfully implemented. The cessation of all nuclear and military collaboration with the apartheid régime, for example, is a measure which should receive immediate and universal compliance. In this context, the world community cannot fail to condemn the continued collaboration in the nuclear, military and economic fields between South Africa and Israel - countries which have in common their contempt for international law and for the human rights of the peoples they persistently oppress.

Somalia hopes that the Pretoria régime will be left in no doubt that the world community considers its racist and repressive policies to be abhorrent. We believe that the minority régime must continue to be isolated and excluded from the normal interchange of international relations until it is prepared to establish a just, peaceful and democratic society in South Africa, consistent with the relevant resolutions of this world Organization, whose noble principles of freedom and human dignity we shall continue to uphold and promote in support of the legitimate cause of the people of South Africa and of oppressed people the world over.

Ms. ATTAH (Nigeria): In the last two decades and a half the United Nations has been seized of the question of apartheid. The agenda item "Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa" has been before this body since 1946 under different titles. Today, as my delegation is once again compelled to participate in the consideration of the agenda item, we are hopeful that the debate and our contribution will not be a wasted effort. There are certain realities which have been and will be restated here today in respect of the agenda item. The primary reality is our conviction, beyond doubt, that every delegation in this Hall

(Ms. Attah, Nigeria)

is aware of the fact that the policies and practices of apartheid by the racist régime in South Africa are in violation of the basic tenets guaranteed in the principles of fundamental human rights. If the fact is not in contention - and I believe it is not - why then must we dwell on this issue year after year? I raise the question in the hope that, as we address the issue during the ongoing forty-second session of the General Assembly, we will all resolve to deliberate on the matter with honesty and with faithfulness to the United Nations Charter and the international principles of human rights.

The Nigerian delegation has read in detail the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid to the forty-second session of the General Assembly (A/42/22). Indeed, my delegation was instrumental in the compilation of the report through its participation in the work of the Special Committee. The structure of the report is in consonance with the previous formats used for the Committee's reports. The five-part report has carefully and in a studied manner given an introduction to the subject, reviewed recent developments in racist South Africa, given an analysis of international action against apartheid, chronicled the work of the Special Committee in the past year and ended with requisite conclusions and recommendations. In consonance with the expectation of the Assembly, the section of the report dealing with developments in racist South Africa is explicit and emphatic in spelling out the grave situation that currently prevails in that tormented nation. The section vividly documents the abysmal level to which the racist régime has degenerated and its wilful crime against innocent, defenceless women, children and men, all in a bid to cling to naked power and leadership to which it has no moral right.

The report captured the picture of a society not only marching inexorably towards self-destruction but also intensifying its repressive system, in which the

(Ms. Attah, Nigeria)

day-to-day existence of the ruling régime is predicated on violence, emergency laws, brutal force and abduction and detention of those of its citizens who hold different views from that of the régime. Furthermore, the pressure of the international community to ameliorate the situation has been answered by the racist Pretoria régime with a co-ordinated violent assault on all forms of extra-parliamentary opposition in the country. In June 1987 the pariah régime renewed the state of emergency, which had been in force continuously since July 1985. The report went on to detail the increasing growth of displacement and forced removal of blacks, a figure which had risen from 40,000 in 1985 to 64,000 in 1986.

(Ms. Attah, Nigeria)

An estimated 100,000 people, including women and children, were arrested in 1986 for alleged trespassing. Furthermore, the report highlighted the draconian restriction of both local and foreign media from reporting, in any manner or form, the savagery and killings by a State police force with unlimited powers. Since September 1984 an estimated 2,300 persons have been killed.

My delegation is unaware of anywhere in the world today or of any nation represented in this Hall, except racist South Africa, where State-sanctioned savagery, torture, dehumanization and killings based on racism, go on without a declared state of war. Even in a state of war, there are binding international rules and regulations. I raise this point because my delegation is convinced, beyond doubt, that the South African situation represents an unfolding tragedy similar in its dimension to the history of the holocaust. It was only on that occasion that mankind witnessed the annihilation of a nation's citizenry by the very government charged with protecting them. What is happening in South Africa today is the systematic genocidal elimination of a particular race of people. The black population of South Africa has become a monumental victim of the perpetrators and practitioners of apartheid.

The grave situation prevailing in South Africa is not only unacceptable but morally indefensible. The international system faces a moral challenge on this issue and carries the conscientious burden and social responsibility to find an end to the heinous crime being perpetrated on the masses of that country. This august body has aptly characterized and defined it as a crime against humanity.

My country, Nigeria, joined the United Nations after attaining independence. We faithfully and strictly abide by its Charter. We cherish those freedoms and inalienable rights enjoyed by our citizens and by the citizens of other Member States, especially the nationals of those States that espouse democracy as a superior way of civilized behaviour. Consequently, our people and our Government

(Ms. Attah, Nigeria)

cannot but regularly react with unreserved indignation and outrage at the atrocities being perpetrated on the blacks in South Africa and the people of the neighbouring independent African front-line States. Any tacit approval of those blatant acts of genocide and aggression by anyone or by the international community amounts to support for apartheid. Our delegation cannot but take due note. We are disturbed by all acts of direct or indirect encouragement that continue to sustain the racist régime in defiance of the will of the international community.

The support of which I speak, which is in turn translated into the racist régime's blatant arrogance, defiance, intransigence and continued aggression, has come largely from overt and covert collaboration by some nations with apartheid South Africa. For instance, we are concerned and disturbed by the refusal of the supporters of apartheid to implement even the mildest form of censure on South Africa by voting for concerted international action against apartheid. The evident willingness to cast vetoes to override the consensus of the Security Council on imposing comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the pariah régime represents the kind of support for apartheid that has caused us anguish.

It is on record that in the past three years a minimum of at least four resolutions on South Africa and apartheid-related issues have been vetoed by important members of the Security Council. With each veto, those concerned have brought to nought our collective efforts aimed at peacefully liquidating apartheid. With each veto, the seemingly God-fearing, peace-loving nations have again and again painfully reminded us that they are committed to the support and sustenance of a régime which, in all its practices and policies, contradicts the very principles on which their countries' democracies are based. We find their

(Ms. Attah, Nigeria)

stand perplexing. We believe that many in this Assembly are equally confused by the negation of our collective will to fashion peace in South Africa and stability in the region of southern Africa while furthering the cause of world peace and security.

Over the years, my delegation has, without any pretensions, argued our support for imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against racist South Africa. Our conviction of the efficacy of this process springs from our belief that it represents a due process of resolving peacefully the South African question without further loss of life, armed conflict and wanton violence. It is further a reflection of our fervent commitment to the implementation of the Charter which, inter alia, calls for our collective and faithful commitment to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. In again calling for the imposition of mandatory and comprehensive sanctions against apartheid South Africa, we are fully cognizant of the numerous efforts in the recent past aimed at resolving, without further misery and bloodshed, the South African debacle. We recall the failed and flawed policy of "constructive engagement". We recall the failed efforts of the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group. The former failed because it represented appeasement and we are all familiar with the fate of that policy during the events that led to the Second World War. The latter failed due to the intransigence of the Pretoria régime. We further recall the Nkomati Accord as well as the Lusaka Agreement. All those efforts failed because of the lack of abiding faith on the part of racist South Africa and its allies. More importantly, the failures proved that apartheid cannot be reformed, or the architects appeased.

We are compelled to ask the apologists and the supporters of racist South Africa what they really expect from the victims of apartheid. What do they expect of us Africans and the people of African descent? What do they want from the rest of mankind, which justifiably abhors and condemns the policies of apartheid?

(Ms. Attah, Nigeria)

In lending our voice once more to the need for the immediate imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against apartheid South Africa, we choose to side with the oppressed people of that tormented nation. We prefer to lend our support to those who are being denied their inalienable rights. We pitch our camp with the independent front-line States, which have suffered and continue to suffer untold hardship, economic strangulation, political destabilization and military violation of their respective territorial integrity. We reject, as absurd and blatantly untrue, the oft-peddled theory that sanctions will not work against racist South Africa, and will hurt blacks more. We take solace in the fact that, if sanctions will hurt the blacks in South Africa, it will not cause them any more hardship than they suffer now. Even if the reverse were true, we are convinced that it would be limited in duration because the faithful and effective application of sanctions will, in the end, guarantee them those freedoms inherent in the fundamental human rights which they hold so dear and so fervently desire. The blacks in South Africa deserve the freedom and rights which are being enjoyed by the citizens of those Member States that have contributed to the continued existence of the policies of apartheid.



(Ms. Attah, Nigeria)

In renewing Nigeria's call for the immediate imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against racist South Africa, my delegation wishes to reiterate, as it did during the forty-first session, its full support for and continued belief in the findings and conclusions of the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group when it said:

"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 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."

