



CONTENTS

Organization of work .....	Page 1339
Agenda item 19:	
Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples ( <i>concluded</i> ):	
(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 .....	1339
Agenda item 32:	
Policies of <i>apartheid</i> of the Government of South Africa ( <i>continued</i> ):	
(a) Report of the Special Committee against <i>Apartheid</i> ;	
(b) Report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against <i>Apartheid</i> in Sports;	
(c) Reports of the Secretary-General	
Report of the Special Political Committee .....	1349

*President: Mr. Ismat T. KITTANI (Iraq).*

*Organization of work*

1. The PRESIDENT: I should like to bring two matters to the attention of the General Assembly. First, representatives will recall that a mandatory deadline, 1 December, was established for the submission to the Fifth Committee of all draft resolutions with financial implications.

2. In this regard, I have received two formal requests for an extension of that deadline. One is from the Chairman of the First Committee in connection with the Committee's consideration of agenda item 42. The second is from the Chairman of the Special Political Committee in connection with agenda items 60 and 67.

3. After considering those requests, I have agreed to propose that the General Assembly approve the extension of the deadline for the submission of the draft resolutions in question to Thursday, 3 December 1981—that is, by 48 hours. May I take it that the General Assembly agrees to my proposal?

*It was so decided.*

4. The PRESIDENT: I hope that this decision notwithstanding, the Assembly will be able to meet its schedule. May I once again appeal to all representatives for their cooperation and understanding.

5. The second matter I wish to bring to the Assembly's attention refers to the speakers' list on agenda item 31, which the Assembly will consider during the next few days. It is my intention to close the list in the debate on that item at 4 p.m. on Thursday, 3 December.

6. With regard to agenda item 30, which will be before the Assembly next week, I should like to recall that the item

was referred to the Third Committee for the submission of recommendations, but that the debate on the item will take place in plenary meeting. Since little time is available for the debate on this item, I urge those who wish to participate in it to inscribe their names on the list of speakers as soon as possible. It is my intention to close the list at 12 noon on Monday, 7 December.

**AGENDA ITEM 19**

**Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (*concluded*):\***

- (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

7. The PRESIDENT: I wish to clarify one important aspect of our proceedings concerning the item now before us. Members of the Assembly will recall that at the 72nd and 73rd plenary meetings, on 25 November, a question was raised about the significance which should be attached to the implications of operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1 in respect of the recommendation of the Special Committee in paragraph 3 of the resolution contained in paragraph 87 of its report [A/36/23/Rev.1, chap. I]. This also gave rise to the submission of an amendment [A/36/L.30 and Add.1] to operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

8. After consultations with numerous delegations concerned, I believe that the following is the accepted interpretation of the intent and the implications involved should the Assembly decide to adopt draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1 as it now stands.

9. Adoption of the draft resolution in its present form would have the effect of recognizing the fact that the Special Committee had recommended that the General Assembly should "examine the question of Puerto Rico as a separate item at its thirty-seventh session" [A/36/23/Rev.1, chap. I, para. 87], but it would not constitute a decision by the General Assembly to do so. It is my understanding that, on the basis of this formal interpretation of the significance of the Assembly's action, the sponsors no longer find it necessary to ask for a vote on the amendment contained in document A/36/L.30 and Add.1.

10. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote on draft resolutions A/36/L.20 and Add.1 and A/36/L.21 and Add.1. Representatives will also be given an opportunity to explain their votes after the vote.

11. May I once again remind the Assembly that, in accordance with decision 34/401, explanations of vote are

\* Resumed from the 73rd meeting.

limited to 10 minutes and are to be made by representatives from their seats.

12. Mr. BARBOSA de MEDINA (Portugal) (*interpretation from French*): For reasons well known to the Assembly, questions of decolonization are of prime importance to my country.

13. The Constitution of Portugal makes the right of peoples to self-determination and independence one of the fundamental principles which govern Portugal's conduct in international relations. The importance that Portugal attaches to this principle becomes evident when it is taken into consideration that the text of the Constitution places it on the same level as the principles of equality between States, the peaceful settlement of international disputes and non-interference in the domestic affairs of other States. In fact, the principle of the self-determination of peoples is one of the fundamental bases of the political and legal systems of Portugal.

14. However, my delegation is confronted with a draft resolution which, whilst it is meant to be oriented towards the future, seems in some parts to be dangerously attached to formulas of a bygone era. Instead of unequivocally stating the right of certain peoples to self-expression and the choice of their own destiny it could, in several passages, endanger that right, especially in cases where the status of certain Territories has already been freely accepted by their inhabitants. On the other hand, my delegation must take a stand before an Assembly a large number of whose Members owe their presence here to the work of decolonization, which has so profoundly contributed to the definition of the major parameters of Portuguese policy in recent years. It must therefore cast an unequivocal vote on a question which more than any other is of interest to Portugal. It will do so by voting in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1, although that draft resolution does not fully express the concepts that my delegation would wish to see in it.

15. My delegation would like to see questions still remaining after the immense progress made in decolonization matters during the past few decades dealt with in depth in a resolution whose importance should not be minimized. Yet, because of an amalgamation that my delegation can only regret, questions with no direct bearing on the matter before us have been considered in a document whose balance is thus dangerously threatened.

16. Therefore, while expressing Portugal's deep attachment to the major principles of decolonization by voting in favour of the draft resolution, my delegation wishes to emphasize its formal reservations about any decision or recommendation which, expressly or indirectly, links the fundamental question which is the subject of our decision with other points which it does not consider to be relevant.

17. These reservations especially apply to operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution. While my delegation supports the work of the Special Committee, we cannot accept certain recommendations in its report, in particular those concerning Territories which, like Puerto Rico, do not come within the competence of the Committee. The reservations apply also to operative paragraphs 4 and 8, since my delegation considers that priority must be given to negotiation rather than to armed struggle and violence, particularly in situations where efforts are under way to achieve peaceful solutions through agreement, which my Government considers essential, and dialogue, which it considers inevitable. Finally, our reservations apply to operative paragraph 10, in view of the fact that its generalized wording does not take

due account of the diversity of situations the implications of which were emphasized unequivocally during our recent debates in the Fourth Committee.

18. Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): Despite United States support for the principle of self-determination and our continuing opposition to colonialism in all of its manifestations, the United States will vote against draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1. We are compelled to do so, much against our natural inclinations, by the grave deficiencies of the draft resolution itself. The recommendations contained in it do not in any way materially advance the progress of decolonization. Indeed, their effect can only be to impede further progress and to jeopardize hard-won gains already made.

19. We are particularly disturbed by operative paragraph 4 of this draft resolution, which recognizes the legitimacy of the struggle of peoples under colonial domination to exercise their right to self-determination "by all the necessary means at their disposal". Such a statement, it seems to us, comes perilously close to providing blanket endorsement for whatever means any liberation movement—either real or self-styled—chooses to regard as necessary. There are, however, certain actions which can never be justified on the grounds of necessity. Random and indiscriminate murder is always wrong; hijacking is always wrong; the killing of diplomats is always wrong. However just the cause, however grave the provocation, our common humanity demands that certain minimal norms of conduct be obeyed by all parties at all times.

20. My delegation also objects to operative paragraph 7 of this draft resolution, which suggests that foreign economic or other interests in the Non-Self-Governing Territories are somehow, by their very nature, detrimental to the interests either of Namibians or of the people of other Non-Self-Governing Territories. The United States categorically rejects this assertion. As we have already pointed out in the course of the Fourth Committee's deliberations, there are many representatives here who recognize that, despite inequities and occasionally irregular patterns of foreign investment, foreign participation in their countries' economies has benefited their peoples greatly. It seems most inconsistent, therefore, to suggest that those same activities are inherently harmful to the people of a dependent Territory. This thesis can only be sustained through the use of the kind of double standard—one for sovereign States, another for Non-Self-Governing Territories—which constitutes the very essence of colonialism.

21. Operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution before us consists of two parts. The United States, however, subscribes only to that part of the paragraph calling on all States to refrain from taking any action which might imply recognition of the legitimacy of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. In this connection, I should like to emphasize that the United States fully adheres to Security Council and International Court of Justice rulings on Namibia. The United States Government maintains a consistent policy toward investment in Namibia: we officially discourage investment; we neither guarantee nor protect investments in Namibia based on rights acquired through the South African Government since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI); and we provide no financial assistance to support trade and investment in Namibia. These official policies ensure that my Government's economic and political relations with South Africa in no way serve to recognize either the legality or the legitimacy of its administration of Namibia.

22. But while the United States supports the second part of operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution, it takes sharp issue with the first part, which seeks to politicize the activities of the United Nations specialized agencies and also to impose what are, in effect, comprehensive sanctions against the Government of South Africa. The United States has stated on numerous occasions that the introduction of extraneous and divisive political issues into the work of the United Nations specialized agencies contravenes their essential purpose and hinders their ability to meet their vital responsibilities. We have also stated on numerous occasions that the attempt to secure Namibia's independence by adding to South Africa's international isolation is counterproductive. It does nothing to hasten independence for the people of Namibia and it harms the many South Africans, black and white alike, who are earnestly working for economic, social and political reform.

23. My Government's opposition to the recommendations contained in operative paragraph 10 of the draft resolution are also well known. The United States does not believe that the presence of military bases on Non-Self-Governing Territories necessarily interferes with the full exercise of the right to self-determination. A call for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all military installations from Non-Self-Governing Territories is therefore unwarranted.

24. The United States appreciates the Assembly's conclusion today on the subject of Puerto Rico, namely, that the adoption of this draft resolution does not constitute approval of the specific recommendation that the General Assembly examine the question of Puerto Rico at its thirty-seventh session, in 1982. The United States regards the Special Committee resolution—which was supported by only 10 of the 25 members of the Committee—as an inappropriate and politically motivated attempt to interject the United Nations into the internal affairs of Puerto Rico and the United States. The General Assembly clearly recognized that the people of Puerto Rico had exercised their right to self-determination when it adopted resolution 748 (VIII) in 1953, removing Puerto Rico from the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories. This was reaffirmed by the General Assembly in 1971<sup>1</sup> and 1978<sup>2</sup> and has been upheld here today. On the basis of these decisions, and of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter of the United Nations, which prohibits the United Nations from interfering in the purely domestic affairs of its Members, the United States continues to oppose any action to interject the United Nations into any decision about the status of Puerto Rico. That decision must reside, and does reside, with the people of Puerto Rico themselves.

25. Finally, my delegation wishes to point out that, while it is often said nowadays that colonialism is on its deathbed, there is one colonial empire in the world today which has been untouched by the historic process of decolonization.

26. To our considerable regret and dismay, draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1 contains no reference to the Soviet Union and its manifestly colonial policies. It thereby fails to address the gravest threat of colonialism currently facing the international community. My Government, which opposed the old colonialism, cannot look with equanimity upon the imposition of a new colonialism, albeit one that hides its true purposes behind a façade of revolutionary slogans and idealistic rhetoric. In the lives of nations, if not elsewhere, sins of omission are no less serious or consequential than sins of commission. For this reason, and for all the other reasons I have cited, my Government will vote against this draft resolution.

27. Miss LUCAS (New Zealand): New Zealand will vote in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1.

28. New Zealand supported General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. We are fully committed to the principle of self-determination for all peoples and we shall continue to meet our responsibilities as an administering Power under the Declaration. It is therefore with regret that my delegation finds itself obliged to make certain reservations in respect of this draft resolution. In the light of the consideration of the question of military bases in the Fourth Committee this year, my delegation reserves its position on operative paragraph 10. We reiterate the reservations we expressed at the thirty-fifth session<sup>3</sup> in respect of the Plan of Action for the Full Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, referred to in the second preambular paragraph. We have concerns too about operative paragraphs 4 and 7.

29. Lastly, my delegation cannot accept the view that approval by the General Assembly of the report of the Special Committee commits the Assembly to carrying out the Special Committee's recommendations. My delegation has reservations in respect of certain aspects of the Special Committee's report, particularly in respect of Puerto Rico. It is only in the light of your remarks at the beginning of this meeting, Mr. President, that my delegation is able to support the draft resolution.

30. Mr. SEZAKI (Japan): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/36/L.20 and Add.1 and A/36/L.21 and Add.1 because we firmly support the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and hope that it will be implemented.

31. However, for reasons we have already made clear many times, my delegation has reservations on some of the paragraphs in draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1. Furthermore, my delegation cannot support some parts of the report of the Special Committee which operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1 approves, and accordingly wishes to indicate its reservations.

32. One of them concerns the question of Puerto Rico. The people of Puerto Rico have exercised their right to self-determination, as recognized by the General Assembly in its adoption of resolution 748 (VIII). More precisely, in this resolution, the General Assembly:

*“Recognizes that the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, by expressing their will in a free and democratic way, have achieved a new constitutional status;*

“ . . .

*“Recognizes that, when choosing their constitutional and international status, the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico have effectively exercised their right to self-determination.”*

33. It is extremely regrettable that the Special Committee did not give due consideration to this fact. In view of the General Assembly's solemn decision, contained in that resolution, my delegation finds no justification for, and will therefore oppose the inclusion of, the question of Puerto Rico as a separate item in the agenda of its thirty-seventh session.

34. My delegation also wishes to express its earnest hope that, for the sake of its dignity and integrity, the Special Committee will give due and careful consideration to the majority opinion on the question of military bases and installations, which was clearly expressed in the adoption of relevant amendments by the Fourth Committee at its 25th meeting.

35. With regard to draft resolution A/36/L.21 and Add.1, my delegation has doubts about the contention that it is necessary to intensify studies and the dissemination of information on decolonization. We maintain these reservations in the light of the fact that the number of Non-Self-Governing Territories which are the subject of the work of the Special Committee and of the Fourth Committee has decreased, and in consideration of the limited resources of the United Nations. Accordingly, my delegation does not fully support the relevant part of the report [A/36/23/Rev.1, chap. II, paras. 1-27] and has reservations on operative paragraph 1.

36. Mr. ORTIZ SANZ (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): With reference to operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1, the Bolivian delegation wishes to express its reservations in connection with paragraph 87 of the report of the Special Committee [*ibid.*, chap. I] because we do not believe it is desirable to alter without due consideration certain agreements and political procedures, with the risk of hampering the very process of decolonization. For this reason the delegation of Bolivia will vote in favour of this draft resolution, with the reservation we have just expressed.

37. Mr. CASTILLO-ARRIOLA (Guatemala) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Guatemala wishes to place on record its position in connection with the vote it will cast against draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1.

38. My delegation recalls with satisfaction that along with other Latin American States it was one of the founding Members that made the greatest contribution to the historic and important process of decolonization undertaken by the United Nations as far back as 1945, in the Charter and the other norms that govern it, among them, and most especially, resolution 1514 (XV), as also to the action undertaken by the Special Committee, the Fourth Committee and the General Assembly, as is fully recorded in the records of those bodies.

39. However, we have noted with concern the excesses that have occurred now that the process of decolonization is coming to an end in that there has been a succession of acts of real political interference in violation of other principles which are fundamental for Member States and enshrined in the Charter, such as the peaceful settlement of disputes.

40. This is the case with the independence of Belize, which was declared in the General Assembly without a dispute between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Guatemala having first been resolved by the peaceful process of negotiation, precisely at a time when both States, Guatemala and the United Kingdom, had subscribed to a serious undertaking to resolve the territorial dispute over Belize, which would have made it possible to solve that problem immediately in all its aspects, including the question of the self-determination of Belize, with the acquiescence and goodwill of Guatemala.

41. For this reason, although we acknowledge the important work done by the United Nations to liberate peoples still under the colonial yoke, we ratify the official position of the Government of Guatemala not to recognize the State

of Belize, or the borders that divide us as frontiers, as long as the United Kingdom does not meet the demands of Guatemala in the dispute, which are clearly defined in the agreement of 11 March 1981 [*see A/36/172 and A/36/390*], known as the "Heads of Agreement"<sup>4</sup>, and which were not taken into account either by the Security Council or by the Assembly, thus creating a state of permanent insecurity in the area.

42. For these reasons my delegation will vote against draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1 because we oppose the ninth preambular paragraph.

43. We shall also vote against that draft resolution because, in our view, operative paragraph 5 is a further act of interference in the work of the Special Committee which is considering the question and expecting the free and legitimate decision with regard to its own destiny of the people of Puerto Rico, which alone have the right to determine their own future, without coercion of any kind and without being made the object of the political designs of other States.

44. Mr. SORENSEN MOSQUERA (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Venezuela wishes to make some remarks concerning the report of the Special Committee and draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1. In that connection and as regards Puerto Rico we wish to state the following.

45. That part of the report of the Special Committee that deals with Puerto Rico cannot of course reflect in detail all that has happened, although such information is to be found in the records of the Committee. Thus we do not find the name of the country that requested that the draft resolution be voted upon separately, nor is there an indication of how each country voted on each paragraph.

46. On that occasion we gave an explanation of vote, which is to be found in the records to which we have referred. At that time we expressed some views on the subject: for instance, that in both words and deeds we have demonstrated our attachment to the principle of freedom and independence; that we have extended our moral support to the concept that peoples should determine their own future, thus clearly upholding the principle of self-determination; and that we express the general will of the Venezuelan people in reaffirming the inalienable right of the people of Puerto Rico to self-determination. We reaffirm our belief in the self-determination of peoples, respect for freedom and the free exercise of human rights and criteria wherever ideological pluralism exists.

47. Our position in this connection with respect to Puerto Rico has been made clear whenever we have had to take a decision on the question in the Special Committee, which this year adopted a decision which, despite the differences we expressed when we abstained in the vote on the recommendation, we respect, because it was adopted by a majority of members.

48. Venezuela's attitude in the Committee was fully in line with our identification with the legitimate interests and aspirations of our people, which was confirmed in the statement of our President, Mr. Luis Herrera Campíns, on 21 September 1981 before the Assembly, when he stated:

"One of the bases of the United Nations is respect for the self-determination of peoples. Memorable General Assembly resolutions have bravely and rightly developed that principle, but solemn words alone do not become practical effectiveness.

“Manifest examples and subtle evidence of the absurd policy of blocs abound. On behalf of that policy of force, interventions occur with the intention of imposing or maintaining given political régimes leaning towards one ideology or another, or intervention is threatened, to intimidate with the force of arms.” [5th meeting, paras. 63-64.]

He also stated:

“In Latin America and the Caribbean we also suffer from problems of colonialism or its vestiges, or other types of foreign domination.

“On our continent, particularly in the Caribbean area, new States have entered the international community as full sovereign nations. Venezuela, because of its geographical ties and as a friend and good neighbour, feels committed to the efforts of those nations as they become ever increasingly the masters of their own destiny. However, there are still cases to be solved, and we trust that solutions will continue to be found, without the traumas that have occurred in other parts of the world.

“I hope that the day is not far off when the Latin American people of Puerto Rico take their place among us. We nurture this hope of all Latin Americans, in the conviction that it is for the people of Puerto Rico alone to determine their future.” [Ibid., paras. 92-94.]

49. In summarizing the principles underlying the policy of Venezuela in the United Nations as a Latin American country, the President indicated, *inter alia*, two principles:

“First, that the problems of Latin America should be solved by Latin Americans, without foreign interference, and without direct or indirect hemispheric or extrahemispheric intervention. . .

“Secondly, that Latin America’s position *vis-à-vis* the world’s great and serious problems should be autonomous and neither related to nor integrated with the interests of bloc politics.” [Ibid., paras. 135-136.]

50. In this context, Venezuela understands—especially after the statement made by the President of the Assembly—that the spirit of draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1 is fully in keeping with the provisions of rule 40 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

51. For all those reasons Venezuela will vote in favour of the draft resolution approving the report of the Special Committee.

52. Mrs. NEIRTZ (France) (*interpretation from French*): Before we vote on draft resolutions A/36/L.20 and Add.1 and A/36/L.21 and Add.1, my delegation wishes to make the following comments concerning the report of the Special Committee on its work in 1981.

53. First of all, the decision of the Committee relating to Puerto Rico constitutes interference in the internal affairs of Puerto Rico and the United States. That is contrary to Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. Puerto Rico’s future is in the hands of its people, and in their hands alone.

54. Secondly, certain of the resolutions or decisions of the Committee have not been endorsed by the Fourth Committee. In these matters France accepts only the draft

resolutions adopted by the Fourth Committee and then by the General Assembly on 24 and 25 November.

55. Thirdly, our reservations on a number of provisions, on South Africa in particular, in draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1 are well known. However, France wishes to emphasize its support for the right of peoples to self-determination. That is why, in spite of certain reservations, the delegation of France will this year abstain on the two draft resolutions.

56. Mr. BEESLEY (Canada): While my delegation uncontestedly supports the spirit behind draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1—that the exercise of the right to self-determination should be available to all—we regret that the draft resolution contains questionable assumptions, assertions and propositions which are not acceptable.

57. In particular we have reservations regarding operative paragraph 10, which is based on an invalid assumption, already rejected by the Fourth Committee, that the presence of military bases necessarily constitutes an impediment to the exercise of self-determination. Accordingly, my delegation will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

58. However, the Canadian delegation was glad to hear you, Mr. President, state that the adoption of this draft resolution would in no way constitute a decision to include the so-called question of Puerto Rico in the agenda of the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session, as proposed in paragraph 87 of the report of the Special Committee. That proposition was put to the Committee in the full knowledge that the people of Puerto Rico have already exercised their right to self-determination.

59. We note from the Committee’s report that only 11 members out of the 25 members of the Committee supported the draft resolution. Should such a draft resolution have been put before the General Assembly, my delegation would have opposed it on the grounds that it would be a violation of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter.

60. The PRESIDENT: The administrative and financial implications of draft resolutions A/36/L.20 and Add.1 and A/36/L.21 and Add.1 are contained in the report of the Fifth Committee [A/36/716]. The Assembly will vote first on draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1, entitled “Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples”. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco,

Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:* Guatemala, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Luxembourg, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 130 votes to 3, with 10 abstentions (resolution 36/68).<sup>5</sup>*

61. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution A/36/L.21 and Add.1, entitled "Dissemination of information on decolonization". A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Luxembourg, Saudi Arabia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 138 votes to none, with 6 abstentions (resolution 36/69).<sup>5</sup>*

62. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote after the vote.

63. Mrs. DAES (Greece): The Greek delegation would like to explain briefly its affirmative votes on the two draft resolutions.

64. At the outset, the Greek delegation would like once again to reaffirm its unreserved support for the fundamental principles of freedom, independence and respect for the human rights of everyone. We strongly support the recognition of the right to self-determination of all peoples and the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

65. My delegation believes further that information, and through it enlightenment of world public opinion, is an important means of insuring the full exercise of the right to self-determination and independence and the effective protection of human rights.

66. Those principles guided my delegation to vote in favour of the aforesaid draft resolutions. Nevertheless, the Greek delegation has serious reservations with respect to the language and content of some paragraphs of those resolutions. In this connection, we should like to place on record that our affirmative vote on draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1 does not mean that we approve its operative paragraph 5 and all the decisions and recommendations contained in chapter I of the report of the Special Committee. In particular, my delegation would like to state that it cannot go along with the recommendation of the Special Committee that the General Assembly include the question of Puerto Rico as a separate item in the agenda of its thirty-seventh session.

67. Mr. SCHAEFER (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1. It wishes to refer to the fact that the General Assembly does not have before it a draft resolution or decision on Puerto Rico. My delegation noted with satisfaction the statement of the President of the General Assembly concerning this question. If there had been any proposal before us recommending Puerto Rico for consideration, we would have opposed it.

68. Mrs. DEVER (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): The Belgian delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1. Belgium cannot subscribe to some of the principles included therein.

69. If the case of Puerto Rico, as referred to in the draft resolution which is in the report of the Special Committee, had been put before the General Assembly, Belgium would have had no choice but to cast a negative vote.

70. Belgium voted in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.21 and Add.1 concerning the dissemination of information on decolonization. Despite that affirmative vote, Belgium has serious reservations concerning operative paragraph 3 (a). Belgium regrets the lack of objectivity in the publications mentioned in that paragraph.

71. Mr. FEITH (Netherlands): The Netherlands is committed to the early implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. We hope that the process of decolonization will rapidly be brought to a close. Consequently, my delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A/36/L.20 and Add.1 and A/36/L.21 and Add.1.

72. We regret to say that draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1, which should have commanded a consensus, contains some paragraphs which meet with our objections. I refer in particular to operative paragraphs 2, 4, 7, 8 and 10. Furthermore, the Netherlands has some reservations on the contents of the report of the Special Committee for 1981. My country opposes the recommendation contained therein to place the question of Puerto Rico on the agenda of the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

*Mr. Djalal (Indonesia), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

73. Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the five Nordic countries—Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Finland.

74. The Nordic countries have a well-known and abiding commitment to the process of decolonization. That process has very nearly run its course, which is one of the historic achievements of the Organization.

75. That is why the Nordic countries voted in favour of the two draft resolutions just adopted. We regret, however, that we could not do so without reservations.

76. Draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1 and the recommendations of the Special Committee contain paragraphs with which we have difficulty. Thus, operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution contains formulations that are contrary to the principle upheld by the Nordic countries, that is to say, that the United Nations should seek peaceful solutions. We also have reservations concerning certain other paragraphs, some of which seem to run counter to the principle of universality to which our delegations remain committed.

77. As for the report of the Special Committee, we should like to point out that we find the Committee's recommendations on Puerto Rico unacceptable. In particular, we oppose the inclusion of the question of Puerto Rico as an item in the agenda of the next session of the General Assembly.

78. Mr. GAN (Israel): Although we support many of the provisions contained in draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1, which has just been adopted, my delegation had to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole because of our reservations concerning the content and language of some of its paragraphs.

79. With regard to operative paragraph 5, we have taken note of the statement by the President that adoption of this draft resolution does not constitute a decision on whether to include an item on Puerto Rico in the Assembly's agenda next year. My delegation would have opposed any other interpretation and would have opposed the inclusion of an item on Puerto Rico in the agenda if it had been proposed.

80. Mr. MIGLIORINI (Italy): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1 because we have general reservations on its wording, in particular with regard to operative paragraph 2 and with regard to the implicit endorsement of armed struggle contained in operative paragraph 4.

81. With regard to operative paragraph 5, we should like it to be on record that we do not support the recommendation of the Special Committee concerning Puerto Rico and that we agree with the interpretation given by

the President that the text of that paragraph does not represent an endorsement of that recommendation.

82. Mr. PIZA-ESCALANTE (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Costa Rica voted in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1, which, *inter alia*, approves the report of the Special Committee. We did so in general and despite some reservations, principally of a drafting nature, that we need not dwell on in detail here.

83. We consider, however, that we must explain and substantiate our vote as far as paragraph 87 of chapter I of the Special Committee's report is concerned, which contains the Special Committee's resolution on Puerto Rico. Costa Rica fully supports the principle contained in operative paragraph 1 of that resolution, which reaffirms that Puerto Rico, already recognized as a free State associated with the United States, a State whose people we recognize and consider as yet another Latin American people, with its own national individuality, is entitled to self-determination and independence. We cannot, moreover, fail to agree with the appeal addressed to the Government of the United States of America to adopt all necessary measures in order that a brother people may fully express in absolute freedom its self-determination in the exercise of its right as a free State and in accordance with the clearly expressed wishes of the different political and social organizations in the country.

84. However, my delegation wishes to state clearly that it understands and interprets that resolution only in the sense of reaffirming the right of the people of Puerto Rico to self-determination and not in the sense that the General Assembly or any other United Nations body can presume to impose upon it any specific form of self-determination or independence, which are matters that the Puerto Rican people alone can decide upon.

85. In this connection, we wish expressly to state that the wording of operative paragraph 2 of the Special Committee's resolution, which is rather ambiguous in this regard, should in no way be used for political or interventionist purposes in the solution of the internal affairs of Puerto Rico or of the United States of America, nor should it impose on the people of Puerto Rico any type of political organization, which, I repeat, Puerto Rico alone must freely and democratically decide upon. It can decide either to maintain its status as an associated free State, to become an additional state of the United States, to accede to fully sovereignty as an independent nation or to adopt any other formula that it may deem fit to choose.

86. The delegation of Costa Rica also wishes to explain that, while it supports the international appeal to the United States to take the necessary measures to enable the people of Puerto Rico fully to exercise their right to self-determination, this in no way means that we do not at the same time recognize that the people of Puerto Rico in general, in their present status, enjoy freedom, a *de jure* State, and fundamental human rights, including the right freely and democratically to elect their own leaders. We wish, therefore, to reaffirm the need and desirability for those rights of the Puerto Rican people to be given full recognition, thus enabling them freely to determine their own form of political organization.

87. Mr. HUTCHINSON (Ireland): My delegation supported General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), adopted on 14 December 1960. Because of the support of the Government of Ireland for the principle of decolonization

and for the work of the United Nations in this area, Ireland has always voted, where possible, in favour of resolutions on decolonization. In this spirit, my delegation has voted in favour of draft resolutions A/36/L.20 and Add.1 and A/36/L.21 and Add.1.

88. As with similar resolutions in the past, my delegation has reservations on some of the provisions contained in draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1. While we support the work of the Special Committee, we have reservations with regard to some of the conclusions and recommendations contained in the report of that Committee. Our vote in favour of this particular resolution, therefore, should not be interpreted as an endorsement of all of the Committee's conclusions and recommendations.

89. With regard to operative paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1, I should like to state that in determining our attitude towards specific military bases and installations, my delegation will be guided by the attitudes, freely expressed, of the inhabitants of the colonial Territories in question.

90. Mr. BUSTANI (Brazil): The delegation of Brazil voted in favour of the two draft resolutions. It wishes, however, to state for the record that its approval of the report of the Special Committee does not necessarily imply endorsement at this stage of all the recommendations contained therein.

91. Mr. TAÏEB (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1. However, it wishes to express reservations on operative paragraph 5 and, more specifically, on the programme of work envisaged by the Special Committee for 1982. In this regard, my delegation does not consider that the question of Western Sahara falls within the competence of the Special Committee.

92. Mr. AKHTAR (Bangladesh): The delegation of Bangladesh voted in favour of the two draft resolutions which have just been adopted. However, we have reservations concerning operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1, which refers to the report of the Special Committee. We should like to place on record our reservations concerning the recommendations contained in operative paragraph 3 of the resolution as set forth in chapter I, paragraph 87, of its report.

93. Mr. SREENIVASAN (India): My delegation would like to state that when the draft resolution on Puerto Rico was put to a vote at the 1201st meeting of the Special Committee on 20 August 1981, India abstained on each of its operative paragraphs and on the draft resolution as a whole.

94. Mr. IBRAHIM (Indonesia): With regard to draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1, I should like to explain the position of my delegation as follows.

95. As Members are aware, my delegation has always opposed the discussion of the so-called question of East Timor in any international forum, including the Special Committee on decolonization. My delegation would like to remind the Assembly that it has registered its strong opposition to the discussion of the so-called question of East Timor in the Special Committee. Consequently, while we voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, my delegation would like to express its reservations concerning operative paragraph 5, in so far as it pertains to the question of East Timor.