In our anger, pain and frustration over this matter we do not wish to appear unappreciative of the risk and costs involved in taking bold steps against apartheid. We have tried, and will continue, to reason with those who lack the commitment to stand against apartheid. We appreciate their preoccupation with their respective national and strategic interests. What we do not understand is the lack of courage and the willingness to assume the long-term risk and costs involved in their flirtation with and support for apartheid today. We also fail to understand their varying standards and inconsistency in the definition of ordered liberty and consent under the rule of law. We do not understand why freedom for a black South African should be different from freedom for a white South African.

It is important for us to say a few words about those who are genuinely opposed to apartheid. We recognize that many Member States and people have contributed tremendously to the resistance against apartheid. We salute the efforts and solidarity of all non-aligned countries, the Nordic countries and the

(Ms. Attah, Nigeria)

East European countries. We applaud the campaign launched by the United States Council of Mayors and Mr. Bill Cosby on 28 September 1987 aimed at the release of South African prisoners. We are grateful for the laudable activities of all anti-apartheid movements in Western Europe and other centres in the world. My delegation further salutes the struggling and oppressed people of South Africa, the detained political prisoners like Nelson Mandela and Sephania Mothopeng and the harrassed people of the African front-line States. Nigeria pledges its untiring support for the anti-apartheid campaign until majority rule is attained in South Africa. We reaffirm our continued support for all United Nations programmes aimed at assisting those dislodged and deprived by the policies of apartheid.

In closing my delegation would like to put on record the fact that those who support apartheid today will have to face an independent black-ruled South Africa tomorrow. We believe that those who make peaceful change impossible make violent change inevitable. In the historic tradition of Mozambique, Angola and Zimbabwe, South Africa will one day be free to elect its own genuine leadership. These truths shall be self-evident.

Mr. DOS SANTOS (Mozambique): May I start my statement by expressing my delegation's deep and sincere condolences to the people and the Government of the Niger on the demise of their President, His Excellency General Seyni Kountché. The untimely death of President Kountché is indeed an irreparable loss not only to the Niger but also to all of Africa. I express my delegation's most heartfelt condolences to the Niger delegation, to the people and the Government of the Niger and to the bereaved family.

The General Assembly is called upon once again to consider Pretoria's policy of apartheid. We believe that this debate is a clear indication of how the international community is preoccupied by the ever-increasingly deteriorating

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

situation in southern Africa, due to the policy of apartheid practised by the South African régime. Although the international community has repeatedly expressed its horror at and condemnation of the system of apartheid as a crime against humankind, that heinous practice still continues.

The racist minority régime is pursuing a two-track policy: brutalization of the majority at home and destabilization and aggression abroad.

The racist minority régime of Pretoria continues to pursue its policy of apartheid. It persists with its practice of violence against the majority of its population in such a manner that the internal situation has attained alarming proportions. It continues illegally to occupy Namibia in complete disregard of the will of the international community and it has increased its acts of destabilization, aggression and terrorism against the independent neighbouring States.

Repressive laws have been reinforced in the land of apartheid. The state of emergency has been extended; arrests, detentions, torture and murder are a daily reality in the life of the South African people. The Bantustanization policy and the forced displacement of population have also continued relentlessly, and their cruel effects have been added to the already precarious situation in which the South African people find themselves.

A most repulsive practice being perpetrated by the racists is the detention and incarceration of children of tender age. Children have become the target of violent repression by the racist régime. Approximately 300 to 500 of the 3,000 persons in detention in August under the emergency regulations were children from eight to eighteen years old. A most disturbing development regarding the detention and imprisonment of children is the creation of secret concentration camps, where children are sent to be tortured and brainwashed.

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

It is well-known that apartheid is the source and cause of the violence and tension now prevailing in southern Africa. All attempts by independent States of the region aimed at easing tension have encountered the same arrogance from racist South Africa. Aggression, occupation, destabilization and terrorism has been the answer by racist South Africa.

The racist régime continues to occupy Namibia illegally, in complete disregard of the will of the international community and despite the consensus embodied in Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

The laws of apartheid have been imposed on the Namibian people, and the exploitation of the natural resources of the Territory by racist South Africa and its allies continues unabated.

Apartheid is not merely a problem of South Africa and Namibia. Since the early 1960s the South African minority régime has waged an undeclared war of aggression against some of its neighbouring States and embarked on a campaign of destabilization and economic sabotage against all the front-line States. Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe have not been spared by the racist régime of South Africa. From time to time direct military incursions are made or terrorists unleashed against them in order to destabilize them both politically and economically.

Racist South Africa has been systematically using the illegally occupied territory of Namibia as a springboard for its aggression against the People's Republic of Angola. Since 1982 apartheid troops have permanently occupied the southern part of Angola. In the past we have expressed our conviction that the racist régime's aggression against Angola is in part designed to prop up terrorists in that country. While in the past the racist régime has always denied any direct involvement with these terrorists, last week it publicly admitted that its occupying forces are fighting side by side with them in order to prevent their defeat and annihilation.

The aggression against Angola in the wake of Security Council resolution 601 (1987) is aimed at frustrating the efforts of the international community to bring about a peaceful settlement of the conflict caused by apartheid in southern Africa. We vehemently condemn this aggression and hold the apartheid régime fully responsible for the prevailing state of war caused by its belligerence and pursuit of military solutions instead of peaceful settlement. We demand the cessation of

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

all aggression against Angola and the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of apartheid troops from the People's Republic of Angola. We extend our solidarity to the MPLA workers' party and the people and Government of the People's Republic of Angola.

Against my own country the Pretoria régime is waging an undeclared war, whose targets are mainly the civilian population and the social and economic infrastructures. In its undeclared war of aggression against the People's Republic of Mozambique Pretoria has not only resorted to direct military aggression by its army, but also used mercenaries and terrorists trained, financed and supported by it. Using terrorists at its service and in its pay, the South African apartheid régime has lately intensified its aggression against Mozambique in violation of the Nkomati Agreement. In the last month or so many civilians have been burned inside the buses they were travelling in when they were set on fire by the terrorists and hundreds of defenceless civilians have been massacred in cold blood.

It is both immoral and inhuman to allow the South African question to stagnate while the atrocities perpetrated by racist South Africa continue to increase. We are convinced that southern Africa will never know peace while the forces of apartheid are not defeated and the system completely dismantled and destroyed.

It has become clear to the international community that the racist régime of South Africa will neither abandon its apartheid policy nor allow Namibia to become independent; and it will not coexist with its neighbours unless concerted and genuine international pressure is applied against the racist régime. Those that collaborate economically, politically and militarily with South Africa must be reminded that their marriage with the racist régime only augments its aggressive and belligerent capacity; it only serves to intensify further the brutal repression against the oppressed South African and Namibian peoples and the aggression against neighbouring States.

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

Peace demands the immediate and unconditional release of all political prisoners in South Africa, including Nelson Mandela and other leaders. Peace demands the lifting of the state of emergency and cessation of destabilization and aggression against neighbouring States. Peace demands recognition of the birthright of the majority people in both South Africa and Namibia. Peace demands that all support be granted to the front-line States so that they may defend their sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Let us all join hands, without excuses, in the noble task of destroying the apartheid system and bringing about peace, democracy, freedom and justice in South Africa and Namibia.

Mr. KENT (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): The United Nations has declared apartheid to be a crime against humanity. The contemporary world considers it to be the most diabolical plot ever hatched against a race.

For more than four decades an entire political, economic and social structure has been worked out and put into practice for the sole purpose of perpetuating and consolidating certain economic interests. The South African régime represents the most ignominious form of injustice and inequality; a territory immensely rich in resources of every kind which are used for the sole benefit of a racial minority.

The dramatic scope of this problem is such a threat to international peace and security that our Secretary-General warns us in his latest annual report that

"In South Africa a human tragedy of overwhelming proportions appears imminent unless timely measures are taken to prevent it." (A/42/1, p. 6)

This year the tragedy has come to a head and the past 12 months have seen an entire people, the South African people, rising up as one man against oppression. That national confrontation is unprecedented and at times would seem to be cornering the Pretoria régime and presaging its end, even though the degree of

(Mr. Kent, Colombia)

sacrifice has also risen and cemeteries, hospitals and gaols are showing a critical increase in the numbers of dead and wounded and of political prisoners.

Despite a huge campaign of disinformation at the world level sponsored by the régime in power, the international community has reacted by adopting more vigorous political and economic measures in order gradually to isolate it.

The General Assembly has hardened the terms of its condemnation and several members of the Security Council have agreed on a number of voluntary sanctions, although as a whole, regrettably, the Council has not agreed on the only avenue to be followed: the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter.



(Mr. Kent, Colombia)

In this respect, the Special Committee against Apartheid takes the view that the application of such sanctions should be the key element in any international effort to create the necessary conditions for a lasting, just and peaceful solution to the South African conflict. Colombia fully endorses that recommendation and the reminder that to be effective those measures must be specific and co-ordinated and their implementation permanently monitored by the United Nations.

We cannot but take the opportunity afforded by the agenda item on apartheid to put forward some considerations to the international community, so worthily represented in the Assembly.

Hatred of one race by another - terrible though it may appear in the abominable South African case - is, unfortunately, not the only manifestation of racial discrimination that exists in the contemporary world, and we must not believe that the problem of apartheid will end with the South African case since history has taught us that many nations have been built, and some are still being built, on the basis of discrimination. It would seem that we wish to cleanse the conscience of our nations by reiterating our condemnation of South Africa's case year after year.

In hundreds of academic statements and dozens of national Constitutions we condemn all kinds of discrimination on the basis of race, belief, sex, culture, and so forth, whereas in our own societies human beings are born daily with their fate already sealed.

As we have said at the United Nations:

"It is unfortunate that while today we find ourselves in the midst of incredible technological advances, of which we are so proud, we must at the same time recognize that no region of the world has escaped discriminatory

(Mr. Kent, Colombia)

practices; consequently that great race to which we belong nevertheless has abominable facets of which we should feel ashamed."

In many parts of the world there are minorities which are, or tend to be, discriminated against, and the methods and the systems involved are often so subtle that they sometimes culminate in self-discrimination.

We all have our own points of view that are conditioned by our own environment; hence objectivity becomes impossible. Not to recognize this would be a dangerous form of arrogance. Each minority group, like each human being, has different perspectives that make it unique. To strengthen one's sense of belonging to one's own culture, to one's own race and to that which makes one different from the majority contributes to enriching not only nations but the human race as well. Hence, the importance of education and dissemination of information as essential factors for the effectiveness of any programme designed to ensure full enjoyment of human rights.

Aware as we are of the existence of these problems both in Colombia and in the rest of the world, we are led to look for ever closer ties with our brother peoples of Africa and other great regions in order to find solutions together.

As Franz Fanon said, the reaffirmation of our traditions and of our own particular characteristics is the true guarantee of the enrichment of our international awareness, and only thus will we find the elements of tolerance and understanding that will enable us, together, to reach the ideals for which we are striving.

Colombia calls here for complete racial equality in South Africa and demands active solidarity from the international community in order to eradicate this aberrant situation. However, collective condemnation alone will not absolve us - and here the United Nations will not truly be able to pride itself on having

(Mr. Kent, Colombia)

eradicated racial discrimination if we - all the Member States - do not rally our determination to eliminate within our own borders the very last vestiges of discrimination of any kind.

Mr. ORTIZ GANDARILLAS (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): Once again Bolivia comes before this forum, which is devoted to peace, freedom and justice, in order to convey its most vehement repudiation of the racist and discriminatory policies and practices of the Pretoria régime, which continues to deny the most fundamental human rights of the great majority of the South African people.

My delegation wishes to protest against the suffering imposed on the oppressed and persecuted peoples of South Africa and Namibia by a régime with anachronistic motivations of so-called racial supremacy that are totally rejected by the world community. At the same time, my country wishes to express its strongest support for and solidarity with these peoples in their struggle for freedom and the recognition of their legitimate and inalienable rights. For those reasons, and in order to see justice triumph, the Government of Bolivia was the first in Latin America to subscribe to the Convention against Apartheid in Sports, which, along with other legal instruments adopted by the international community, is respected and promoted by my Government.

Once again the international community on this occasion is manifesting its severest condemnation and just indignation against all types of abuse of power, and also conveying its message of support and hope to the courageous people of South Africa and its liberation movement in their just and heroic struggle against apartheid and for full recognition and exercise of their rights to

(Mr. Ortiz Gandarillas, Bolivia)

self-determination and the creation of a new South African State based on democratic and non-racist principles of unity and peaceful coexistence.

However, we do not want the echoes of this message to die away in this Hall; we want them to reverberate loud and clear until they have reached those for whom the message is intended: both the oppressors and the oppressed; so that the former may feel the weight of the accusation and condemnation of the international community and the latter the resolute and unswerving support of our Organization.

(Mr. Ortiz Gandarillas, Bolivia)

For all these years the United Nations, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and other international organizations have adopted many resolutions rejecting the policy and practices of apartheid and demanding the abolition of the system that in an institutionalized and systematic way offends, wounds and destroys man's human dignity and physical integrity. At first appeals were made to the Government of South Africa to put an end to a régime that was totally incompatible and at variance with the present values of our civilization.

Far from heeding those appeals from the international community, the Government of Pretoria has not only maintained the policy of apartheid but intensified it both internally and internationally, through the escalation of aggression, State terrorism, destabilization and political subversion against neighbouring States.

The situation has become even more acute with the declaration and maintenance of the state of emergency that confers absolute power on South African police forces and legalizes abuse and injustice.

Of the thousands of victims of the Pretoria régime, we cannot fail to mention Nelson Mandela and the other political prisoners who have become symbols of the resistance struggle of the black people of South Africa. The resistance struggle of that courageous people has grown in intensity as a result of recent events.

History has taught us that the reign of force cannot be upheld for long, much less indefinitely. That lesson must be borne in mind by the Pretoria Government. It must realize that the conditions that support the apartheid régime are losing strength and that the increasing discriminatory policies and practices are aggravating tension beyond the limits of human resistance. A repressed people's uncontrollable will to survive and be free, which has been kept under control so far, will cause it to seek, through action and sacrifice, its own solutions, with unforeseen and unpredictable consequences.

(Mr. Ortiz Gandarillas, Bolivia)

Our own Organization has reaffirmed the legitimacy of the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa and its right to use all means, including armed struggle, for the total eradication of apartheid, which is the main cause of the critical explosive situation in South Africa. There will be no peace or tranquillity as long as the reign of terror, as the Special Committee has called it, continues. Responsibility rests with the present Pretoria Government.

It is therefore essential for that Government to embark on meaningful and serious dialogue with the true representatives of the black people of South Africa to bring about the prompt abolition of the apartheid régime and to open the doors for the construction of a modern South African State based on democratic principles of freedom, respect for human rights and peaceful coexistence.

The United Nations, the supreme forum of peace, wishes to attain these objectives through all the peaceful means within its reach, but a negotiated solution of the South African problem cannot be delayed any longer if greater and even more serious sacrifices are to be avoided.

In this regard my delegation joins in the appeal of the Assembly for the Security Council to take the action appropriate to it under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter for the application of far-reaching, mandatory sanctions as the most appropriate, effective and peaceful means available to the international community to exert full pressure on the Government of Pretoria, as the strongest, most resolute expression of support for the struggle of the South African people.

From the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid (A/42/22), it can be seen that although a number of actions have been decided on and implemented through various mechanisms, they appear to be inadequate to give us reason to anticipate the prompt eradication of the apartheid régime.

(Mr. Ortiz Gandarillas, Bolivia)

Nevertheless, we are sure that sooner or later the international community, with its great moral force, and as a result of world mobilization, will attain its objective of eliminating racial discrimination and apartheid through all peaceful means at its disposal and thus bring to bear the noble cause of respect for freedom and human rights.

At this point I should like to offer a clarification. In the section on sports and culture, the report of the Special Committee makes reference to a letter of 6 May sent to the Permanent Mission of Bolivia calling for information concerning references in the South African press to three Bolivian students attending Pretoria universities.

My Government immediately informed the Special Committee that the Government of Bolivia had condemned and continued to condemn the abysmal apartheid régime and, that consistent with that policy, it had no cultural or trade exchange agreement with the Pretoria régime. If indeed three young Bolivians are attending universities in Pretoria, they are doing so strictly in a personal capacity, using the freedom conferred upon them by our Constitution: they are free to have the education of their choice.

Those three students are not participating in any programme of a Bolivian university or of the Government of Bolivia. What is more, organizations of Bolivian universities have on various occasions condemned the apartheid régime and the Pretoria Government for its intransigence in maintaining it.

In conclusion, my Government wishes to place on record its appreciation and gratitude for the work being done by all those institutions and individuals that have courageously come not only to give testimony on the sufferings of the oppressed peoples, but also to give their message of hope and support for the courageous black people of South Africa.

Mr. WIJewardane (Sri Lanka): Apartheid is more than mere racial discrimination. The General Assembly branded it a crime against humanity in 1973 when it adopted its landmark International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid. The term apartheid describes man's inhumanity to man. It is a reflection of a malignancy embedded in the mind of a minority obsessed with its imperative need to safeguard and retain the luxury of privilege. In that process, apartheid has been elevated to the status of South African State policy since the white National Party took office in 1948.



(Mr. Wijewardane, Sri Lanka)

A long record of racial prejudice, discrimination and exploitation has fashioned the thinking, policies and, eventually, the laws of South Africa. No wonder then that South Africa continues its policies of racial segregation and separation, justifying its warped policies on the poverty, illiteracy and ignorance of the majority and using terror and force as its instruments of law enforcement. Perhaps the Caesars of South Africa feel superior and tend to denigrate the capabilities of others when they bask in their powerful role of ruthless masters. Time is not on their side, as we read and observe from events that are fast closing in upon the racist régime of Pretoria.