96. With regard to the question of the political status of Puerto Rico, my delegation believes that this is a matter for the people of Puerto Rico themselves to decide.

97. Mr. BOLE (Fiji): Draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1 is like those that we have traditionally supported in the past. We have done so again this year, primarily because of our abiding commitment to the right of all colonial peoples to self-determination, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). Moreover, our support for the draft resolution stems from the fact that it approves the work of the Special Committee in 1981 and also the programme of work envisaged by the Committee for next year.

98. However, my delegation would like to register its reservations concerning operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, in so far as it applies to the recommendation of the Special Committee that is contained in chapter 1, paragraph 87 of its report. Our stand in this regard is consistent with the position that my delegation took on the question in the Special Committee earlier this year.

99. Mrs. MAUALA (Samoa): My delegation believes in the principle of decolonization and in resolution 1514 (XV). We firmly believe that the wishes and aspirations of colonial peoples must be heeded and acted upon. For that reason we have voted in favour of the two draft resolutions. However, while our admiration and support for the work of the Special Committee have always been strong, we have some reservations regarding some of the conclusions and recommendations in this year's report and therefore we cannot give our unqualified endorsement to all its proposals.

100. Furthermore, in operative paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1 the unconditional withdrawal of military bases is called for. We cannot agree with this, since it is not in accordance with the wishes of the people involved.

101. Mr. SAGHIYYAH (Lebanon): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1, which has just been adopted, because we believe in the rights of peoples to independence and sovereignty. Accordingly, my delegation supported operative paragraph 4, on the understanding that the struggle of the peoples would be confined to the areas occupied by alien or colonial Powers.

102. My delegation also had certain reservations about operative paragraph 5. However, in the light of the President's interpretation, we found no difficulty in casting a vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

103. Mrs. NOWOTNY (Austria): There can be no doubt about Austria's firm and unconditional commitment to the process of peaceful decolonization, a process which indeed constitutes one of the greatest achievements of the United Nations. This commitment has once again found active expression in Austria's vote in favour of the two draft resolutions just adopted. We have, however, a few points of reservation which I have to bring to the attention of the General Assembly.

104. Above all, we are not in a position to associate ourselves with all the decisions and recommendations of the Special Committee, especially with the recommendation concerning Puerto Rico, contained in paragraph 3 of the Special Committee's resolution. We find, however,



that the explanatory remarks that the President of the Assembly has just made are satisfactory in this regard.

105. Furthermore, Austria wishes to register its position that the situation in South Africa and the policies of *apartheid* of the South African Government constitute a political problem of the greatest importance and of wide impact and are, therefore, rightly considered by the General Assembly under a separate agenda item. This problem should not be dealt with in the context of decolonization.

106. Lastly, I wish to reiterate Austria's position of principle that, while we recognize the legitimacy of the struggle for self-determination and independence, this struggle has to be conducted by peaceful means.

107. Mr. CHAN (Australia): Australia voted in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1. We should emphasize, however, that in doing so we do not in any measure accept the interpretation which certain delegations have put on operative paragraph 5, as it relates to Puerto Rico. Our position, as we stated at the 72nd plenary meeting last week, is that the question of Puerto Rico is no longer one of decolonization, since the General Assembly, in 1953, decided that the people of Puerto Rico had effectively exercised their right to self-determination. Accordingly we are opposed to moves by any State Member of the United Nations to bring the question of Puerto Rico before the General Assembly.

108. Mr. TANÇ (Turkey): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1, in keeping with the firm commitment of my Government to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, as well as our support for the activities of the Special Committee. However, our acceptance of operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1 would not affect in any way the position of my delegation on the recommendation contained in paragraph 3 of the Special Committee's resolution. My delegation cannot concur with that particular recommendation.

109. With regard to the subject-matter of operative paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1, the view of the Turkish Government in this respect is reflected in operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution I recommended by the Fourth Committee in part II of its report on item 19 [A/36/677/Add.2] and in operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution II recommended by the Fourth Committee in the same report. We are of the opinion that operative paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1 should have been formulated in the same way as the paragraphs on the same subject in the two draft resolutions I have just mentioned.

110. Mr. LOZINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation has voted in favour of both draft resolutions on the question of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and it is our opinion that these two resolutions that have just been adopted contain a whole series of important provisions aimed at the final liquidation of the system of colonialism. We wish to highlight, among others, the provisions expressing satisfaction with the work done by the Special Committee and approving its report. We should like to point out that in this way the General Assembly has approved the recommendations which are contained in that report. Among those recommendations, as

has already been mentioned, there is a resolution on the question of Puerto Rico, which was adopted by that Committee. We would point out that in the Special Committee on decolonization only two or three delegations voted against that resolution. In that resolution there is a reaffirmation of the inalienable right of the people of Puerto Rico to self-determination and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and the full applicability of that resolution with respect to Puerto Rico. The Government of the United States of America is once again urged to adopt all necessary measures for the full transfer of all powers to the people of Puerto Rico and to assist the Special Committee in the implementation of its resolutions relating to Puerto Rico and, in particular, to co-operate in the sending of a fact-finding mission of the Special Committee to the territory.

111. In the resolution of the Special Committee there is also a recommendation that the General Assembly examine the question of Puerto Rico as a separate item at its thirty-seventh session. The decision on this question will obviously be taken by the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session inasmuch as it was not contemplated that a final decision on the question would be taken at this time, as we understand it. Nevertheless, the fact that the Assembly has approved the report of the Special Committee, and has thereby approved the recommendations therein on this question, should be noted.

112. The Soviet delegation wishes to express its satisfaction that the overwhelming majority of the delegations in the General Assembly have voted in favour of both of the above-mentioned draft resolutions. Only three delegations voted against draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1, among them the United States of America and the United Kingdom. Thus, on the question on decolonization these two delegations have pitted themselves against the overwhelming majority of the Member States of the United Nations. It is not surprising that this situation has greatly irritated the representative of the United States, who, in justification of his position, has attempted to introduce into the discussion of this matter questions which have no relevance to it at all. The representative of the United States has mentioned the Soviet Union in connection with this problem. There is no need to provide any kind of answer to that statement by the representative of the United States, since the whole world knows and it is quite clear to all that the brotherly family of people of the Soviet Union are moving forward together on the path of economic and social development, and that all the peoples of the Soviet Union, in particular those that were formerly less developed, have now had the opportunity under Soviet rule of catching up with the more developed peoples in the family of the Soviet Union. That being so, the comments of the representative of the United States are completely out of place. What emerges clearly from his statement is that the United States objected to a whole series of provisions in the draft resolution that has just been adopted and recognized that those provisions are aimed against the United States. Although the United States was not specifically mentioned in that draft resolution, nevertheless in other resolutions of the General Assembly they have already been condemned for their collusion with the most reactionary racist forces, in particular the Pretoria régime.

113. The delegation of the United States expressed its discontent with such provisions of the draft resolution just adopted as the condemnation of the continuing activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding decolonization. This is not surprising inasmuch as the

United States monopolies, with the support of the Government of the United States, which has not adopted any measures to limit their activities in accordance with the decisions of the United Nations, are continuing increasingly to dominate the economy of colonies, and also of the young countries which were formerly colonies, causing them irreparable economic damage.

114. The delegation of the United States expressed its dissatisfaction with the provision of the resolution reaffirming the legitimacy of the national liberation struggle of the peoples of colonial Territories. Once again, that is not surprising, because the United States speaks against national liberation movements and is now striving to block those movements by declaring them to be terrorist organizations, in spite of the obvious fact that the peoples of colonial Territories are waging a war against the repressive measures by means of which attempts are made to keep them under the yoke of colonial slavery.

115. Lastly, it is no accident that the United States is upset by the paragraph calling upon the colonial Powers to withdraw immediately and unconditionally from their military bases and installations in the colonial Territories and refrain from establishing new ones, inasmuch as that is precisely what the policy of the United States consists of, both within its own colonial Territories and in the colonial Territories of other States.

116. The representative of another colonial Power, at an earlier meeting, stated that the problem of colonialism represents, as it were, a kind of dinosaur. As we know from paleontology, the dinosaur was a rather rapacious animal, and in this respect the comparison could be quite apt. The problem of colonialism resides in the fact that that particular animal, which should have been extinct from the face of the earth, is still in existence and, like the Hydra, is constantly acquiring new heads in the shape of neo-colonialism, which is continuing its former policy in new forms. That is why we consider that the resolution which has been adopted is a highly important and useful one, inasmuch as it emphasizes the need for all peoples to continue in their efforts to liquidate colonialism and neo-colonialism in all their forms and to show vigilance with regard to attempts to relegate this problem prematurely to the archives of history.

117. Mr. BOUGUERRA (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): The Algerian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1. We are pleased once again to see the General Assembly adopt the report of the Special Committee.

118. The delegation of Algeria regards as highly positive the conclusions arrived at by the President after a number of consultations. We interpret the draft resolution as meaning that the Assembly, by adopting the report of the Special Committee, accepts the recommendations, including those concerning the inclusion of the question of Puerto Rico in the agenda of the thirty-seventh session.

119. Mr. LESETEDI (Botswana): The delegation of Botswana voted in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1. We would, however, express our reservations with regard to operative paragraph 5 if it implies the inclusion of the question of Puerto Rico in the agenda of the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly. Furthermore, we do not associate ourselves with all the recommendations and decisions of the Special Committee.

120. Mr. BURAYZAT (Jordan): We should like for the record to express reservations with regard to operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1, inasmuch as it applies to paragraph 87 and chapter X of the report of the Special Committee.

121. Ms. JACOB (Guyana): The delegation of Guyana voted in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1. However, we wish to state for the record that we support the statement by the President to the effect that adoption of the report of the Special Committee does not constitute a decision or an endorsement of operative paragraph 3 of the Special Committee's resolution, as set forth in paragraph 87 of its report.

122. Mr. SARRÉ (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of Senegal found it possible to vote in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1 in view of the explanation provided by the President that the vote on operative paragraph 5 did not imply the adoption of the resolution of the Special Committee, according to which the question of Puerto Rico would be considered at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

123. Mr. MELÉNDEZ-BARAHONA (El Salvador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of El Salvador voted in favour of the two draft resolutions because we are in agreement with the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. However, we wish to place on record our reservations in connection with operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1. We agree with the President's interpretation of paragraph 87 of the report of the Special Committee.

124. Mr. ADAN (Somalia): I wish to reserve my delegation's position on the recommendation of the Special Committee with regard to the question of Puerto Rico and operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1. We also take note of the interpretation of the President on this matter.

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

126. Mr. KALINA (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of Czechoslovakia, as a member of the Special Committee, cannot agree with those negative appraisals of its work that have been made by the representatives of certain Western countries whom we have heard at this meeting, and in particular of those who in one way or another bear the responsibility for hindering the process of the elimination of the vestiges of colonialism. In this connection, the Czechoslovak delegation wishes once again to state that it supports the recommendation of the Special Committee to consider the question of Puerto Rico as a separate item at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

127. Mr. ROA KOURÍ (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation, a member of the Special Committee, cannot agree in any way with the opinion of a number of delegations concerning the report of the Special Committee, which was adopted by the General Assembly.

128. The delegation of Cuba considers that in adopting the report of the Special Committee as a whole by an overwhelming majority the General Assembly endorsed the results of the work of the Committee and all its con-

siderations and recommendations, specifically in connection with the colonial status of Puerto Rico, considered by the Committee on the basis of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), the applicability of which to that case was confirmed by the Committee, although Puerto Rico is not on the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories.

129. The interpretation given today in raising objections to this question, as reflected in the report, runs counter to the terms of resolution 1514 (XV). Therefore, in the light of that resolution, it is invalid. Draft resolution A/36/L.20 and Add.1 just adopted does not imply the automatic inclusion of this item in the agenda of the next session of the General Assembly. That is all that the statement by the President means. That item will be included in accordance with the General Assembly's rules of procedure, because, as we said in our statement in the general debate [see 12th meeting], the people of Puerto Rico, including its annexationist Governor, consider that the present status of that country is purely and simply colonial.

130. That was also recognized by the representative of the United States, when he said that the Special Committee's resolution on Puerto Rico interfered in the domestic affairs of the United States. So far as I know, the domestic affairs of the United States are not the domestic affairs of Puerto Rico. If they are, it is because Puerto Rico is not independent but, rather, a colony of the United States.

131. That is precisely what 11 Member States—not 10, as the representative of the United States erroneously said today—and the Special Committee itself declared in adopting the resolution on 20 August 1981 on the colonial status of Puerto Rico.

132. The attempt to call into question the legitimacy of the consideration of that question by the Committee has been rejected yet again by the Assembly.

#### AGENDA ITEM 32

##### **Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa (continued):**

- (a) Report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*;
- (b) Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports;
- (c) Reports of the Secretary-General

##### REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/36/719)

133. Mr. SASORITH (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from French*): The problem of *apartheid* has been on the General Assembly's agenda for more than 30 years. It was at the behest of Mahatma Gandhi, the illustrious Indian statesman, that the Government of India raised the question for the first time in the Organization in 1946. Since then nothing tangible has been done, even though Chapter VII of the Charter clearly lays down the measures that the Organization may take with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace and acts of aggression. Yet the situation prevailing in South Africa fully justifies taking such measures, in the opinion of eminent jurists and great international bodies, such as the non-aligned movement and the Organization of African Unity [OAU], in order to stave off the threat and to preserve peace and security in that part of the world.

134. In this connection, the exhaustive report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* [A/36/22 and Corr.1], produced under the clear-sighted and devoted leadership of Mr. Maitama-Sule of Nigeria, again gives a grim picture of the developing situation in South Africa and around it. Consideration of that report has led us to note with bitterness and anger that the racist régime of Pretoria is hardening over the years, in spite of some sham attempts at reform intended to soften its image abroad.

135. The true hideous nature of the racist régime no longer deceives anyone with its policy of bloody repression and of bantustanization, which is being remorselessly pursued. The celebration of the twentieth anniversary of the establishment of the republic is a veritable challenge to the African people of South Africa, who continue, in spite of the merciless measures of repression, such as the Terrorism Act, to fight for national liberation and self-determination. Faced with the rising tide of nationalism and the national liberation movement in South Africa, the leaders of the racist Pretoria régime have been in the grip of a bunker psychosis. They believe themselves to be stranded on an island in the middle of a hostile black sea, whereas the Africans of South Africa are merely asking for equality and dignity as fully fledged citizens in a multiracial republic shared by whites and Africans, and a common life and destiny.

136. The world may remember a similar situation brought about by the Nazis, which resulted in the Second World War. It was precisely in order to prevent for all time such a terrible event happening again that the Organization was set up. Faced with *apartheid*, a régime chosen and established by a white minority, where racism is elevated to official policy, we shall have unhesitatingly to undertake a new crusade to repudiate so anachronistic a doctrine. That régime, held in contempt by mankind, is characterized by a merciless racial war against millions of people—a domination by 5 million whites over 20 million Africans—the illegal occupation of Namibia and the constant threat to neighbouring independent States.

137. In spite of capital punishment and the greatest number of prisoners in the world, the freedom fighters continue their relentless and persistent struggle in a country in which the police make no distinction between adults and children, men and women, the young and the old. The massacres of the innocents at Sharpeville in 1960 and Soweto in 1976, to mention only those two, are still fresh in our memories. The torch-bearers of freedom, such as Nelson Mandela, Walter Sisulu and Markus Kataketa, are still in the gaols of the South African racists. About 45,000 freedom fighters belonging to the African National Congress [ANC] are held in detention for the same reason. That means that a whole generation of resisters are languishing in prisons.