The Special Committee against Apartheid has provided us with a comprehensive overview of the situation in South Africa vis-à-vis apartheid and the unprecedented, nation-wide resistance to the racist apartheid system. We appreciate its efforts and thank it for its dedication. My delegation would like to single out Major-General Joseph N. Garba of Nigeria and Mr. James Victor Gbeho of Ghana for their personal efforts in developing the study incorporated in the report.

We see that the resistance to apartheid is unprecedented and nation-wide. Trade unionists, students and youth, women and children, journalists and church leaders are in the vanguard of the battle against Draconian laws and repressive policies. They enjoy the understanding, sympathy and support of the international community, as witness the voluntary sanctions adopted by the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries the Organization of African Unity and the socialist countries. We welcome the initiative of the Congress of the United States of America, which has opted to adopt selective sanctions. We also acknowledge the decision by both the European Economic Community and most Commonwealth countries that steps have to be taken by adopting sanctions to contain Pretoria's capacity to inflict terror and repression upon its own people.

(Mr. Wijewardane, Sri Lanka)

It is unprecedented for a Government to wage war against its own citizens, but the evil system perpetuated by Pretoria is using every conceivable measure of repression it can to abort the birth of a democratic and non-racial régime to replace the pernicious system of apartheid.

We would also like to see more concerted and enforceable sanctions taken at this stage, for we are now within striking distance of crippling the effectiveness of the racist régime of Pretoria. For that purpose, we must enlist the assistance and support of the international community, including international agencies, to deny that régime the technology, loans and trade that are critical for waging its undeclared war against its own people. Its capacity to perpetuate its evil designs must be dismantled and demolished now.

The international community is in no mood to treat seriously the so-called betterment schemes, which have been proposed by Pretoria as a sop to mislead both its citizens and the international community. We are indebted to the Special Committee for highlighting that subterfuge in its report and alerting us to the nefarious plan of the racist Pretoria régime to regain administrative and political control at the grass-root level. We have seen that devious plan in action in recent times, when it egged on black groups to engage in fratricidal war with the police standing by or even encouraging these murderous activities. That scheme is undoubtedly being put into operation to perpetuate white rule over the black majority. It will only result in the confinement of black Africans to the so-called homelands, which is the National Party's aim.

It is evident from the results of the maverick general election of May 1987 that the present racist régime has increased its majority, playing upon the fears of members of the white minority that, in a democratic system, they would lose their privileged position. It is in that context that the black trade-union movement has taken over the lead role in the struggle against apartheid. It has

(Mr. Wijewardane, Sri Lanka)

done so at a time when other organizations and activists have been weakened in an atmosphere of terror and fear created by the police, the army and vigilante groups. In its frenzied attempts to stay in power, Pretoria has adopted measures to confer upon itself unlimited powers of repression, making South Africa a police State. Under those measures, activists even under the age of 18 disappear into police custody. Vigilante groups are allowed a free hand in their attempts to crush the popular movement for democracy. Given such a free hand, South African State terrorism has surpassed and excelled itself. Its ugly face is disguised behind the veil of press censorship, which has placed severe restrictions on the media and denies it fair and objective reporting. Apart from those restrictions, new administrative interpretations have been given to innocuous words and phrases to enable the State to take action against those deemed subversives.

It is not surprising that such measures have been met with defiant resistance. Regrettably, however, those spontaneous measures are unguided. We know that people are organizing themselves to display "people's power" in the form of People's Committee's and People's Courts. In that populist process, the law could be abused. This is a certain recipe for the breakdown and collapse of law and order. If this untoward disaster occurs, we could expect revolt and revolution, leading to unprecedented bloodshed and mayhem. That is precisely what the international community would be responsible for unless it takes immediate action to wipe out the terrorist capacity of the racist Pretoria régime.

To strengthen itself, South Africa has developed a sophisticated indigenous arms industry. The technical know-how and technology for it have been surreptitiously imported. We are alarmed that, in spite of the embargo placed upon the exportation of oil to South Africa, it continues to receive shipments of banned cargoes. Unless the international community makes a determined effort to monitor the embargoes in force, there is no assurance that the resolutions we adopt would

(Mr. Wijewardane, Sri Lanka)

have any meaningful impact on arresting the flow of contraband shipments. We would thus help South Africa's military and repressive capacity to grow and to strengthen its intransigent policies of defying the democratic aspirations of the majority of the people.

In the meanwhile, the victims of its ruthless persecutions languish in gaols without being brought before the courts. Amongst that number are women and children. The international community has an obligation to alleviate their sufferings in torture chambers. It must not lose sight of its moral and humanitarian obligations to see that all the detainees, including such leaders as Nelson Mandela and Zephahie Mothopeng, are released and assured freedom.

We have recently seen the first evidence of the régime's acceptance, under pressure, of international concern. It has released Mr. Gonon Mbeki, who emerged from prison after 23 years. The international community must continue its campaign to demand that the ban imposed on the national liberation movements be removed and that all political organizations be at liberty to take part in the democratic process, which will result in the liberation of black South Africa.

The liberation of the black South Africans and their Namibian brothers would indeed be the landmark decolonization achievement of this House. Let us not fail them.

Mr. ORAMAS OLIVA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Discrimination on the basis of religion, race, or sex is contrary to Article 1, paragraph 3, of the Charter of our Organization, but when this becomes an institutional policy, as in South Africa, that aberration is an insult to human sensibility. For that reason numerous resolutions of the United Nations qualify apartheid as a crime against humanity.

There has been no session of the General Assembly in which the condemnation of apartheid has not been one of the main topics. There is no international forum in which rejection of that system has not been a constant feature. There has been increasing isolation of the Pretoria racists and ever more resounding condemnation of that régime because of its institutionalized racial discrimination.

South Africa has become, with the passing of the years, a focal point of danger to peace in southern Africa, at the same time as internal and external pressures against apartheid are developing. The racists, like all wounded animals, have reacted by increasing internal repression and trying at the same time to destabilize the front-line States.

The South African authorities, in statements by the Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces of that country, have recognized that their regular forces are in the south of Angola, have helped the UNITA bandits in military operations and as a consequence have suffered military casualties. It has also been stated that the President of the South African régime visited the southern part of Angola. Because of the force of events, the criminal today recognizes its crime, which is that of violating the sovereignty of a State Member of the United Nations, in this case Angola. I believe that this is a sufficiently substantiated element to lead the Security Council, in the interest of peace and security in the region of southern Africa, to carry out the action provided for in the Charter in such cases.

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

According to an announcement by the Ministry of Defence of Angola, on 26 August a South African military intervention began with the blowing up of a bridge over the River Cuiro. At present fighting is taking place against the racist régime's regular forces in the provinces of Cunene and Cuando Cubango, according to Angop, the official Angolan agency. In this regard, the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, Kenneth Kaunda, has stated:

"The occupation of parts of Angola, recently confirmed by Pretoria, is clear testimony to the continued arrogance of that régime and its total disregard for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country."

It is fitting for us to ask why the racist South African régime today admits its shameless presence in the south of Angola, to whom this message is directed, and what is sought in making such statements. I think we should ask why South Africa acted in that way when, in August, the Government of Angola made new proposals to facilitate peace in the region and gave signs of constructive flexibility.

No further tolerance can be shown to the apartheid régime. The international community, in particular the members of the Security Council, cannot calmly allow Pretoria, in the name of its spurious, unhealthy and crazed civilization, to impose the law of the criminal on surrounding territories. It should be recalled that complacency concerning Hitler's actions resulted in millions of deaths during the Second World War.

From this rostrum we salute the liberation of Govan Mbeki, who for 24 years languished in the racist dungeons although his only crime was to proclaim racial equality in his country. If the release of Mbeki is a result of pressure against the upholders of apartheid, this leads us to believe that it is necessary to redouble our efforts to bring about the release of the leader who for 25 years has

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

been in South African prisons and who is a symbol of determination and a martyr. I refer to Nelson Mandela.\*

Pretoria has had a long history of duplicity, deceit and subterfuge, combined with the use of brute force, dogs, torture and murder to repress the struggle of the patriots of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) internally and also prevent the continuance of the world campaign in favour of the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions. It is not true that Pretoria is today working sincerely to arrive through dialogue at the dismantlement of apartheid and the establishment of racial equality in South Africa. The Joint Management Centre is the veil, or fig leaf, which can scarcely conceal the continued murders of leaders, mass detentions and military occupation of townships by one of the greatest violators of human rights in this closing stage of the century. The voices of those who claim to be the great defenders of these rights are in this case stilled, and we hear only whispers, for they merely make political use of these cherished and noble principles.

The ANC has proclaimed its readiness to participate in genuine negotiations which will lead to the establishment of a united democratic State in which all human beings can enjoy the same privileges and duties, independently of the colour of their skin. The ANC cannot accept as valid the mechanisms created by Pretoria, allegedly for negotiations, for inherent in them is the philosophy of what the ANC wishes to eliminate: apartheid.

It is not through destructive engagement - I am sorry, I meant to say the so-called constructive engagement - with its double-standard policies or

---

\*Mr. Wijewardane (Sri Lanka), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

adulterated theories, that we can hope to eliminate the political AIDS that is apartheid. If one is sincere, if one really is not trying to give precedence to short-sighted economic interests or base geopolitical calculations, with all the ensuing consequences, it is necessary that all of us without exception combine our efforts to establish a South Africa united in race, religion and sex, which will contribute to man's full dignity and the stability and development of a continent confronted with great challenges, such as those presented by drought and desertification, among others.

Cuba supports the declaration on southern Africa adopted by the Organization of African Unity at its most recent summit meeting. Africa as a whole has the support of the remainder of the international community, so that united we can co-operate in this great human endeavour, the liquidation of this creature called apartheid. To witness a crime calmly is to commit it, said José Martí. Reason and history bring us together to fight against this crime.



Mr. DIATTA (Niger) (interpretation from French): Once again our General Assembly is called upon to consider the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa, which shows the grave concern of the whole world over that malevolent system, which institutionalizes racial discrimination and denies fundamental rights to the great majority of the population of that country, contrary to the values in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the principles of the Charter of our Organization, which we are all supposed to respect.

Apartheid is indeed the most extreme form of the violation of human dignity and universal morality. That is why the whole international community has been unanimous in regarding that abominable system as a crime against humanity. It is therefore the duty of all nations to fight it, with the goal of eradicating it, which would open the way for the South African people finally to establish on their land a democratic, non-racial society and to work in unity and harmony, with a regained freedom, for their country's economic and social progress.

The painful events that have occurred again this year in South Africa confirm our judgement that the racist Pretoria régime continues to show the same obstinacy and intransigence in maintaining and rigorously applying that odious policy, which, together with the régime's persistent refusals to grant independence to Namibia, is the basic cause of the continuing increase in tension and the general worsening of the situation not only within South Africa, but also in the entire southern region of our continent.

The report of the Special Committee against Apartheid is very eloquent when it describes the brutality, the atrocities and the revolting acts of repression again carried out by the racist South African authorities against the black majority, in their hysterical stubbornness in maintaining their domination over the country at all costs. That is why there have again been assassinations of hundreds of people in a cowardly fashion, while many others have been incarcerated without trial, a

(Mr. Diatta, Niger)

number of whom were subject to abuse and torture that will mark them for the rest of their lives - if they do not lose their lives. That whole litany of horror and suffering inflicted on the oppressed masses of South Africa can only arouse indignation and anger in the conscience of peoples who genuinely believe in respect for the dignity of the human being, especially when one knows that it is the evil result of a so-called state of emergency, which for the past two years has been systematically used by the Pretoria régime the better to impose its tyranny.

The intransigence of the racist Pretoria régime is also seen in the contempt it constantly shows for the insistent demands throughout the world for the freeing of the historic leaders of the national liberation movements and many other political prisoners detained in its gaols because they tried to shake off the yoke of injustice that has been placed upon the South African blacks.

If we add to that dark picture the repeated aggression and continued acts of political and economic destabilization perpetrated by the South African racist authorities against the neighbouring States, we can only reach the terrible conclusion that we face a very dangerous situation, which may at any moment degenerate into an uncontrollable conflagration.

It was that intolerable situation, seriously threatening the security of the whole region, that led my country's Foreign Minister to say in his statement during the general debate:

"No one that desires progress, no one with a conscience, can sleep peacefully while that hateful system persists in that part of the world, a system under which men deny other men the mere right to exist." (A/42/PV.23, p. 47)

We can see that apartheid is one of the most serious challenges to the authority of the United Nations, as well as an unacceptable affront to the conscience of mankind. The way for South Africa and the rest of southern Africa to improve the situation is for them to get rid of apartheid, once and for all, and

(Mr. Diatta, Niger)

for the rights of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence to be granted. It is, therefore, up to our international community to redouble its efforts to achieve those goals, which will certainly put a final end to the sufferings of the peoples of the region.

Within South Africa itself the oppressed people still remain firm and tenacious in their determination to dismantle apartheid. Thus the armed struggle is intensified, with severe blows being dealt to the oppressor. The same is true of trade union activity. Proof of that, if proof is needed, was the successful strike organized by the national miners' union, which for three weeks last August paralysed certain important South African mines, inflicting heavy financial losses on the companies concerned. Year after year the courageous struggle of the black South African majority is being extended throughout the country. The struggle, which has strong roots, is plunging the supporters of apartheid into deeper and deeper disarray.

Within the white population more and more voices are being raised against the barbarities of the racist authorities of Pretoria and in favour of the emergence of a just and democratic society in the country. The meeting last July in Senegal between representatives of the African National Congress (ANC) and members of the Afrikaner community was a significant development in the troubled political and social life of South Africa, one which permits us to hope for the establishment one day of a union of all the progressive democratic forces of the country to root out the evil of apartheid and promote the birth of a constitutional system, whereby equality of political, economic and social rights, as well as liberty for all, are guaranteed. The dialogue that has thus begun should be followed up and encouraged, for it is on the noble ideals of all those democratic forces that the South Africa of tomorrow will be built.

(Mr. Diatta, Niger)

Outside South Africa, we note with satisfaction a growing mobilization of international public opinion to denounce this aberration of our times and lead Governments that still have relations of various kinds with the Pretoria régime to end them. This anti-apartheid campaign has borne fruit, several of those Governments have already taken measures to reduce or eliminate their ties. The adoption of such measures has also had a significant impact on some corporations and national institutions of those Governments, because they have taken at their own level measures to reduce, suspend or completely withdraw their investments in South Africa, because of the absence of progress in dismantling apartheid.

To totally isolate the racist South African régime would certainly, in many respects, be a source of great comfort to the oppressed people of South Africa. However, it must be recognized that such action will not overcome the stubbornness and intransigence, which have now become legendary, of the oppressor in maintaining and pursuing its ignoble and universally despised policy. Only comprehensive and mandatory sanctions, such as those advocated by the World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa, held in Paris from 16 to 20 June 1986, can enable the valiant people of South Africa to break out of the infernal cycle of terror and degradation of the human being.

The Security Council, which under the Charter has the main responsibility for adopting and implementing such sanctions, must therefore no longer avoid using its powers; it must act without further delay. It is clear that any delay in taking action commensurate with the seriousness of the situation can only prolong the abominable blood-bath and the crucifixion of the oppressed peoples. We therefore urge particularly the Permanent Members of the Security Council that still do not support the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions to change their position urgently, given the prospect of a worsening of the present disaster.

(Mr. Diatta, Niger)

We cannot end without reaffirming the full support of the Government and people of Niger for the oppressed people of South Africa in their courageous struggle, and our active solidarity with them at this extremely difficult time in their history. We are firmly convinced that the enormous sacrifices which they have made will ensure their eventual triumph.

We wish to thank very sincerely the Special Committee against Apartheid for the excellent report with which it provided us again this year and for its tireless efforts to ensure intensified international action against this abhorrent system and to alleviate the suffering of the victims of apartheid.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the African National Congress of South Africa, in accordance with the decision taken by the General Assembly at its 3rd plenary meeting, on 18 September 1987.

Mr. MAKATINI (African National Congress of South Africa (ANC)): First, I must join those who have preceded me in extending sincere condolences to the Government and people of Niger following the untimely death of President Seyni Kountché.

On behalf of the African National Congress and in the name of our National Executive Committee, headed by comrade President Oliver Tambo, who deeply regrets his inability to be with us here today, I wish to congratulate Mr. Peter Florin on his unanimous election as President of the forty-second session of the General Assembly. The ANC is for ever appreciative of the place the German Democratic Republic continues to occupy and the crucial role it plays in the international fight for the eradication of apartheid.

I also wish to express our appreciation to Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, Secretary-General of the United Nations, for his tireless efforts in the cause of

(Mr. Makatini, ANC)

humanity and particularly his commitment to the independence of Namibia and the establishment of a non-racial democracy in South Africa.

The indefatigable Joseph Garba, Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, has given a truly analytical and objective report on the situation in South Africa, thereby effectively preparing the ground for what we hope will prove to have been a lively debate leading to action-oriented decisions. The Special Committee against Apartheid must be highly commended for the invaluable contribution that it continues to make in the international campaign for the total isolation of racist South Africa and the eradication of apartheid. We must also say a word of welcome to Mr. Satiros Massouris, Assistant Secretary-General and Head of the Centre against Apartheid, whom we assure of our full co-operation in the action-packed days ahead.