138. Faced with those crimes against human dignity and against the most fundamental rights, all those who love peace and justice must, without delay, undertake a campaign for the liberation of those people or at least to see that they are given the status of political prisoners, as numerous resolutions of the United Nations have demanded. The policy of *apartheid* has deprived the great majority of the right to equality in education, health care and other most elementary services, the lack of which has caused the population untold suffering.

139. Together with the intensification of repression against those who oppose *apartheid*, the racist régime of

Pretoria has created puppet mini-States, which are really dormitory cities, called Venda, Transkei and Bophuthatswana, and soon it is to establish Ciskei. These are populated by a total of some 6 million people. These bantustans, claimed to be independent, governed by the iron rule of hereditary chiefs, held in contempt and completely overtaken by events, are cheap manpower reserves and dumping grounds for old and infirm people. They deprive the Africans of the right to citizenship and bring about ethnic strife among them.

140. Those puppet mini-States, 16 per cent of whose land is scarcely capable of being cultivated, cannot provide for their own subsistence. The lack of industry, trade and other activities merely adds to the extreme poverty of the wretched population. The massive, forced transfer of the population greatly increases the already widespread unemployment. That is the precise scope of the Pretoria régime's policy of bantustanization.

141. In summary, a veritable policy of enslavement and even ethnocide pervades South Africa. The cold-blooded extermination machinery is already working properly. A former Minister of Bantu Administration and Development, Mr. C. P. Mulder, announced on 7 February 1978: "if our policy is taken to its full logical conclusion as far as the black people are concerned, there will not be one black man with South African citizenship" [see A/36/708, annex I, para. 2].

142. In the face of such a cataclysm the international community in the form of the United Nations has since its foundation constantly advocated measures to put an end to these crimes against humanity. There have been mandatory arms embargoes, the oil embargo decreed by the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries [OPEC], and various sanctions and actions to put South Africa on the path of reason and international morality. But all of this remains ineffective. In the meantime, transnational corporations have been increasing their co-operation with that country, which is coming more and more under the open protection of certain Western Powers, in particular the United States, whose present Administration officially recognizes that the racist régime of South Africa is a faithful ally. The development of the collaboration of the transnationals and the new orientation of United States policy greatly strengthen the policy of *apartheid* of the South African Government, which continues to defy the whole of the international community with extreme arrogance.

143. Another serious challenge by South Africa to international opinion is its obstinate refusal to abandon its illegal occupation of Namibia, in spite of the pertinent resolutions of the United Nations relating to the right to self-determination of the Namibian people. The racist régime has taken insolence to the point of actually attacking, for the purpose of destabilizing them, independent neighbouring countries such as Angola and Mozambique and by accentuating, and thereby increasing, the threat which weighs upon the African continent as a whole. Seeing that its policy of a constellation of States has been a sorry failure, South Africa has been indulging also in acts of real terrorism, subversion and aggression against the other front-line countries, including Zambia. The greatly increased military budget of South Africa for 1981-1982, which exceeds by 30 per cent that of the 1980-1981 period, clearly shows the aggressive intentions of the *apartheid* régime which last week, using a group of some 100 mercenaries, carried out an abortive raid against the Republic of Seychelles, which is several thousand kilometers from its coast. We condemn this criminal act and

wish to congratulate the Government and the security forces of the Republic of Seychelles on inflicting a stinging defeat upon the aggressors. It is clear that instead of seeing reason, the South African racists seem to have deliberately chosen the policy of the conquistadores. Needless to say, this new emphasis in the attitude of South Africa occurred after the Prime Minister of the *apartheid* régime described as more realistic the new United States policy towards his country and after the ostentatious attempts made by the Government of the United States to annul the Clark amendment, which prohibited all military assistance to groups of traitors and terrorists such as the Savimbi band, which is plotting against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of independent States of southern Africa.

144. In spite of the intensified repressive policies and practices and the open collaboration between South Africa and certain Western Powers in dealing ruthlessly with the freedom fighters of the national liberation movements, the frontiers of freedom have nevertheless been extended to the threshold of the *apartheid* régime. In order to intensify and strengthen this heady momentum of the struggle for freedom, dignity and equality of the South African peoples and of southern Africa generally, the international community must provide aid and assistance to the front-line States to reduce their dependence upon South Africa and enable them to fulfil their historic duty, which is to root out for all time *apartheid*, that crime against humanity and the last stronghold of colonialism in southern Africa.

145. In parallel with the increase in this aid and assistance, the international community, and particularly the General Assembly, must once again urge the Security Council to consider the imposition of the comprehensive mandatory sanctions, including the oil embargo, provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter, against the racist régime of Pretoria. Any hesitation in adopting these measures will merely prolong and encourage the *apartheid* system in South Africa.

146. Finally, the Lao People's Democratic Republic wishes to reaffirm once again its total support for the South African people fighting for freedom and democracy. The Lao people will always remain at the side of the Azanian and Namibian people, which are waging their relentless struggle for the final triumph of their just cause.

147. May the seventieth anniversary of the founding of ANC constitute a new stage in the struggle and the ever greater victory of the South African people.

148. Mr. MUTHANA (Democratic Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The fact that at this session the General Assembly, as at every session each year, is considering this agenda item represents in our view the strongest international condemnation of the régime and policy of *apartheid*. It is also an important step on the path to the total elimination of *apartheid* and the white minority Pretoria régime.

149. The policy of *apartheid* and racial régimes are doomed. However, certain countries come before a forum like the General Assembly to proclaim their opposition to racism but in fact continue to maintain their real position, which is collaboration with those régimes, an expression of the shameful policy of domination and colonialism.

150. In our times, when socialism, like all liberation movements, is triumphing and the principles of freedom,

progress and peace are affirmed, racism, like fascism and zionism and all forms of colonialism, is operating in isolation, in a tunnel with no exit.

151. The racist Pretoria régime exercises its domination through the most inhuman forms of oppression and persecution of the majority of the lawful people. It commits acts of genocide, torture, repression, terrorism, humiliation, isolation, destruction of homes, impoverishment, plunder of property and land, banning, aggression, occupation of neighbouring countries. These acts have become the law which governs the life of the Pretoria régime. It also applies to the Zionist entity in usurped Arab Palestine.

152. As has been said, racist régimes and the policy of *apartheid* are a disgrace to mankind. It reflects the collective responsibility of the international community and makes it incumbent upon the international community to take action by all means to eliminate the racist régimes and the policy of *apartheid*, which affect the rights of men to a life of freedom and dignity. The peoples being subjected to racial discrimination are struggling, together with the international community, against such a policy and they point an accusing finger at the Western allies which aid such régimes in various fields to safeguard their own selfish, illegitimate interests.

153. The white minority régime in South Africa guarantees that the Western imperialist countries will be able to continue to plunder the resources of southern Africa and Namibia, enabling them to extend their aggressive strategic policies. Evidence of this is contained in the continued acts of aggression against the African front-line States—Angola, Mozambique and others. Another example of this policy was the recent aggression against the Republic of Seychelles, in an attempt to violate its sovereignty and national independence.

154. I would stress the similarity between the racist régime in Pretoria and the Zionist entity in occupied Palestine: We must also note the similarity between the aggression against Seychelles and the Israeli attack against the Iraqi nuclear installation and the United States aggression against Libya in the Gulf of Syrte. Those are sufficient motives to prompt Arab countries and their liberation movements to unite in a common front to confront the racist entities wherever they may be found, to eliminate the imperialist presence everywhere in the world and to defeat the imperialist conspiracies designed to impose their hegemony and domination.

155. Imperialism today is apparently again choosing the path of confrontation. We are confident, however, that the independent countries will not hesitate to defend their freedom. Those countries are ready to make every sacrifice rather than surrendering to the challenge and aggression of imperialism.

156. Democratic Yemen supports the struggle of the people of South Africa and the strengthening of solidarity with their liberation movement, ANC. We demand freedom for the political prisoners. My country condemns the aid given by Western countries to the Pretoria régime, as well as their collaboration with it. We believe it is high time to put an end to that collaboration. We also call for the imposition of comprehensive sanctions against South Africa.

157. For those reasons, my delegation fully supports the recommendations of the Special Committee against

*Apartheid*, and in particular the recommendation contained in document A/36/22/Add.2 on the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa.

158. Mr. COUMBASSA (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): One of the most serious problems of concern to the international community today is unquestionably the policy of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa. South Africa is the only country in the whole world where racism has been institutionalized and the only country where the colour of the skin determines the place in the social hierarchy of a whole category of nationals. More than four fifths of the South African population are victims of this policy. *Apartheid* is recognized as the most horrible socio-economic system, based upon the negation of universal values and upon the systematic denial of human rights and the rights of peoples.

159. The cornerstone of the present domestic policy of the Government of South Africa is the establishment of bantustans where blacks are lumped together to provide reservoirs of cheap manpower for the economy of the white minority. These bantustans, baptized "independent States" with uncommon cynicism and scarcely veiled hypocrisy, are installed largely on arid land poor in mineral resources. These so-called independent States in which 80 per cent of the population—particularly blacks—are confined cover only 13 per cent of the land, whereas the whites, who represent scarcely 20 per cent of the population, occupy 87 per cent of the national territory. Thus, virtually all the rich territory belongs to the white minority, which retains all the resources of the country.

160. This policy of separate development based on the colour of the skin is applied in every sphere of South African national life, whether political, economic, cultural or social. The safeguarding and the preservation of the selfish interests and exorbitant privileges of the white minority in South Africa in the face of the growing awareness of the black population underlie the conception of the bantustanization of the country.

161. Numerous publications on South Africa have revealed in all their horror the intolerable administrative and police constraints which weigh on the daily life of the black population. These publications report the facts of torture and inhuman persecution of the civilian population by the police of the racist South African régime. Wicked labour laws result in the separation of fathers from their families and mothers from their children, who live very precarious lives.

162. And yet, since the Sharpeville massacre in 1960 and the Soweto massacre in 1976, South Africa has been experiencing another reality: that of a long-subjugated people which is now affirming its will to put an end to all this and especially to the repugnant system of *apartheid*. The massive resistance to *apartheid* has reached new proportions in South Africa in spite of the brutal repression exercised by the Pretoria régime. There is no doubt that the more *apartheid* persists in its criminal acts, the greater becomes the anger of the South African people, which is rising, weapons in hand, to recover its freedom and its dignity.

163. What can we say of that régime, which denies the sacred character of human life, rejects all idea of freedom and justice, refuses to understand that Governments have a foundation only to the extent that they are based upon popular support? The *apartheid* policy of the Government of South Africa is a real danger to international peace and

security. *Apartheid* is a scourge that must be eliminated from our planet. Africa, which is enduring it, is battered by it, and the international community is thereby humiliated.

164. The *apartheid* régime of South Africa does not limit its acts of barbarous repression to the country it oppresses. It continues illegally to occupy Namibia in spite of numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. The South African armed forces are operating with impunity and making incursions into neighbouring African countries, in particular Angola, which they are trying to destabilize—but in vain.

165. We know that the South African *apartheid* régime has been given a respite by its Western allies, but they cannot at one and the same time be responsible for international security and protective of the racist minorities in southern Africa. It would be to betray the confidence of the whole of mankind to play at accommodation with the inhuman *apartheid* régime. We know that without the military, political and economic support of the Western Powers the Pretoria régime would not have had the audacity to defy the United Nations.

166. The *apartheid* of South Africa is not a problem of the people of South Africa alone or a subject of concern to the African continent alone; it is a question that affects the entire international community. Indeed, the General Assembly has solemnly proclaimed that the United Nations and the international community have a particular responsibility towards the oppressed people of South Africa and its liberation movement as well as towards those who are imprisoned or banned or otherwise restricted in their movements as a result of their struggle against *apartheid*. The General Assembly has reaffirmed its determination to devote all the necessary resources to mobilize the efforts of the international community to bring about the early elimination of *apartheid* in South Africa and the liberation of the South African people. That is why today more than ever it is our sacred duty to adopt all necessary measures to reaffirm and renew our commitment to the fight against *apartheid* so that the peoples of southern Africa, long oppressed and exploited, may finally accede to freedom and total responsibility.

167. In conclusion, I wish to pay a tribute to the leaders of the national liberation movements of southern Africa and their worthy fighters for the courageous struggle they are waging against the barbarous Pretoria régime for the total liberation of the African fatherland.

168. Mr. BEDJAOUI (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): *Apartheid* is a challenge flung at the universal conscience, a crime against humanity, the most sinister symbol of racism, the most cynical example of continued aggression against all the neighbouring countries and, lastly, the most blatant threat to international peace and security.

169. That is why my country believes it is in duty bound to express its strong conviction that so long as the policy of *apartheid* of the South African régime continues Africa as a whole will not be able to consider itself free, the world process of decolonization will be incomplete and the ideals and principles of the Charter will not be universally respected.

170. *Apartheid* is an affront to dignity, to freedom, to equality and to peace. It diminishes mankind. It is the charnel-house of civilization. It has unfolded in southern

Africa a tragedy involving all the scourges of man's history.

171. That is why the consideration of the situation in southern Africa has for more than three decades now dominated international life through the struggle of the oppressed peoples, the expression of their profound aspirations and their faith in their inevitable triumph. Nothing is more significant than the debates to which that consideration has given rise and the unequalled mass of decisions and resolutions which over the years have consistently and in strong terms expressed the vigorous condemnation of the international community, its vigilant perseverance and its desire to find the means to eliminate *apartheid*. Nor is anything more significant than this unanimous censure of a system that has for decades outraged man and his fundamental values. Finally, nothing is more comforting than this true consensus, sufficiently rare to bear emphasis, which has emerged in the denunciation of *apartheid* and the need for its eradication.

172. The nature of *apartheid*, its ideological foundations, its institutional bases and its internal and international expression demonstrate that that policy combines in a single stroke racial oppression, colonial domination and the policy of aggression. Need I say that *apartheid* is the arrogant and defiant expression of force, brute force, and that however sure of itself it may feel today it is yet nurturing obsession with its own end?

173. Analysing *apartheid* as the dogma of racial supremacy, a racist pipe-dream of exclusive monopoly of power and a system of national domination, the international community has through various means denounced national oppression as a crime against mankind, a phenomenon of aggression, a negation of the purposes and principles of the Charter and an unlawful situation.

174. Thus Angola, Mozambique, Botswana, Zambia and, recently, Seychelles have regularly paid their tributes in human lives and destruction of every kind to that South African political monster eaten up by hegemonistic ambition. The immediate objective of those operations of State terrorism against neighbouring Powers remains the vain attempt to destroy the resistance of the South African and Namibian peoples. But over and above this circumstantial objective, the Pretoria régime seeks to give body to its plans for the satellization of the whole of the southern part of the African continent.

175. Civil war, colonial war, intracontinental war, international war: the arrogant policy of the South African régime is also a war against mankind because of the "crime against humanity" which *apartheid* represents. That scourge demands of our reason and our conscience that they be alert even, and above all, if some who are bitterly discouraged no longer believe in the possibility of exorcising the racist South African demon and allow their faith to grow cold in obsolete rites. But in this multifaceted war which is waged both against the South African people and the neighbouring States and against the very essence of the human condition, *apartheid* benefits from powerful outside support, not the least active of which are the "cosmopolitan enterprises," the agents of an anonymous, stateless economy, now on a world-wide scale and more or less endorsed by some of the most powerful nations.

176. The relations which certain countries maintain with South Africa have enormously strengthened the capacity of the racist régime to challenge the international commu-

nity. They constitute the major obstacle to the application of even limited sanctions, to which the United Nations agreed. The South African people took up that challenge long ago and have been engaged in a long struggle of national liberation, which is the only one that will ensure its true emancipation. If Sharpeville resounded as a warning, Soweto a few years later confirmed the determination of the South African people to recover its rights by every means. Today thousands of students demonstrate their opposition to the system of *apartheid*. Their movement complements that of the workers who, through their strikes, not only refuse the inhuman conditions of work imposed on them, but above all call into question the régime that seeks to impose those conditions.

177. The South African national liberation movement has resolutely embarked on the course of armed struggle, the only means to free its country from racist oppression. Let us pay a tribute to the Special Committee against *Apartheid* for echoing at the level of the international community the sound of that struggle of the South African people for the welfare of their fatherland and also of man. For their part, Africa, the international community and the progressive forces of the world give their full support to a national liberation struggle, about the justice or outcome of which they have no doubt.

178. Thus, we welcomed the convening of the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, which marked an important milestone in the efforts of the international community to strengthen solidarity with the struggling South African people.

179. As for our action here, the Charter provides for a series of enforcement measures, ranging from the application of economic sanctions to the use of force. The oil-producing countries members of OPEC have assumed their responsibilities by decreeing an oil embargo against the Pretoria régime. For its part, the General Assembly has recommended that all Member States should prohibit oil exports to South Africa. It is now up to the Security Council to endorse that measure in order to make it mandatory under Chapter VII of the Charter. Measures should also be envisaged against individuals and bodies corporate that continue to provide South Africa with oil.

180. We can help to do away with Pretoria's war machine and its repressive arsenal. The consequences of that measure would be to alleviate tension in the region. The Security Council, for its part, has the duty to prohibit any technological contribution which would help to develop South Africa's military industry. It must also put an end to public and private foreign investments in South Africa. Those obligations are justified politically and juridically. They are, above all, an expression of faith and of commitment to the cause of freedom and peace. For in South Africa a vital struggle is being waged to gain respect for international law, which has been so outrageously trampled underfoot. In South Africa a battle is going on for man's rehabilitation. That is the battle that today we are asked to make our own.

181. Mr. ABDULAH (Trinidad and Tobago): Some 21 years have elapsed since the Sharpeville massacre and the adoption of Security Council resolution 134 (1960) calling for an end to the system of *apartheid*. In the intervening years the international community has seen the growth to hardened maturity of *apartheid*, the brainchild of a lunatic racist minority in South Africa. It is painful to note that this lunacy exists despite the unanimous condemnation by the international community of the inhumane sup-

pression of the black population, comprising over 80 per cent of the total population of South Africa, and the violation of their every right, including their right to be citizens of the land of their forbears. There is not a single State Member of the United Nations which has not condemned the *apartheid* policy of the Pretoria régime; yet *apartheid* is alive and flourishing. Clearly that is so because some among us are not sincere. We have asserted a position of condemnation, but without ever having the intention to act on those stated positions.

182. We the States Members of the United Nations lend our efforts in countless international forums towards the achievement of a better quality of life for all. Yet the situation in South Africa bears testimony to the fact that the profit motive is paramount in the affairs of some Member States, States that have the influence to put an end to South African intransigence with speed and efficiency. That profit should be placed before human dignity is clear evidence that those who pronounce loftily on the quality of life have failed to realize that their right to promote it and their *bona fides* in so doing are highly suspect.

183. It is well known in the Assembly and elsewhere that the efforts to impose total and effective sanctions against the Pretoria régime have failed, not because of the will of the majority of Member States, but because of the persistent thwarting of that will by a few. Those Member States insist that the solution to the question of *apartheid* lies in a continuation of dialogue with Pretoria. To what end? Is that an honest position? How could anyone accept that the régime in Pretoria, which has perpetrated the horrors of Sharpeville and Soweto, needs to be given more time?

184. The system of *apartheid*, with its doctrine of supremacy based on race, was institutionalized in 1948. Four years later, the question was placed before the General Assembly. At that time, the dust had hardly settled in Europe from the devastation of the Second World War. The ravages of nazism were still evident, and the decisive action of the world in dealing with that crime was clearly reflected in the Nuremberg Judgements. How could the world stand by and so soon afterwards see racism take root in another continent? The answer lies in the fact that, in the eyes of a few nations, some human beings are perceived to be less equal than others.

185. For the most ignoble reasons, *apartheid* has been allowed to fester. Economic, military and strategic interests have been allowed primacy over basic human rights and over every other human right on which the international community has declared itself. These interests cannot continue to be used as an excuse for the continued collaboration of some States with the South African régime. That régime is as strong as it is allowed to be, and it derives its boldness from the fact of that collaboration.

186. As the Assembly is aware, in 1977 the Security Council, by its resolution 418 (1977), imposed an arms embargo against South Africa. Not only has that embargo been less than strictly observed, but South Africa has now been assisted in developing a nuclear-weapons capability.

187. On the economic front, while developing countries have been experiencing enormous difficulties in obtaining financing for their development, capital-aid flows to South Africa from major financial institutions in certain Western countries have continued unabated. The South African economy has been sustained and enhanced by a

combination of international credit, obtained with great ease, and the cheap labour of the oppressed black majority.

188. The litany of abuse against the black population is long; we have heard it stated on many occasions. There is therefore no need for my delegation to repeat it here. But there is one aspect that bears repetition on the eve of the so-called independence of Ciskei. That aspect is the establishment of bantustans and homelands, which is a particularly obnoxious manifestation of *apartheid*. That those whose skins are black should suffer the debasing and dehumanizing effects of *apartheid* is sufficiently abhorrent. That they should in addition be forced to eke out an existence in the arid wastelands of their mother country is a crime that cries out to heaven for justice. It is a credit to this world body that it has steadfastly refused to accord any recognition to these so-called independent homelands. This is a position that the world community must never abandon.

189. Nor is there any need to remind the Assembly that Pretoria's reign of arrogance and terror extends far beyond the borders of South Africa. The régime has repeatedly made massive military incursions into neighbouring States, violating their sovereignty and posing a threat to international peace and security, with the transparent excuse of acting in self-defence. Actions such as these have been encouraged by the failure of South Africa's collaborators to condemn such flagrant breaches of the Charter. It is essential that the international community act forcefully to protect the territorial integrity of South Africa's neighbouring States by invoking the appropriate measures under Chapter VII of the Charter.

190. There are those who seek to justify their continuing support for the South African régime by arguing that sports should not be linked to politics. My delegation believes that the sports boycott has been the most effective weapon in the fight against *apartheid*. In the light of this, it is totally unacceptable to re-establish sporting links with South Africa. We are firm in the view that the complete isolation of South Africa in the political, diplomatic, economic and cultural spheres is the only way to bring about the changes which we all desire. There can be no relaxation in our efforts on all these fronts until the system of *apartheid* is dismantled once and for all.

191. But if the picture is bleak, let us not be daunted by that fact, because there is hope. There is hope because the children in South Africa have awakened. They are prepared to give their very lives in the struggle for freedom and human dignity. Their struggle and the courage which they display in that struggle must inform world public opinion, particularly at the level of the youth of the world. In this respect, the mass media have a responsibility to bring their tremendous influence to bear on the side of those young patriots who seek to eliminate the scourge of *apartheid*.

192. But if the children of Soweto and of other townships have been forced to take an active part in the fight against the inhuman system of *apartheid*, it is partly because the racist régime of South Africa has imprisoned, detained and banned every black leader. We States Members of the United Nations must insist that those leaders be set free so that they can lead the way in building a just, free and democratic society in South Africa.

193. Trinidad and Tobago has over the years made its contribution to the struggle against *apartheid* by means of

moral and material support. We continue to do so in the firm conviction that we are contributing to the inevitable liberation of southern Africa from the yoke of *apartheid*. We call upon every Member of this body to redouble efforts to ensure the achievement of this goal. For should our efforts fail, international peace and security would be further seriously threatened, and we would bring our world closer to the possibility of a holocaust too terrible to contemplate. It is inconceivable that anyone here would be willing to pay so high a price.

194. Mr. JANI (Zimbabwe): The civilized and civilizing provisions of the Charter aim, among other noble ideals, at the reaffirmation of faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and in the unity of our strength to maintain international peace and security. It is with dismay that, despite those provisions, we find in our midst, even after the bitter lesson of Hitler's totalitarian adventures, a Nazist, laagered society fiercely struggling against the fulfilment of those ideals through the fanatic pursuit of the degrading policy of *apartheid*, a policy universally condemned as a crime against humanity.

195. The international community is viewing with concern and alarm the rapid deterioration of the situation in southern Africa, and it is important that this trend be understood in its proper context. It must be stated at the outset that in the present changed political conditions South Africa's main preoccupation is to hold on to power at all costs and by whatever means necessary. Its sole purpose is to preserve the decadent society of rampant and flagrant white materialism and abject black poverty, bitterness and hopelessness. The inhuman tactic of resorting to the police and the military to contain black discontent and bitterness, which has become typical of racist Pretoria's naked totalitarian repression, has not precluded any escalation or widening of the confrontation.

196. It is in the face of this reality that the spiritless and fruitless strategy of "adapt or die" has been preached by Botha since the Soweto uprising of 1976, which was in all respects a significant landmark in South African race relations. The simple message from the brave masses was unequivocally clear: "Enough is enough." It has been asserted that South Africa is introducing changes for the better. It is against the background of escalating black demands that the so-called government changes and reforms must be measured. The superfluous measures have never been sufficiently far-reaching, inasmuch as they still attempt only to redress certain black grievances, especially in the urban areas without substantial white concessions, on which the future of a peaceful non-racial South Africa lies. In all instances they aim at maintaining white control by the limited appeasement of blacks. Inevitably, black manifestation of discontent will occur with increasing severity. Blacks are becoming more and more aware of their labour power and their ability to control it, and increasingly black students are acting as agents of change.

197. An interesting litmus test for the political will of the racist Pretoria régime is provided by an examination of one of the so-called major constitutional changes. After the abolition of the Senate, that is, the upper house of the South African Parliament, in 1980, the so-called Presidential Council, consisting of 59 members, to advise on a new constitution was nominated. The salient feature of this measure was the glaring but calculated omission of any black members from the Council, which in itself is beyond any doubt a challenge to the legitimacy of any constitutional changes under the present order. In addition,



the increasing militancy with which the “concentratization” of the homeless widows, children, old people and dehumanized and degraded husbands in bantustans is being pursued hardly makes the South African intentions credible. It is an obvious reality that such proposals fall short of the radical and innovative changes for the majority of Africans that are essential for long-term political stability. This can be achieved only when the Pretoria régime is made to realize the futility of sustaining the evil policy of *apartheid*, whose crumbling at some stage is inevitable for the simple reason, which has been demonstrated elsewhere in Africa, that history is on the side of the black people in southern Africa. Thus it is in the interest of peace that those who are in a position to do so should exert their leverage on South Africa with the aim of forcing it to abandon this inhuman and misplaced ideal. This is the kind of “constructive engagement” which Africa and the entire world are hoping for, that is, constructive engagement which accelerates the implementation of declarations on self-determination and on the upholding of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In fact, in all truth, this is the only kind of engagement with South Africa which warrants being termed constructive.

198. The inhuman repressive policy of the racist Pretoria régime, in typical Hitlerite totalitarian fashion, has not been confined to the defenceless and atomized people inside the country. We are witnessing Pretoria’s abject disregard for dignity and freedom with the extension of the inhuman policies in the form of naked aggression and destabilization manoeuvres against the democratic neighbouring States. The list of such incidents is so long that to attempt to mention them would indeed be impossible in the time available. The gravity of the situation can be appreciated when we mention that this misdirected use of force has cost Angola more than 7 billion United States dollars in terms of property losses. The loss of human life has been immense, indeed incalculable, since it is irreparable. Recently in Zimbabwe an ammunition depot was destroyed as a result of the work of agents with proven South African connections, and the total loss in ammunition was valued at 35 million Zimbabwean dollars, which is approximately 50 million United States dollars. The railroads and bridges through Mozambique, which are essential for the elimination of dependence on South African routes by the neighbouring States, have been the targets of constant bombardment by South Africa’s proxy armies. It is on this basis that South Africa boasts that economic dependence upon Pretoria is and will continue to be a fact of African politics for a very long time. It is upon this instability that Pretoria hopes to erect a constellation of States and possibly transform this concept into a practical operation. These are a few of the indications of the militant determination of the Pretoria régime to see to it that democracy and freedom are destroyed in order to make the region safe for *apartheid*.

199. With that background in mind, we all hope for and look forward to the judicious exercise of positive political will by the five Western States now actively engaged on the Namibian issue. The attainment of genuine independence by that country will indeed be hailed as a victory by the forces of peace against this totalitarian scourge. This would indeed be a shining example of constructive engagement in the right direction, namely, the upholding of the provisions of the Charter.

200. Again, with that background in mind, it is disheartening when sentiments such as “We can co-operate with a South Africa undergoing constructive change” are expressed by a senior official in the Administration of one

of the permanent members of the Security Council. From that point of view, can the disclosures in the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* be dismissed as mere fantasies, figments of the imagination? Do the atrocities committed against the refugees in the countries of refuge who flee from the *apartheid* régime to the neighbouring States afford any proof of this? Do the modern-day concentration camps, that is, the bantustanization of the abused and degraded masses, afford any proof of this? Do the massive arrests of union leaders, student leaders and journalists and the death sentences against the genuine champions of democracy in South Africa trying to secure a decent living for all afford any proof of this? We feel that such sentiments, especially when they are transformed into practical policy, are tantamount to a betrayal of the trust of the international community by those whose prime responsibility is to secure peace and security. We do not see any justification whatsoever for this engagement, which is in contravention of the accepted norms and provisions of international law. Nor do we see any honour in betraying the trust of the great statesmen with vision who drafted the Charter with the intention of directing future generations on the best course to follow and saving them from the scourge of war. Have we forgotten already in the short period of 35 years the holocaust in which millions needlessly died as a result of misdirected and unattainable ideals?

201. To the people of South Africa, to the people of Africa, to the peace-loving international community, we say that history is on our side and always has been. So, on this note, the struggle for freedom and justice must continue. *Pamberi ne chimurenga*.

202. Mr. KOLBY (Norway): Let me open by quoting these words of a famous African:

“All peoples have at one time or another in their history been plunged into the struggle towards the goal of fuller life and liberty and the right to live as men—free men. But generally the passing of time has seen the barriers to freedom going down one by one. Not so in South Africa. Here the barriers do not go down. Each step we take forward, every achievement we chalk up, is cancelled out by the raising of new and higher barriers to our advance. The colour bars do not get weaker, they get stronger. The bitterness of the struggle mounts as liberty comes step by step closer to the freedom fighter’s grasp. All too often the protests and demonstrations of our people have been beaten back by force, but they have never been silenced.”

These were the words of Chief Albert Luthuli in his acceptance speech on receiving the Nobel Peace Prize in Oslo in December 1961.

203. It is a sad fact that these words are as true and valid today as they were 20 years ago. As the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly is meeting to consider once again the policies of *apartheid* we have to take note of the fact that developments in South Africa during the last year also show that *apartheid* cannot be reformed. It has to be abolished.

204. Norway has on numerous occasions in the General Assembly expressed its strong objections to the *apartheid* system. On behalf of the Norwegian Government, I would like to confirm that this basic policy remains unchanged. There are many aspects of the present situation in southern Africa that we find disturbing. Only one week ago the General Assembly discussed the question of

Namibia. On that occasion representatives from countries all over the world expressed their deep concern over South Africa's continued occupation of that Territory and South Africa's attacks on neighbouring countries. The Norwegian Government would like once again to express its support for the efforts now being made to find a negotiated settlement to the Namibian problem. A just and peaceful solution for the Namibian people in accordance with the United Nations plan would, in our opinion, have beneficial effects also for the remaining problems in southern Africa.