Like our counterparts in other parts of Africa and the world, who have known colonial or semi-colonial, alien or racial domination, we, the oppressed people of South Africa, have never ceased to yearn for, dream of and strive for freedom. Though the intensity of our struggle has tended to ebb and flow, there have occurred crucial junctures at which years have been the equivalent of decades in terms of the ground covered by the resistance movement. The period under review has been a momentous one in South Africa, ever since September 1984, when the white minority régime moved its troops into the black townships in an attempt to crush the popular resistance to apartheid. It has been a period marked by the relentless mass resistance that reached its peak in the week of the birth of the United Democratic Front (UDF), formed in 1983 to oppose the bogus constitutional dispensation - that vain attempt to co-opt the so-called Coloureds and Asians for use as second-class allies in the perpetuation of white supremacy.

(Mr. Makatini, ANC)

It will be recalled that when the UDF was launched it called for the participation in the resistance of the working people. The UDF expressed faith "in the leadership of the working class in the democratic struggle for freedom". It also resolved to strengthen the unity between genuine trade unions and freedom-loving people in the struggle for human rights. The inauguration of the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) at the end of December 1985 was therefore a major development in the current phase of our struggle. It meant that the most militant sector of our people had accepted the UDF's challenge. As is known to all, in spite of increased repression, harassment and intimidation, COSATU has launched and endorsed several strikes, including the recent ones of 20,000 postal workers and 360,000 mine workers. We share the view expressed today by many friends and foes that the South African situation will never be the same again after this tremendous show of working-class power, which has the potential of immensely increasing the capacity of the resistance movement.

The undaunted spirit and determination of the oppressed people of South Africa has manifested itself repeatedly and in various forms, including the refusal of black youth to be muzzled by the draconian laws and repression of the second state of emergency declared in June 1986. In this connection, it should be noted that the banning of the Congress of South African Students (COSAS) - the powerful student voice since the 1976 Soweto uprising - has backfired, because in its place our valiant youth, on 1 March 1987, at the height of the second state of emergency, launched the South African Youth Congress (SAYCO). This is clear testimony that the state of emergency has failed to suppress our struggle. The welding together of the black youth, who constitute the cutting edge of the resistance movement and the future of our country, has been another milestone whose potential in the strengthening of the democratic movement's capacity cannot be overestimated. The

(Mr. Makatini, ANC)

adoption of the Freedom Charter by that powerful organization, whose membership is over half a million, was another watershed. The same may soon be true of another giant federation, that of women, recently formed as an underground organization at the height of the state of emergency.

It is also important to note that the African National Congress has developed a capacity to integrate such local struggles as the rent boycott into the framework of the broader national liberation struggle. It is against this background that the armed action of our military wing - Umkhonto We Sizwe - recently reported on Magnus Malan's own admission in Parliament to have increased by 300 per cent - must be seen.

The most important development during the period under review is certainly the political successes scored by the mass democratic movement in general and by the ANC in its campaign to isolate the Pretoria régime at home and abroad. Delegations of white institutions and groups that have defied the Pretoria régime and undertaken trips to hold consultations with the ANC in Harare and Lusaka have increased significantly this year. They now include the 61 mainly Afrikaner intellectuals, artists, writers and other opinion makers, whose meeting with an ANC delegation in Dakar has been welcomed in various capitals and by many inter-State organizations as an important development. The ANC intends to continue on this path for the purpose of reaching out to and encouraging large numbers of white compatriots to distance themselves from P. W. Botha's laager mentality, embrace the Dakar spirit and participate in one way or another in the struggle for majority rule in a South Africa that belongs to all who live in it - black and white.



(Mr. Makatini, ANC)

These consultations have been held with a variety of groups and have yielded varying but encouraging results. We must reiterate our position that these are not intended as negotiations or beginnings of talks: they are but part of the ANC campaign of mobilization intended to isolate the Pretoria régime at home and strengthen the position of the democratic movement committed to a non-racial democracy in a united South Africa. The Dakar group's acceptance of certain important positions, including the principle of one person, one vote and the historical reasons for armed struggle, is indeed an important milestone.

The world-wide consensus on the application of sanctions as the only peaceful means of compelling racist South Africa to end apartheid was further strengthened and broadened last year by the conclusions of the Eminent Persons Group and the World Conference held in Paris in June 1986. Effect has been given to it by the Nordic countries through the total trade embargo by Denmark, Sweden and Finland against racist South Africa. It has compelled the European Common Market member States to embark on some kind of first step in the same direction, despite the continued intransigence of the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany. In October last year it was given a strong shot in the arm by the adoption in the United States of the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act, 1986 - an important victory over the policy of constructive engagement. We must never tire of thanking the anti-apartheid movement throughout the world, including the American people and their anti-apartheid elected officials. Their relentless efforts have made them active allies of the struggling people in South Africa and Namibia.

The latest opinion polls showing that two thirds of South African blacks support the idea of sanctions, and the positions recently taken by the UDF, COSATU, SAYCO and the South African Council of Churches in support of sanctions, make nonsense of the often repeated argument by Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and President Ronald Reagan that comprehensive sanctions would hurt the blacks. It was

(Mr. Makatini, ANC)

the blacks through their organization, the ANC, who first called for sanctions, as early as 1959, fully mindful that they would result in the loss of some jobs for both black and white workers, but would also effectively weaken the Pretoria régime, thereby complementing our struggle.

"Every trade agreement, every new investment and every bank loan is a brick in the wall for our survival",  
said John Balthazar Vorster in 1972.

All we are saying to Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, Chancellor Helmut Kohl and President Ronald Reagan is that their countries should actively pull out those bricks and weaken the wall of apartheid, which must be brought down and replaced by a non-racial democracy. We must again reiterate our position that continued refusal by those Governments to make common cause with the rest of the international community is clearly a prescription for violence, as it deprives the embattled and oppressed people of South Africa of their only remaining option for peaceful change in South Africa.

It is interesting that President Ronald Reagan, in his report to Congress - pursuant to section 501 of the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act, 1986, correctly observed that the state of emergency in South Africa had not been repealed, but instead the earlier decree had been tightened; press restrictions had been tightened and an increasing number of journalists, including Americans, had been expelled; Nelson Mandela and other key political prisoners had not been released, but instead the number of political prisoners, including a large number of minors, detained by the Government had increased. He also observed that no clear and credible plan had been devised for negotiating a future political system involving all the people equally in South Africa, and that many legitimate representatives of the majority were still banned, in hiding or in detention. He also said that the

(Mr. Makatini, ANC)

Government of South Africa had not ended its military and paramilitary activities aimed at neighbouring States.

Bearing in mind the correct observations made by the President of the United States of America regarding the current situation in South Africa, we condemn the abuse of the veto by the United States and the United Kingdom and the position taken by the Federal Republic of Germany during the month of February. In our view that action was hostile to the interests of the oppressed people of South Africa and contrary to the letter and spirit of the United States Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act, 1986. That Act called for the imposition of additional sanctions in the absence of significant progress leading to the end of apartheid and the establishment of a non-racial democracy in South Africa. Therefore, in our opinion, the Administration of the United States of America stands in violation of a Congressional Act empowering and mandating appropriate action to the full extent of the law. That Act also called upon the Secretary of State to convene an international conference on multilateral sanctions against South Africa, and to have the United States representative at the United Nations take an initiative leading to the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions.

The African National Congress is not alone in holding the view that the situation in South Africa has further deteriorated this year. This viewpoint is shared by many inter-State organizations including the United Nations, as well as by the Commonwealth leaders, who stated at their recent meeting that:

"the crisis engendered in the region by apartheid has seriously deteriorated ... Repressive measures resulting in more suffering and loss of life have been intensified within South Africa, and the toll taken by acts of war and destruction directed against South Africa's neighbours in an attempt to sustain and defend apartheid has continued to rise." (A/42/677, annex II, para. 2)

(Mr. Makatini, ANC)

We have in addition recently witnessed the latest confirmation of the white supremacy doctrine: the whites-only election, the imposition of states of emergency, the increased detention of our compatriots and, in particular, the hideous and wanton detention and torture of hundreds of our children; and the press censorship intended to hide the régime's evil from the South African community in general.

The combined impact of the internal and external pressures on the Pretoria régime reached an unprecedented level early this year. In characterizing this period we can safely speak of a psychological threshold having been crossed in South Africa. On the side of the oppressed, our people cast aside fear of death and, like their brethren in Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe and Namibia, put their lives on the line for freedom. On the side of the oppressor, he admitted to himself that he had lost the strategic initiative, which has passed into the hands of the people, and that he can no longer rule by himself and in the old way. We are talking of the irreversible process now seen by friend and foe as leading to the inevitable demise of the apartheid system.