205. The question of political prisoners in South Africa is another problem of great concern. The continued imprisonment of Nelson Mandela and reports about torture and other forms of cruel punishment are acts in clear defiance of appeals made by the United Nations, Governments and voluntary organizations all over the world. We are particularly worried about death penalties against opponents of the *apartheid* system in South Africa. I would like to express the hope that the South African Government will listen to the appeals from the international community to spare the life of these young men.

206. The policy of bantustanization is an integral part of the *apartheid* system. In spite of the failure of Transkei and the other so-called independent states to win international recognition, we have recently learned that South Africa intends to set up in three days time a new "black homeland" called Ciskei. As pointed out by the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, this is part of the plan of the South African authorities to ensure white domination of South Africa. The Norwegian Government endorses the views expressed by the Chairman of the Special Committee with respect to this policy, and I would like to confirm that my Government does not intend to make any kind of formal or informal recognition of these artificial States.

207. The fact that the situation in South Africa has remained basically unchanged over a span of 20 years demonstrates that the mere adoption of resolutions by the General Assembly is not enough. Therefore, the Norwegian Government has for a long time advocated the adoption of mandatory international sanctions against South Africa by the Security Council. It was a major step forward when in 1977, in its resolution 418 (1977), the Council adopted a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa. We have supported proposals to broaden these sanctions to other fields.

208. In the absence of binding international measures, Norway has, together with the other Nordic countries, adopted a number of measures aimed at voluntary and unilateral disengagement from previous contacts with South Africa. Such measures now include steps to prevent Norwegian investments in and exports to South Africa, a policy of not selling Norwegian oil to South Africa, visa requirements for South African citizens and various forms of humanitarian assistance to refugees and economic assistance to the front-line States. Together with the other Nordic countries we will continue to discuss what more could be done from our side. We have also indicated our willingness to co-operate with other countries to see how existing voluntary measures could be better co-ordinated and made more effective.

209. We know that time and patience are running out among the black majority. We fear the human consequences of the upheaval that will surely come if the necessary changes are not adopted in time. Let me nev-

ertheless express my Government's earnest hope that even the problem of *apartheid* will be settled through the triumph of reason over oppression and of negotiation over violence.

210. Mr. KIOKO (Kenya): Africa and the United Nations have over the years been seriously concerned by the problem of the policy of *apartheid* of the racist minority Government of South Africa. The United Nations has made its position on that policy crystal clear. Various other international organizations have spoken out and taken up firm positions against the wicked policy of *apartheid*. The OAU, the non-aligned countries and the Commonwealth have spoken out vociferously against the unacceptable system of *apartheid* in all its forms and shadings.

211. Those of us who have not seen *apartheid* in actual operation cannot perhaps have a full idea as to what a ruthless, merciless, brutal and cold system it is. If they were exposed to it they would shudder to see how in the twentieth century man can still be so unfeelingly cruel to man, and would marvel at the extent to which man's base instincts, once released, can lead him to inflict organized injury on another's body, soul, mind and, indeed, his whole dignity, existence and being.

212. Some of the things that we hear about what the ruling South African régime does to the black African majority sound like tales from the underworld, but they are true and are taking place every day in South Africa: the pass laws, the racial laws designed to keep the races segregated, the endless arrests, the brutal and commonplace floggings, the death cells, the abuse and invasion of personal and family privacy—the undesirable list could go on. And yet this and more is what *apartheid* is, and this is what South Africa would like the international community not to complain about but rather to approve, sanction and possibly praise.

213. But little do they realize—or have they forgotten, and if so, how short are their memories—that the United Nations itself was formed to combat and prevent that very same situation from arising and existing in the world, after the cruel experiences of the Second World War. When, therefore, this international body expresses revulsion against the *apartheid* system, it is fulfilling a duty that is central to its very role and existence and fulfilling a promise which it gave to the world and all its people when those eminent founding fathers met in San Francisco in 1945. Contrary to the South African régime's delusion, the United Nations is a fully toothed lion, whose teeth may be likened to the mills of God, which, although they may seem to grind slowly, grind exceeding small.

214. *Apartheid* is an historically cumulative and purposeful system of institutionalized racial containment which has four operational components: racial prejudice and discrimination; racial segregation and separation; economic exploitation of natural and human resources; and legal, administrative and police terror. But, although each has its own experiential profile and time-frame, the four converge and merge to make a homogeneous whole, each assisting the other to complete the wicked system. Further, associated with each is a set of functions and instruments. This system is a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It rests on the dispossession, plunder, exploitation and social deprivation of the African people perpetrated by the colonial settlers and their descendants since 1622.

215. The delegation of Kenya would like once again to assure our brothers and sisters languishing under the double yoke of *apartheid* and colonialism in South Africa and Namibia of our unflinching support in opposition to those that are thus subjugating them. To the freedom fighters we repeat the message of our leaders, past and present, that we shall not consider ourselves free until they are free also. To this end I should like to restate what my President, Mr. Daniel Arap Moi, current Chairman of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU, had to say about *apartheid* when he addressed the General Assembly in September this year:

“Across the whole spectrum of impact and meaning, *apartheid* torments the conscience of all civilized men. It violates those universal principles of human dignity and conduct which the United Nations has been authorized to codify and to harness. And there is no doubt that it affronts the very foundation of international law. On these three grounds alone, and there are many more, the only conclusion to be reached is that *apartheid* must be destroyed. In any case, there should never be any compromise with evil—and *apartheid* is, in every respect, evil.” [11th meeting, para. 17.]

This is the unwavering stand of Kenya on *apartheid*. It is also the unswerving stand of the OAU and the international community.

216. To underline the loathing and the repugnance with which the world views *apartheid*, I would cite the Lagos Declaration for Action against *Apartheid*,<sup>6</sup> which was the outcome of the World Conference for Action against *Apartheid*, organized by the United Nations in co-operation with the OAU and the Federal Government of Nigeria, and which met in Lagos from 22 to 26 August 1977. Also present were representatives of 112 Governments, 12 inter-governmental organizations, 5 liberation movements and 51 non-governmental organizations and a number of prominent individuals. Among its key speakers were the heads of State of Nigeria and Zambia and the Prime Minister of Norway.

217. The document that was produced as a result of that important meeting should be a blueprint of what the world expects from racist and *apartheid* South Africa. The Conference reiterated the universal abhorrence of the policy of *apartheid* and racism in all its forms and manifestations and the determination of the international community to secure its speedy elimination. It also affirmed its support and solidarity with the oppressed people of South Africa and the liberation movements and condemned South Africa's illegal activities and occupation of Namibia and its acts of aggression against African States. Here we may refer to the repeated aggressive attacks against Angola, Mozambique, Botswana and other neighbouring States and, still more recently, the abortive mercenary invasion of Seychelles, which was repelled by the valiant people of that sister State. South Africa cannot deny its connivance in this.

218. A strong call was made for the unconditional release and freedom of those imprisoned, restricted or exiled for their struggle against *apartheid*. In this context, repeated demands have been made for the immediate release of Nelson Mandela and his compatriots in Robben Island and other prison dens of South Africa. The World Conference also rejected the South African régime's imposition of bantustans and condemned that régime for its ruthless, repressive measures that constitute the pillars which support its cruel domination.

219. Recognition of and respect for the inalienable right of the oppressed people of South Africa and their liberation movement to resort to all available and appropriate means of their choice to secure their freedom were also expressed, and the Conference called upon the international community to come to their aid in this noble endeavour. A further solemn call was made on States and international and national sporting bodies to take all appropriate steps within their jurisdiction to bring about the termination of all political, cultural and sporting contacts with South Africa. While there have been some minimal improvements in some of these areas, it is also true that more could be done. Sporting and other contacts with the racist régime give the impression—probably unintended—of harbouring sympathy for the system. The same goes for the supply of arms and for commercial contacts.

220. I should like to pay a special tribute to the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, Mr. Maitama-Sule, for the commendable report that he and his team have produced. It is a deep and revealing document, the reading of which I recommend for full understanding of the issue that we are considering.

221. All of us assembled in this Hall have a human duty to be angry with South Africa, the naughty and incorrigible adolescent of the African continent and of the international community. How can we approve of a system which oppresses, racially segregates, exploits, tortures, arrests, imprisons without recourse to law and, as if that were not enough, kills and deprives a population of adequate means of livelihood? How can we have sympathy with a system with an institutionalized policy of separation of families? Indeed, it reminds us of the Nazis, in whose defeat, ironically, South Africa actively participated during the last world war. Why should the present leaders of South Africa—and they claim to be honourable and civilized men—be so cold and unfeeling about the very basic feelings and rights of man, the individual, the race and the family? The system of *apartheid* negates all Christian tenets and the Bible itself, which, alas, they claim to be the foundation of their régime.

222. In the eyes of the minority South African régime, we in the OAU and, indeed, the United Nations itself hate them. This is not true, and they know it is not. If they do not, let them, then. But, like a recalcitrant child, South Africa is doing, and has been doing, something terrible, by practising a system of government that can stir no other reaction among the international community than extreme disgust. I refer to *apartheid*. We cannot accept the imposition of this system on our brothers and sisters, and, for that matter, fellow human beings. Therefore, as long as South Africa continues with it, we resolutely promise that country our united opposition, wrath and indignation.

223. All of us in the General Assembly look forward to that glorious session when we shall gather here to say nicer and better things about South Africa than those we have been forced to say thus far.

224. Mr. KAMANDA wa KAMANDA (Zaire) (*interpretation from French*): The problem of *apartheid* constitutes a challenge hurled by the new followers of Gobineau in Pretoria, 3 million insolent, domineering whites, installed by force in the southern horn of the African continent, at the whole international community, about 3 billion other human beings who, since the abolitionist movement of the nineteenth century, have rejected

the theories which upheld the inequality of races, the existence of a hierarchy of the human races allegedly proved by history, anthropology and philosophy, and have ended slavery and condemned *apartheid* as a crime against humanity and the dignity of the human person.

225. The problem of *apartheid* is also a problem of the responsibility of the United Nations and the international community faced with a Government whose policies of *apartheid* and racial segregation they have condemned as a crime against humanity. That condemnation acquires particular significance when we examine it in the light of the provisions of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* [resolution 3068 (XXVIII), annex] according to which: first, under the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide [resolution 260 A (III)], certain acts which can be termed acts of *apartheid* constitute a crime under international law; secondly, in the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity [resolution 2391 (XXIII)], inhuman acts resulting from the policy of *apartheid* are termed crimes against humanity; thirdly, people accused of the acts enumerated in article II of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* may be tried by a competent tribunal of any State party to the Convention which may acquire jurisdiction of the person of the accused or by an international penal tribunal having jurisdiction with respect to those States parties which shall have accepted its jurisdiction.

226. Article II of the Convention provides that the expression "crime of *apartheid*", which includes the similar policies and practices of racial segregation and discrimination such as are practised in southern Africa, describes the inhuman acts set out below, committed for the purpose of establishing or maintaining the domination by one racial group of persons over any other racial group of persons and systematically oppressing them. Those acts are the following: First, the denial to a member or members of a racial group or groups of the right to life and liberty of person by murder of members of a racial group or groups; by the infliction upon the members of a racial group or groups of serious bodily or mental harm, by the infringement of their freedom or dignity, or by subjecting them to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment; by arbitrary arrest and illegal imprisonment of the members of a racial group or groups; secondly, the deliberate imposition on a racial group or groups of living conditions calculated to cause its or their physical destruction in whole or in part; thirdly, any legislative measures and other measures calculated to prevent a racial group or groups from participation in the political, social, economic and cultural life of the country and the deliberate creation of conditions preventing the full development of such a group or groups, in particular by denying to members of a racial group or groups basic human rights and freedoms, including the right to work, the right to form recognized trade unions, the right to education, the right to leave and to return to their country, the right to a nationality, the right to freedom of movement and residence, the right to freedom of opinion and expression, and the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association; fourthly, any measures, including legislative measures, designed to divide the population along racial lines by the creation of separate reserves and ghettos for the members of a racial group or groups, the prohibition of mixed marriages among members of various racial groups, the expropriation of landed property belonging to a racial group or groups or to members thereof; fifthly,

the exploitation of the labour of the members of a racial group or groups, in particular by submitting them to forced labour; and, sixthly, the persecution of organizations and persons, by depriving them of fundamental rights and freedoms, because they oppose *apartheid*.

227. How does the United Nations intend to fulfil its obligations and responsibility concerning the black people who are the victims of racial discrimination in South Africa, since all the actions which constitute the crime of *apartheid*, as mentioned in article II of the Convention, have been amply established as having been perpetrated by the head of the minority illegal régime, the white racist régime of Pretoria?

228. Since 1946 the General Assembly has been concerned about the policies of *apartheid* and its consequences, because they run counter to the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Resolution 103 (I) of 19 November 1946 states:

"The General Assembly declares that it is in the higher interests of humanity to put an immediate end to religious and so-called racial persecution and discrimination, and calls on governments . . . to conform both to the letter and to the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations, and to take the most prompt and energetic steps to that end."

In its resolution 616 B (VII) of 5 December 1952, the Assembly declared that:

". . . in a multi-racial society harmony and respect for human rights and freedoms and the peaceful development of a unified society are best assured when patterns of legislation and practice are directed towards ensuring equality before the law of all persons regardless of race, creed or colour, and when economic, social, cultural and political participation of all racial groups is on a basis of equality";

and affirmed that:

". . . governmental policies of Member States which are not directed towards these goals, but which are designed to perpetuate or increase discrimination, are inconsistent with the pledges of the Members under article 56 of the Charter".

It called upon:

". . . all Member States to bring their policies into conformity with their obligation under the Charter to promote the observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms".

229. General Assembly resolution 721 (VIII) of 8 December 1953 stated that:

"It is highly unlikely, and indeed improbable, that the policy of *apartheid* will ever be willingly accepted by the masses subjected to discrimination, and . . .

"That the continuance of this policy would make peaceful solutions increasingly difficult and endanger friendly relations among nations,

". . . enduring peace will not be secured solely by collective security arrangements against breaches of international peace and acts of aggression, but that a genuine and lasting peace depends also upon the observ-

ance of all the Principles and Purposes established in the Charter of the United Nations, upon the implementation of the resolutions of the Security Council, the General Assembly and other principal organs of the United Nations intended to achieve the maintenance of international peace and security, and especially upon respect for an observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all and on the establishment and maintenance of conditions of economic and social well-being in all countries.”

230. In its resolution 820 (IX) of 14 December 1954 the General Assembly expressed its conviction that the policy of *apartheid* constituted a grave threat to the peaceful relations between ethnic groups in the world, and called upon the régime of Pretoria to re-examine its position in the light of the high principles expressed in the Charter, taking into account the pledge of all Member States to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms without distinction as to race; and further taking into account the valuable experience of other multi-racial societies.

231. I could spend days quoting the various resolutions of the United Nations on *apartheid*, only to conclude that the essential points have already been made and that it is now time to move on to action. It is time to move on to action because, as stated in the preamble to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted on 10 December 1948, in resolution 217 A (III):

“... recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world,

“... disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people,

“... it is essential that human rights, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, should be protected by the rule of law”.

And because, finally:

“All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.”