(Mr. Makatini, ANC)

In a desperate attempt to stem the tide of mass resistance at home, as well as international pressure and sanctions, the Pretoria régime has embarked on a two-pronged approach. One was articulated a few years ago by Magnus Malan, the régime's Defence Minister, who admitted that, despite its military might, the régime could not win in the mainly psychological warfare waged by the ANC. On that occasion he stressed the need for the régime's campaign being 80 per cent political and designed to win the hearts and minds of the people, and only 20 per cent military. It is in pursuance of this campaign that P.W. Botha has publicly declared his régime's policy of co-opting "moderate blacks" with whom he intends to share power.

The other approach of the campaign derives from the régime's loyalty to all the tenets of apartheid, including the doctrine that whites are inherently superior to blacks, that apartheid enjoys divine inspiration and that, as the representative of white, Christian and Western civilization, racist South Africa is the bulwark against the spread of communist influence in Africa.

The origins of this strategy can be traced to P.W. Botha's policy statement during the May whites-only elections, when he declared the need to crush the ANC and the extra-parliamentary organizations before co-opting "moderate blacks" with whom to share power. This campaign has taken the form of abduction of ANC cadres, such as Ibrahim Ismail Ibrahim and Priscilla Nyanda from the Kingdom of Swaziland. It has taken the form of assassination of 13 ANC cadres and leaders, including Cassius Make, the late National Executive Committee member. It has also taken the form, revealed at the recent trial in London, of the plan to kidnap 15 ANC leaders, including Comrade President Oliver Tambo. At the same time, the régime continues to spend millions of dollars in the propaganda campaign to discredit the ANC, while promoting the ever-growing number of bogus groups being groomed for co-option.

(Mr. Makatini, ANC)

That is indeed further proof that the Botha régime has neither the desire nor the intention to engage in any peaceful negotiations. On the contrary, everything it does is directed at the destruction of the national liberation movement, the suppression of the democratic movement and the entrenchment and perpetuation of the apartheid system of white domination. It is conducting a determined campaign to eliminate the ANC and the democratic movement.

We call on the United Nations and the entire international community to meet this challenge by lending appropriate political support to the ANC, which enjoys unparalleled authority in the country today. Attempts to co-opt Bantustan and other puppets towards a neo-apartheid solution must be defeated.

The conflict in our country is between the forces of national liberation and democracy on the one hand, and those of racism and reaction on the other. Any negotiations would have to be conducted by those two forces, as represented by their various organizational formations. It is in this context that we call on the international community to join the ANC in rejecting, without qualification, the proposed National Statutory Council, which the Botha régime seeks to establish through legislation to be enacted by the apartheid parliament and on the basis of the constitution, which the General Assembly and the Security Council have declared null and void. The National Statutory Council seeks to entrench and legitimize the very structures of apartheid that our struggle seeks to abolish.

The position of the ANC on negotiations is clearly stated in the 9 October statement of the National Executive Committee, which states, inter alia, that:

"Once more we would like to reaffirm that the ANC and the masses of our people as a whole are ready and willing to enter into genuine negotiations provided they are aimed at the transformation of our country into a united and non-racial democracy."

(Mr. Makatini, ANC)

However, in viewing the Pretoria régime's record exemplified by non-compliance with the Nkomati Accord, the Lusaka Agreement and Security Council resolution 435 (1978), our statement further declares:

"Our region is fully conversant with the treacherous and deceitful nature of the apartheid régime. Taking this experience into account, we insist that before any negotiations take place the apartheid régime would have to demonstrate its seriousness by implementing various measures to create a climate conducive to such negotiations. These would include the unconditional release of all political prisoner, detainees, all captured freedom fighters and prisoners of war, as well as the cessation of all political trials. The state of emergency would have to be lifted, the army and the police withdrawn from the townships and confined to their barracks. Similarly, all repressive legislation and all laws empowering the régime to limit freedom of assembly, speech, the press and so on, would have to be repealed. Among these would be the Riotous Assemblies, the Native Administration, the General Laws Amendment, the Unlawful Organizations, the Internal Security and similar Acts and regulations.

"We take this opportunity once more to reaffirm that the African National Congress is opposed to any secret negotiations. We firmly believe that the people themselves must participate in shaping their destiny and would therefore have to be involved in any process of negotiations."

In this context, the release of Govan Mbeki must be welcomed as an important development and victory not only for the South African patriots but also for the justice-loving peoples of the world in general, whose relentless campaign for the unconditional release of all the South African political prisoners can no longer be

(Mr. Makatini, ANC)

ignored by the already isolated Pretoria régime. However, in order to have it serve as a catalyst for meaningful change, it must be followed immediately by the equally unconditional release of Nelson Mandela, Walter Sisulu, Ahmed Kathrada and all other political prisoners and detainees, including children.

As we meet here today, racist South Africa's full-scale invasion of the People's Republic of Angola continues with savage intensity. Pretoria's arrogance and desperate move to secure the Reagan Administration's active participation in this anti-African act, has been underscored by P.W. Botha's reported visit to southern Angola. There can be no bigger challenge to the United Nations and the international community in general; they must take immediate and appropriate action against the Pretoria régime. The repeated massacres committed by the RENAMO armed bandits in Mozambique, who have killed hundreds of civilians in cold blood, call for equally urgent action.

I take this opportunity to confirm that the African National Congress, in co-operation with the Party and Government of the United Republic of Tanzania, will be holding an international conference in Arusha from 1 to 4 December 1987. The theme of the conference is "The Peoples of the world against apartheid and for the establishment of a non-racial democracy in South Africa", and we hope that it will, among other things, address the issue of sanctions.



(Mr. Makatini, ANC)

Our organization thanks the Special Committee against Apartheid and all who have helped to fund this project, and it appeals to those who have not yet contributed to do so.

At this juncture and in keeping with the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and the overwhelming support of the international community, we call upon the Assembly once again to urge the Security Council to convene immediately in order to adopt comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

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

Mr. MANSOURI (League of Arab States) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like at the outset to extend to you my sincere congratulations and best wishes, in the name of the League of Arab States. Your election to this important post, is the best evidence of the trust you personally enjoy and ample proof of the high esteem in which the people and Government of your country are held for their role in securing peace and upholding the principles and goals of the United Nations Charter.

The League of Arab States and the Arab countries value the cordial, friendly relations with your country and cherish its firm stand on the just cause of Arab peoples, particularly its support for the cause of the people of Palestine.

History has never witnessed the like of the degrading, inhuman practices pursued by the racist régime in South Africa whose policies are based on the institutionalization of racial discrimination. In pursuance of its apartheid policies, the racist minority régime, imposes its hegemony through systematic oppression and victimization of the black majority in South Africa.

For a long time now the police, army and paramilitary forces of the apartheid régime have been brutalizing the people of South Africa. What the rulers of South

(Mr. Mansouri, League of Arab States)

Africa and their oppressive machinery are trying to do through emergency legislation which continues in force, is to defeat the forces of national resistance in a desperate attempt to dampen and put out the flame of a valiant movement which grows more determined and steadfast in the face of this increasing repression. Instead of knuckling under, the people of South Africa, stand united behind its leadership and face up to the apartheid régime despite arbitrary arrests and detention. The people of South Africa continue to struggle against the brutal repression of the Pretoria régime.

The report before the Assembly states that that brutal régime pursues arbitrary policies against the populace regardless of sex or age. Thus, women, disabled persons and even children under the age of 18 - have fallen victim to its criminality and arbitrary persecution. In detention now there are between 300 and 500 children below the legal age.

In South Africa there are secret detention camps for children where the inmates are subjected to brainwashing through indoctrination programmes which are supposed to facilitate this integration in their communities, if we are to believe the claims of the officials of the apartheid régime. Obviously, that is neither believable nor acceptable.

Not content with its racist policies, which are a crime against humanity and an affront to the dignity of man, the apartheid régime resorts to military attacks against neighbouring countries. The Government of racist South Africa pursues a systematically hostile policy against the territorial integrity of the independent neighbouring countries. On the other hand, the Government of South Africa still occupies the Territory of Namibia illegally, persecutes its people and hinders the independence of that territory by linking it to the contrived issue of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola.

(Mr. Mansouri, League of Arab States)

The claims by the Government of South Africa that it is improving ethnic relations through the so-called constitutional reform and the repealing of the Pass laws, are nothing but bogus reforms which, in reality, is a manoeuvre aimed at appeasing an outraged international community. In the first instance the aim is to perpetuate the policy of apartheid.

We in the League of Arab States support the overwhelming majority of the citizens in South Africa who reject all such manoeuvres and bogus cosmetic changes. We urge the international community to eliminate completely the régime of apartheid and establish a unified, free, democratic society on the basis of a free general election.

The League of Arab States requests, in line with numerous resolutions adopted by the Council of the League, that the Pretoria régime release Nelson Mandela, all the other political prisoners and those under house arrest; that it lift the state of emergency and repeal its racist laws. The League of Arab States believes it necessary that workers in South Africa be granted all their trade union rights, that an end be put to the bantustan system and that a political dialogue be commenced with the legitimate leaders of the majority population in order to put an immediate end to apartheid and establish a representative, democratic government.

We in the League of Arab States, and indeed all over the Arab world, believe it is extremely difficult to try to reform of the apartheid policy. It must be overhauled from the roots.

For more than four decades now the United Nations has been seized of the problem of the policy of apartheid pursued by the Government of South Africa. Throughout that period, the international community has made tremendous efforts to put an end to the abhorrent régime of racial discrimination and its attendant

(Mr. Mansouri, League of Arab  
States)

degradation and persecution of the majority of a whole indigenous people in the land of their forefathers. During the last 40 years, the Government of South Africa, in defiance of the resolutions of the United Nations and the international will, has come up with thousands of pretexts, relying on the tolerance and collusion of a limited number of countries, in order to prolong its racist policy. However, the horrendous circle of terror pursued by the Pretoria Government shows that it is desperately attempting to preserve its very foundations, which are crumbling as a result of its policies of racial discrimination.

(Mr. Mansouri, League of Arab States)

How else can anyone explain the upsurge of arbitrary arrests, detentions, systematic genocide, the suppression of freedom of the press and freedom of association? All this is happening at a time when the chief demand of the indigenous population is that their fundamental rights as set out in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights be recognized.

It is worth noting that the main reason behind the intransigent posture of the South African Government in pursuing these aggressive policies, defying the international will and the norms of legality and refusing to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations and respond to the just demands of the international community, is the continued and increasing collaboration between Pretoria and a number of countries and transnational corporations which seek by every means to achieve their objectives of increased benefits from the exploitation of the human and material wealth of South Africa and Namibia.

The outcome of this military, economic and trade relationship is more poverty for the black majority and more plundering of the natural resources of the territory. It encourages the leaders of South Africa to stick to their policies of racial discrimination and aggression. This is the only context within which the world should view and assess the privileged close relationship between the apartheid régime in South Africa and the Zionist entity régime in occupied Palestine.

In this connection, we must refer to the declaration by the Zionist occupying power on the so-called embargo against South Africa. This is but a ploy to circumvent the measures included in the 1986 legislation by the United States Congress, entitled "United States anti-Apartheid Act" of October 1986, which is aimed at reconsidering assistance given to countries that violate the arms embargo against South Africa. The report before the General Assembly (A/42/22/Add.1) explains Israel's real intentions vis-à-vis its dealings with South Africa. The

(Mr. Mansouri, League of Arab States)

report also underlines the belief that Israel is South Africa's major source of arms and that South Africa's arms purchases from Israel exceed R 1,000 million annually. In addition, there is the covert technical and intelligence collaboration and co-operation in the area of military research between the arms industries of South Africa and Israel. The report also recognizes fully the increasing gravity of nuclear collaboration between Israel and South Africa, particularly in so far as this introduces an element of nuclear blackmail into the African situation through the close collaboration in the nuclear field between Israel and South Africa. Obviously, this is a grave threat to the African countries, particularly the front-line States in southern Africa.

The Arab countries, which believe that the cause of freedom and the right to self-determination and independence form an integral whole that has its basis in international law and norms of legality have always stood by their brethren in Africa in this particularly critical stage of their liberation struggle. Therefore, the Arab countries see themselves as party to a battle against apartheid and the struggle for its elimination and for the freedom and independence of the people of Namibia.

The League of Arab States, in accordance with the resolutions adopted by the Council as well as at Arab summit conferences, have always affirmed their total boycott in every field of the racist régime in South Africa. We also affirm our resolve to continue our endeavours to expose the policies and practices of the apartheid régime. The Arab countries call on all international bodies to isolate the Pretoria régime, and impose mandatory sanctions and a boycott against it in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter.

The Arab countries and the League of Arab States call on the international community to shoulder its full responsibilities towards the people of South Africa extend its support to the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) and the African

(Mr. Mansouri, League of Arab States)

National Congress of South Africa (ANC) and bring greater pressure to bear on the racist régime to respect and comply with the wishes of the international community, acknowledge the aspirations and wishes of the national majority to exercise their national constitutional and political rights in a just democratic society.

In this context, the Council of the League of Arab States has affirmed that the support given by some Western countries to the South African régime by means of their continued relationships with that régime in every field is one of the factors which cause the racist régime to continue its intransigence and arrogance.

The Arab countries affirm that the collaboration between the racist régime in South Africa and the racist régime of Tel Aviv is a major axis of colonialist racist conspiracy against the Arab and African countries. The League of Arab States believes in the necessity of concerted regional and international efforts in facing up to this situation which gravely threatens international peace and security.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

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

Mr. FLAX (Israel): I wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply regarding statements we heard this morning by the representatives of the United Arab Emirates and Syria during the debate on apartheid.

I never cease to be amazed, even after spending so many hours in this Hall, by the wilful ignorance and barefaced hypocrisy displayed by some representatives here. I hold in my hand document A/42/45 dated 5 November 1987, which was released

(Mr. Flax, Israel)

this morning. It is entitled "Report of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Petroleum Products to South Africa". Permit me to quote from the introductory section:

"Oil and petroleum products are vital for South Africa's transport sector and for the military and police forces...". (A/42/45, para.8, p. 5)

In annex III, on cases of violations, pages 49 through 58 of that report, a great number of paragraphs deal with the United Arab Emirates. These paragraphs are 3, 6, 8, 11, 13, 15, 16, 27, 32, 33, 34, 36, 41 and, lastly, 44. Other oil-producing countries are being investigated, but first place undoubtedly belongs to the United Arab Emirates.

Permit me now to make a few observations regarding the remarks of the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, a régime noted for its tolerance and scrupulous regard for human dignity.

We were heartened by the lesson the Syrian representative offered on the subject of nazism. I commend him for his expertise, but he is far too modest. I believe that all here should be aware whence such expertise is obtained.

There lives in Damascus, at 7 Rue Hadad Street, a man - if you can call him that - named Alois Brunner, SS serial number 342767. He was Adolph Eichmann's deputy and, as such, was in charge of deporting Jews from Austria, Greece, Yugoslavia and France.



(Mr. Flax, Israel)

In fact, he ran the notorious concentration camp at Drancy. In the findings of the Nuremberg Tribunals he was singled out for his specialty - murdering children and humiliating the elderly before death. In all, he was responsible for some 136,500 murders.

In 1954 he was sentenced to death in absentia by France. Lest anyone think that Mr. Brunner has just recently been discovered, let the record show that on 10 October 1984 a warrant was issued for his arrest in Germany. On 18 December 1984 a formal request for his extradition was presented to the Syrian Government. At first the Syrians claimed to have no knowledge of his whereabouts. But after Brunner was repeatedly interviewed in the media - the last time this past October - the Syrian Government changed its tune. They now claim that Brunner has committed no crime which can be prosecuted in Syria and therefore he cannot be extradited.

If the mark of a civilized society is the extent to which it protects its children and respects its elders, what can be said about a régime which harbours a murderer of children and a tormentor of the elderly?

The cynicism of the Syrian representative smacks of a vulgarity which we had all hoped had perished 42 years ago. It is reprehensible. In the final analysis, it is incomprehensible.

Mr. HASSAN (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic): The representative of Israel, in exercise of the right of reply, tried to defend his country's relations with South Africa by accusing others and not mentioning Israel's links with the racist South African régime.

I should like to remind the representative of Israel that the Knesset this year adopted a resolution dealing with contracts with South Africa that should not

(Mr. Hassan, United Arab Emirates)

be signed. Significantly, the Knesset approves of the co-operation between the two régimes; it adopted that resolution because of the pressure exerted by certain American institutes so that funds paid to Israel should not be cut off.

What is more important in relations between Israel and South Africa is the strategic, military and nuclear co-operation between them, which is never mentioned in Israel. I do not wish to dwell on this; suffice it to say that the relations existing between Israel and South Africa are referred to in United Nations documents and in General Assembly resolutions.

The United Arab Emirates are proud of their position of principle against racism, be it that practised by South Africa or Israel.

We do not know whether the representative of Israel is trying to deceive himself or others.

Mr. ARNOUSS (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): A few moments ago the representative of Israel, who represents a racist régime, tried to divert the General Assembly's attention from the agenda item, "Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa". He tried insolently to deny the existence of relations between his country and the Pretoria régime.

I referred this morning to certain paragraphs of the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid dealing with Israel's collaboration with that régime. Consequently, at this late hour I shall not again quote that report. I shall limit myself to reading out a paragraph from a statement made by a former Israeli ambassador to South Africa. It appeared on 31 January 1987 in The Citizen of Johannesburg and is an indication of Israel's regard for our African brothers:  
(spoke in English)

(Mr. Arnouss, Syrian Arab Republic)

"First, we should think of the Jewish community, when 20,000 Jews are more important than black African nations. Sanctions do not solve any problems."

(continued in Arabic)

Such, then, are the relations existing between the two régimes, and such are their practices.

The meeting rose at 7.45 p.m.