232. It appears, therefore, according to the various United Nations resolutions, that we are all convinced today that one of the essential purposes of the United Nations is to bring about international co-operation by developing and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion; that the policy of *apartheid*, which is based on doctrines of racial discrimination, is a crime against humanity; that in a multi-racial society, harmony and respect for human rights and freedoms and the peaceful development of a unified society are best assured when patterns of legislation and practice are directed towards ensuring equality before the law of all persons, and when economic, social, cultural and political participation of all racial groups is on a basis of equality; that it is highly unlikely and indeed improbable that the policy of *apartheid* will ever be accepted by the

masses subjected to discrimination; that the pursuit of the policy of *apartheid* forces people as a last resort to revolt against tyranny and oppression and constitutes a grave threat to the peaceful relations between ethnic groups in the world, and in any case that policy is contrary to the Charter and to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; and, finally, that the régime of Pretoria refuses and will certainly continue to refuse to co-operate with the United Nations. What, then, is the point of today adopting other resolutions calling upon the Pretoria régime to review its policies in the light of its obligations and responsibilities under the Charter?

233. Is it not time to explore other specific ways to confront this problem? A few moments ago I quoted from the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*. Article III of that Convention states:

“International criminal responsibility shall apply, irrespective of the motive involved, to individuals, members of organizations and institutions and representatives of the State, whether residing in the territory of the State in which the acts are perpetrated or in some other State, whenever they:

“(a) Commit, participate in, directly incite or conspire in the commission of the acts mentioned in article II of the present Convention;

“(b) Directly abet, encourage or co-operate in the commission of the crime of *apartheid*.”

How have we followed up these provisions of a Convention to which many Members of the United Nations have adhered?

234. These ways deserve further exploration, I feel. When the Nuremberg and Tokyo tribunals were set up to judge the great war criminals, was there, I ask, an international convention which prohibited the commission of such crimes?

235. When I spoke on the question of Namibia a few days ago, I said:

“We live in a world where a legal order governs relations among States and within each State. But the ultimate goal of right and law is to ensure the prospering of man. What then is the law in South African terms? What is the South African right that degrades man? What is this society that has succeeded in institutionalizing inhumanity through laws and legislation which contravene the most sacred rights of man and the values venerated by all civilizations?” [71st meeting, para. 178.]

236. During the Security Council debate on Namibia I said:

“More than 60 years ago, Hitler and the Nazis, inspired by the ideas of Gobineau on the superiority of the Germanic race, ideas found in his *Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races*, by those of Chamberlain in his *Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*, by the notion of the superman as developed by Nietzsche and by an old tradition of anti-semitism reinforced by *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, by the *Apologia* for war, violence and the cult of force of Arndt—in short, by all the ideas of Fichte and Hegel on the authoritarian, not to say totalitarian, State; . . .

[developed] National Socialism, which was aimed at preserving and defending the superior race: that of the tall blond Aryans of the North, we were told.

“National Socialism was to be typified by an obsession with racism and the cult of force and violence. That absurd Nazi doctrine engulfed all of Europe—for Hitler tried to impose his law from the Atlantic to the Urals—as well as other parts of the world.

“Then we witnessed a formidable coalition, an extraordinary alliance of Powers aimed at halting the Nazi adventure and at preserving the world from such pernicious notions of man, the State, relations among peoples, and the races and their rights.

“African soldiers joined the forces of the Allied Powers to oppose the excesses of the Nazi racists and, during the Second World War, as they had done during the First, they died side by side with their European brothers in arms, in defence of peace and international security, human rights and the rights of peoples, in defence of their cultural identity, and of the territorial integrity of States, to say “no” to the dream of domination, to the Nazi desire for power and domination based on racism and exploitation—in short, so that all the rights of the peoples of Europe might be restored to them.

“What other system of government today comes closer than South Africa’s *apartheid* system to nazism, which, in its time, mobilized the whole of the international community in a wave of universal condemnation?

“But the impression tends to prevail today that all of us who participated in the destruction of Hitler’s dream of domination, based in particular on race, seem no longer to agree when it is a matter of restoring to the African people of Namibia its rights to self-determination, freedom, equality and independence; that our co-operation stops at the threshold of Namibian independence, although . . . we were unanimous in affirming that South Africa had failed in its obligations . . .”

and we were unanimous in condemning *apartheid* as a crime against humanity.

237. The time has come, in the interests of confidence in international relations, for us to leave the beaten track to confront the challenge of *apartheid* head on, using all possible means—economic, trade, political, legal, sporting and any others that exist. All the conditions exist for the Security Council to have recourse to effective enforcement action against South Africa in the interests of peace and stability throughout the world in general and in southern Africa in particular.

238. I wish to repeat that, when they wanted to punish the great war criminals for their genocidal crimes and attacks on the peace and security of humanity, the victors flouted certain principles of law, of their own domestic laws, against the retroactive application of penalties, against the establishment of special tribunals and against the principle *nulla poena, nullum crimen sine lege*. Tribunals were set up and the criminals were judged. Furthermore, after the Second World War, in order to punish the perpetrators of crimes called crimes against humanity, the international community did not hesitate for a moment to consecrate the principle of the international responsibility of individuals which were not the traditional or conventional subjects of international law.

239. Why do the perpetrators of crimes against humanity under *apartheid* benefit today from this complacency? Do crimes against humanity vary in importance according to whether the victimized peoples are black or white? Why do the descendants of those honourable people who in Europe in the nineteenth century abolished slavery and servitude, in the name of the highest ideals of mankind, still in South Africa practise racism, which is an insult to the dignity both of the victim and of him who practises it?

240. When we examine this problem everything leads us to believe that the political, economic and cultural world to which the Pretoria régime belongs or claims to belong hesitates in its own interest to take effective measures to put an end to *apartheid* and bring about the desired changes before it has developed a strategy enabling it to conserve in that region or that part of Africa its acquired privileges in the strategic, economic, cultural and political fields.

241. The problem to be resolved is how, without *apartheid* and without the white minority in power in South Africa, they can preserve or promote the advantages and privileges they have acquired and which serve both their global strategic needs and those of the balance of power throughout the world and East-West relations. Thus posed, apart from the fact that it perverts the very nature of the question, the problem uselessly complicates the urgent search for an appropriate solution. But such an approach destroys itself. Furthermore, this approach shows that a number of leaders and modern-day Governments, particularly in the developed world, are still possessed by archetypal demons and that decolonization has not succeeded in exorcising them.

242. The real reply to that approach is that given by Albert Luthuli in his appeal of 1963 and in his autobiography, in which he declared:

“To nations and governments of the world I say: abandon your hypocrisy and your double-dealing; do not think that we can be taken in by your pious protestations as long as you are prepared actively to support tyranny in our country. The test is action against oppression. We are not anti-white-South Africans; we are against white supremacy. We do not conspire with foreign Powers, but we are particularly aware of the fact that the disavowal of the Pretoria régime and its isolation by other nations would, if correctly done, have the effect of curtailing these bloody days, these days of servitude.”

243. I cannot conclude without paying a tribute to the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and to its successive Chairmen, Mr. Clark and Mr. Maitama-Sule, for the efforts they have expended in order to eliminate the inhuman policy in South Africa and for the effective action they have been taking throughout the world to sensitize world opinion.

244. My delegation totally agrees with the recommendations contained in the report of the Special Committee [A/36/22 and Corr.1 and Add.1 and 2]. In particular we agree with the idea that the General Assembly should proclaim 1982 the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa.

245. The delegation of Zaire would like to reaffirm its total support for the legitimate struggle being waged by the national liberation movement of South Africa. We are

convinced that sooner or later the African people of South Africa will triumph over *apartheid*, and we hope that when it celebrates its victory that people will remember with trust and respect the decisive efforts that the United Nations undertook to assist it in its struggle. That victory will be the victory not only of the South African man; it will be the victory of man, over the will to subjugate and degrade him; it will be the victory of man over man.

246. Mr. FARAH DIRIR (Djibouti): The question of *apartheid* in South Africa and the ways and means of eradicating its evils has remained before the United Nations, as a matter of priority, for a very long time. Each year since the recognition of the blight of the *apartheid* system, the existing state of exploitation, the violation of human rights, oppression and humiliation of the black majority in South Africa have become a permanent source of serious international concern.

247. Through our experience we have become fully aware that the tension and acute confrontation emanating as a result in southern Africa cannot be eliminated nor peace established until the dismantling of the structure of *apartheid* in South Africa and the liberation of Namibia from the illegal occupation of South Africa are completely achieved.

248. Throughout the years the international community has, in the United Nations and other international forums, eloquently voiced its outrage against the *apartheid* system. The international consensus is that the *apartheid* system and its implications should be condemned outright through active support of the ongoing struggle against it and through extending the best possible means of moral, material, political and diplomatic support to the liberation fronts.

*Mr. Kam (Panama), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

249. The practice of *apartheid*, which has unanimously been branded by the United Nations as a crime against humanity and against the conscience and dignity of mankind, greatly aggravates the situation in South Africa and seriously disturbs its internal peace and security, and if not wisely checked it will inevitably lead to violence and racial conflagration and develop into serious international turmoil.

250. It is very regrettable that South Africa has chosen to perpetrate its racist domination by the application of violence, repression and oppression against the black African majority to subjugate it under the *apartheid* system. It is also regrettable that, in spite of the repeated appeals by the international community, South Africa refuses to deviate from its indulgence in the practice of *apartheid* in defiance and flagrant violation of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

251. Perhaps the only language that the racist régime of South Africa can understand is that of negative persuasion. In this context it has become clear that any reasonable and positive approach intended to persuade the South African régime to desist from its practice of *apartheid* has proved impossible. Thereafter it has become imperative to intensify all international campaigns, whether potential or active in nature, to isolate the South African racist régime.

252. In this regard we commend the Special Committee against *Apartheid* for the active role it has been playing to bring about major successes in the international ongoing

campaign against the *apartheid* policies in South Africa and the isolation of the racist régime of South Africa. We also congratulate the Committee on the efforts it exerted to bring about the convening of the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, organized by the United Nations in co-operation with the OAU, and held in Paris in May 1981. We are gratified that the Conference, which was attended by an impressive number of Member States and governmental and non-governmental organizations as well as specialized agencies and voluntary organizations, demonstrated to South Africa that the international community could no longer tolerate the hideous practices of *apartheid*.

253. We are encouraged that the Conference expressed its deep conviction that the situation in South Africa and southern Africa as a whole concerned all Governments, organizations and humanity as a whole, and in this regard called for concerted action in the mobilization of full support for the people of South Africa to enhance and accelerate their legitimate struggle for self-determination, freedom and national independence. My delegation declares its full support for the Conference in its reaffirmation of the international recognition that the struggle of the South African people for the elimination of *apartheid* and for the establishment of an independent democratic State, irrespective of race, colour or creed, is their God-given right. We are very pleased to associate ourselves with the Conference's adoption of the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa and the Special Declaration on Namibia\* and we declare our support for their speedy implementation.

254. We express our complete support and solidarity to the people of South Africa, in their long and bitter struggle for their freedom and independence. The Republic of Djibouti vehemently denounces the policy of grouping the South African people in the programme of bantustanization and condemns the creation of the so-called constellation of South African States, which should be rejected and dismantled completely before they lead to systematic subjugation of those people. We deplore and condemn the criminal acts of terrorism, subversion and aggression by the racist régime of South Africa against neighbouring independent sovereign States; we also condemn the massacres of refugee women and children and the kidnapping of other refugees from those States; and we declare that those States have the legitimate right to protection against the repeated acts of intimidation, armed attacks and aggression by the South African racist régime.

255. We have now become accustomed to hearing that South Africa has ruthlessly committed every crime under the sun against the innocent people of South Africa. The acts of injustice and the atrocities committed in that part of Africa are so incalculable that one would not believe that they are inflicted on human beings by human beings. The bitter fact, however, is that the minority racist régime of South Africa is dominated by an aberrant group of degenerate riffraff who have lost their mental and moral bearings the same way that they have long lost their true origin. Otherwise, how could we think that in the *apartheid* régime of South Africa there exists a state of savagery and barbaric treatment which is only reserved for the weak and helpless and which has surpassed all proportionate norms in the scale of inhuman treatment. Who could imagine the detention, imprisonment and savage and debasing treatment against children and pupils whose only crime was their courageous struggle for equality in education and against the humiliation of *apartheid*. The

massacre of the African children in Soweto on 16 September 1976 is still fresh in our minds.

256. While the whole world has left no stone unturned in its search for a peaceful solution in the South African blight, the South African régime has opposed all international peace efforts by its continuous refusal to come to terms with United Nations resolutions and other multi-lateral peace negotiations outside the United Nations. South Africa has clearly shown its opposition to peace by its indulgence in the massive build-up of military machinery and other repressive apparatus, in addition to its acquisition of nuclear-weapon capabilities, whose sole intention is to subjugate the people of South Africa in the *apartheid* system and to terrorize the people of the neighbouring States against their legitimate and justified co-operation with the oppressed people of South Africa.

257. South Africa's uncompromising state of aggression has been expressed by its ongoing and increasing collaboration with Israel in political, military, nuclear, economic and cultural activities. That is a very dangerous precedent which should be collectively condemned by the whole peace-loving community of the world.

258. Accordingly, while my delegation condemns such collaboration, we are pleased to register our appreciation that the Special Committee against *Apartheid* has kept the matter under constant review and has reported it to the General Assembly and the Security Council for action. We are disappointed, however, with the past failures of the Security Council to impose effective mandatory economic sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter to force the South African régime to terminate its acts of aggression against the black African majority in South Africa. Such failure emanating from the Security Council has added an impetus to the stubborn arrogance of South Africa and has encouraged it to intensify its policy and style of repression and suppression of the black African. If this passive action on the part of the Security Council had any positive purpose, it did not in any way bring any change in the indiscriminate violence being perpetrated against peaceful demonstrators resisting *apartheid*, in the political trials followed by imprisonment, in the torture of political prisoners, in the murders in detention and the massacres of innocent children asking for equal rights in education, or in the horrors perpetrated against the black African majority under the Pretoria régime.

259. Under these circumstances, we strongly believe that any peaceful change in South Africa can be brought about only by the international imposition of comprehensive and mandatory economic sanctions on South Africa. We also believe that it is high time that all nations—including the big Powers—come to agree on the modalities of imposing on South Africa the appropriate sanctions as provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter, since that is the most appropriate and effective means to ensure that South Africa abandon its lawlessness and comply with the decisions of the United Nations.

260. Mr. ROA KOURÍ (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly has been discussing the item under consideration today for decades, but that has not served to lessen the attention paid by the United Nations, the OAU, the non-aligned movement and many other international forums to the abominable policy of *apartheid*, which has been institutionalized by the South African régime, or their repugnance of that heinous practice.

261. Quite the contrary; in the present state of heightened tension in international relations, the criminal actions of the racist Pretoria clique, supported and nurtured by known Western Powers, southern Africa has been converted into one of the most dangerous hotbeds of tension for international peace and security.

262. Hence, along with the question of Namibia, which we have just considered, the policies of *apartheid* of South Africa deserve to be given high priority on the agenda of this session of the General Assembly.

263. In disregard of the repeated resolutions of the General Assembly, the Security Council and other United Nations bodies, this redoubt of the Nazi-Fascist spirit that persists in southern Africa has recently seen an upsurge of activity. The intensification of repression—the waves of detentions, summary trials, political assassinations, killings and genocide—goes hand in hand with the acceleration of the fraudulent system of bantustanization, which seeks to split the people of South Africa into tribal enclaves, with the declared intention of perpetrating the supremacy and control of the racist régime over the overwhelming majority of the South African population.

264. Freedom, peace, security and progress in South Africa and throughout southern Africa will not be attained until the system of *apartheid* has been crushed and replaced by a democratic State in which the fundamental rights and the full dignity of man are guaranteed. These just aspirations of the people of South Africa, of all the peoples of that continent and of the international community as a whole daily encounter the obstacles which are persistently set up by the same interests that gave rise to that diabolical system of exploitation, repression and racial oppression.

265. The *apartheid* system established in South Africa and extended to the Territory of Namibia, which is illegally occupied by the Pretoria racists, has not only made it easier for transnational corporations to control, exploit and plunder both peoples and their natural resources but also converted South Africa into a strategic bulwark of the global policy of imperialism. In this context, it is necessary to denounce the well-known plans and attempts of imperialism to bind South Africa, along with some of the most reactionary and Fascist-like régimes of South America, into an aggressive military alliance pitted against the national liberation struggle of the peoples of both continents, and to install imperialism throughout the South Atlantic region.

266. The continued political, diplomatic, economic and military support of certain Western Powers, known to all, and particularly of the United States, has made it possible for the Pretoria régime not only to maintain the system of *apartheid* and to perfect its repressive machinery, but also, in disregard of Security Council resolution 418 (1977), to increase its war potential, including its plans for nuclear development, an area in which the Zionist régime of Israel, the counterpart of the South African racists in the Middle East, is playing a primary role.

267. The development of the nuclear weapon by the *apartheid* régime is a particularly serious danger, precisely when the repeated vetoes of the Western States permanent members of the Security Council have permitted the frequent breaches of the peace committed by the South African racists and their systematic aggression against the front-line States to be carried out with im-



punity, as we saw, for example, last July in their large-scale attack against the People's Republic of Angola.

268. The complicity of those Powers with South Africa strengthens the latter's pretensions to being the régime's defender of the so-called free world, with a right to take military action in any African country, thereby seriously threatening stability and progress in those countries as well as international peace and security.

269. My delegation pays a well-deserved tribute to the front-line States, the reliable rearguard of the southern African liberation movements, for their valiant contribution to the cause of African freedom and independence, and reiterates its unswerving support for ANC and for the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO] of Namibia.

270. The oppressed people of South Africa, despite the massive and brutal repression they are confronting, have won major victories in their heroic struggle to eradicate the inhuman system of *apartheid* in their country and to create a new society based on freedom, equality and full respect for human dignity. In this difficult task, the national liberation movement of the South African people has also, at enormous cost, been helping to eliminate once and for all the last vestiges of colonialism from African soil and to wipe out one of the most dangerous hotbeds of tension in the world.

271. The cause of the South African people has become the cause of all humanity. The ignominious policy of *apartheid*, both internally and in its aggressive and expansionist manifestations towards the other African countries, is an unbearable affront to mankind.

272. The General Assembly—in keeping with the declarations of the eighteenth session of the OAU Assembly and of the non-aligned movement, in particular the agreements reached at the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana in 1979, the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in 1981, and the special ministerial meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries, held at Algiers in April of this year—must energetically condemn the complicity of the Western Powers and Israel with the *apartheid* régime. Secondly, it must call upon the Security Council to adopt, without further delay, comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter, in order to isolate it and force it to abandon its present course of conduct. Thirdly, it must endorse the resolutions and recommendations of the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa. Fourthly, it must reiterate the solidarity and support of the international community for the struggle being waged by the heroic people of South Africa and their national liberation movement, ANC, together with the front-line States, in particular the People's Republic of Angola, which is now a victim of large-scale aggression by the South African racists.

273. Consistent application of the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations, the OAU and the non-aligned movement will make an unquestionable contribution to the final eradication of the policy of *apartheid* from South Africa, assist the liberation movement's struggle, reduce the sufferings and sacrifices of that country's heroic people, and necessarily serve to strengthen international peace and security.

274. I cannot fail, on this occasion, to mention the attempt made by the South African régime to carry out a commando raid against Seychelles, a member of the non-aligned movement. That attempt was foiled. I must congratulate that country most warmly for its rapid repulsion of the attack, which can be imputed to the imperialists, acting through the South African racists.

275. Finally, I wish, on behalf of my delegation, most sincerely to congratulate the Special Committee against *Apartheid* on its resolute endeavours to further the just cause of the people of South Africa and I must express our deep conviction in the final victory of the patriots of ANC.

276. Mr. GONZÁLEZ CÉSAR (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to pay a tribute, on behalf of my delegation, to the Special Committee against *Apartheid* for its untiring efforts to eradicate the racist policies and practices of Pretoria. The problem of *apartheid* is one of the cruelest manifestations of domination and exploitation of our time. Most of the population of the territory is condemned to separation and gradual annihilation, to the denial of their fundamental human rights and to the systematic blocking of any prospect of change or genuine improvement.

277. South Africa, since its inception, has been conceived of by its allies and by itself as an extension and enclave of the Western Powers. Similarly, its own existence depends on the support, material and political, that it receives from its allies. The strategic importance and the economic potential of southern Africa have been of primary interest since the arrival of the early colonizers. Situated on the most important shipping routes and being rich in minerals, it constitutes a fundamental complement for countries alien to the region, with whose objectives it fully concurs. This situation of mutual complementarity tends to be strengthened as time goes on and the interests of both sides grow stronger—an interaction which consequently has been disproportionately strengthening the Pretoria régime.

278. The South African régime, with the support of its allies, has managed to establish a high level of technical autonomy and, what is most dangerous for the neighbouring States, military autonomy. At present the military capacity of South Africa is already excessive, not only in terms of defence but also by comparison with all the other countries of the region. The existing military imbalance and the constant threats and acts of aggression against neighbouring States have made the region one where an attempt is being made to impose forms of international coexistence the rejection of which constitutes one of the basic principles of the Organization.

279. *Apartheid* is a social policy which has been completely rejected by the international community. It has been condemned in almost every international organization, at every international meeting and conference. Public opinion has been mobilized very broadly against it, even within the borders of the main allies of South Africa. All these efforts are both a factor and a result of the fact that, as far as the situation in South Africa is concerned, there is a most solid consensus on the need to change the prevailing situation. Whereas it took more than 200 years to arrive at almost general acceptance of the decolonization process, it has taken only a few decades for most Governments to agree that *apartheid* cannot continue.

280. Nevertheless, there are clear differences concerning the way in which this common objective can be attained. Some would like an immediate end, as a result of pressure and co-ordinated international actions of all kinds, by the use of all the mechanisms established by the world community, including the use of legitimate effective enforcement action. Others would rather seem to be covering up with the language of false pacifism their real projects of complicity with expansion and domination.

281. Who today, where, why and on the basis of what interests, defends the *apartheid* régime? The *apartheid* régime, that new version of feudal systems designed to keep the best lands and guarantee cheap captive labour, is today still defended with blood and fire, by minorities that advocate the superiority and natural eminence of one race over another. But this is happening not only in one corner of southern Africa but also in various places throughout the world—some not so far from here—as a reminder and a proof of an opprobrious past, which still persists in the form of aberrant prejudices and actions. In a world which calls itself civilized, in a society which claims to be democratic, this regressive manifestation can be explained only by irresponsible tolerance or by deliberate complicity, which in reality can reflect only an intention to perpetuate privilege.

282. No alleged legality, no so-called respect for freedom of expression or for political organization, can be invoked either in the international community or within the borders of a State, whatever it may be, as being above the principles of equality, justice and human dignity, which history has confirmed in the conscience of modern man as irreducible and universal values.

283. The ideology of *apartheid* is still the worst form of barbarism, the most serious moral crime and the most ominous social threat hanging over the precarious peace of our time. In truth, it reflects overt or covert aspirations to military supremacy and world hegemonism. *Apartheid* is an open door to the ideology of “final solutions”, to militaristic elitism, the discrediting of reason and the praise of force, and to attempts to legitimize war economies, the arms race and war itself.

284. We cannot be deceived. The survival of a régime such as that of *apartheid* in a country like South Africa is possible today only because its roots and ramifications still subsist in the main centres of power and in the last bastions of the colonial culture of the West.

285. How long will the international community continue to be incapable of dealing with this potentially immense threat to world peace, namely the existence of *apartheid* with its fearsome network of multinational alliances ranging from the economic and ideological fields to the strategic and military fields, including nuclear weaponry?

286. Three quarters of the population of Mexico is “mestizo”, or of mixed origin. That explains why my delegation, whose Government promotes racial and national integration within the framework of a proud and ancient mixed-race culture, remains firmly convinced that the international community must act decisively and resolutely to put an end to *apartheid*. Firm and increasing rational and sustained pressure, joint concerted effective action is what is being demanded with an urgency that cannot be put off not only by the immense majority of the South African people but also by the immense majority of

the peoples of the world. It is not too late to act; there is still time.

287. Mr. ADAN (Somalia): I should like to inform you from the outset that Somalia, as a member of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, fully supports the recommendations made by the Committee in the report it has submitted at this General Assembly session. The intense suffering and hardships which the people of South Africa have been forced to experience under the vicious and iniquitous policies of *apartheid* and racism have been fully documented by the United Nations; the recommendations in the report constitute effective and realistic courses of action to deal with the situation.

288. Although the United Nations has not yet been able to take substantive action in support of the oppressed peoples of South Africa to break free from the brutal grip of *apartheid*, there has been noticeable progress in recent years, and particularly over the past 12 months, in establishing and shaping international mechanisms to combat the racial policies of South Africa. Through a wide variety of conferences and by regular contacts, significant progress has been made in mobilizing international support for the campaign to eradicate *apartheid*. That support has been particularly evident at the grass-roots level of non-governmental organizations and concerned individuals, but it has also been shown in the constructive attitudes of States towards United Nations resolutions on *apartheid*.

289. My delegation heartily welcomed the strong support given during the past year to initiatives of the Special Committee on questions such as reinforcement of the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa, ending financial and economic support for the racist régime and enlarging the role of the mass media in the international mobilization against *apartheid*. The International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa held in Paris last May was particularly significant since it elicited important support and publicity for a central aspect of the international campaign.

290. There has indeed been a world-wide stirring of the public conscience about the situations in South Africa and Namibia, along with a growing understanding of the reasons behind United Nations efforts to persuade Governments to discourage all trade, financial, military, technological, nuclear, diplomatic and cultural and sports contacts with South Africa until it ends its racial policies.

291. All these activities and trends reflect the international consensus that the policy and practice of *apartheid* in South Africa confronts humanity with a challenge that is without parallel. No Member State can claim to be ignorant of the inhumanity, degrading nature and injustice of the racist system imposed on South Africa's non-white majority by its ruling minority régime.

292. Today, almost two decades after the Special Committee was established, the need for concerted action by the world community to eradicate *apartheid* has never been more apparent. It is clear that the racist policies of the minority régime are being brought to bear more heavily, with each succeeding year, on the lives of the non-white majority. Repression and terrorism against all who oppose *apartheid* escalate daily. We learn from press reports of the continuing intimidation by banning, imprisonment and even murder of trade unionists, students, religious leaders and other supporters of a just and open society in South Africa. At the same time, the gross injustice of the bantustan scheme operates with ever more

inhuman force, separating families, alienating and dispossessing Africans in their own land, and attempting to ensure that their only functions will be to provide a pool of migrant labour and to support the privileges of the white minority.

293. The tyrannical *apartheid* structure is being frantically shored up by a repressive police-State apparatus, by a massive military machine and by a nuclear-weapon capability acquired to suppress and intimidate the liberation struggle in the Republic and in Namibia, and to terrorize neighbouring States.

294. The internal policies of the *apartheid* régime were considered by the Security Council to be a threat to regional and international peace and security long before they had reached their present state of implementation. Today, when the blueprint for *apartheid* has been translated into grim reality, when South Africa continues its illegal occupation of Namibia in flagrant violation of international law, and when it wages a war of aggression against the people of Namibia and against the neighbouring States which support their legitimate struggle, the Security Council has an inescapable responsibility to deal with South Africa's dangerous breaches of the peace in the region and its serious threat to international peace and security.

295. In view of this situation, the steadily increasing co-operation South Africa has received from its main trading partners over the past two decades, and continues to receive in the economic, financial, military, technological and nuclear fields, constitutes a shameful record. The collaboration of these States and of certain transnational corporations with South Africa in precisely those areas where the entrenchment of *apartheid* can be affected is, of course, the major obstacle to the elimination of this evil system. This collaboration is particularly dismaying when it is expressed in vetoes by permanent members of the Security Council of anti-*apartheid* resolutions which have been adopted by overwhelming majorities of the General Assembly.

296. The International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa rightly emphasized the gravity of the situation caused by South Africa's repressive internal policies, by the escalation of its military aggressions against the people of Namibia and neighbouring States, and by the encouragement South Africa receives in its aggressive policies through the wide-ranging assistance of its trading partners.

297. My delegation gives its unqualified support to the call of the Conference for the imposition on South Africa of comprehensive economic sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter, including an oil embargo. In our view, these measures constitute the minimum response commensurate with the responsibility of the United Nations towards the oppressed peoples of South Africa and with its special responsibility in leading the people of Namibia to independence. Comprehensive economic sanctions would be an essential complement to the struggle of the people of South Africa and of Namibia for freedom and a means of shortening and minimizing the dangers and suffering inherent in that struggle.

298. It is pertinent to recall that as far back as 1964 the Group of Experts established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 182 (1963)<sup>9</sup> was of the opinion that economic sanctions were not only a legitimate response to South Africa's intransigence over its racist policies but

also a feasible method of isolating the minority régime until it changed its inhuman policies. The Group of Experts noted then, and it is equally true today, that the success of sanctions depends on the co-operation of the small group of powerful States which are South Africa's main trading partners.

299. My delegation calls urgently on those States, as we have done in the past, to meet and to consider amongst themselves what mutual arrangements they could make to enable them to respond to the call of the world community for the imposition of sanctions against South Africa.

300. We note with satisfaction the unilateral action already taken by individual States and by groups of States to carry out selective sanctions pending action by the Security Council. We hope that in the year ahead, which will undoubtedly be proclaimed as the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa, this trend will continue. However, the major responsibility for peaceful but firm and effective action remains with the Western and other States which continue to give moral and material support to the *apartheid* régime. They should have no doubt that the alternative to concerted international action under Chapter VII of the Charter is an escalation of the conflict, with incalculable consequences for South Africa and for the world.

301. Mr. RICARDES (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): At the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, Member States are again considering the problem of *apartheid*, on which the Government of Argentina has expressed its opinion both here and in other international bodies.

302. On this occasion, the Republic of Argentina wishes once again to express its complete and utter rejection of the *apartheid* régime and all forms of racial discrimination. This is not the first time in history that the international community has had to face such a situation, and we are clearly convinced that all the régimes of discrimination, regardless of the reason for which they came into being, are systems of injustice and political and social oppression. They not only adversely affect the coexistence and morale of the entire international community but also generate lasting conflicts and suffering, thereby posing a threat to international peace and security.

303. In the face of this situation, which we denounce year after year and which is hardly unfamiliar to the international community, we consider it of importance for the United Nations, basing itself on the purposes and principles of the Charter, to consider the most appropriate and urgent measures that could be adopted in order finally to eliminate the *apartheid* régime, the existence of which thus far has proved to be a source of conflicts which have extended beyond the borders of the nations directly involved and which is merely a prelude to the aggravation of an already painful and unjust situation.

304. In the light of the foregoing, the eradication of the *apartheid* régime and of all forms of racial discrimination has become a moral and political imperative. Hence the international community must not spare its efforts or shun its responsibilities.

305. In this regard, we feel that an effective contribution has been made in the adoption of decisions by the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, organized by the United Nations in co-operation with the OAU. The Republic of Argentina attended that

Conference together with representatives of 121 Governments and, in an act of reaffirmation of its foreign policy, supported the Paris Declaration and the Special Declaration on Namibia, which were adopted by consensus.<sup>8</sup>

306. Similarly, in a further demonstration of our continual support for the legitimate interests and aspirations of the peoples of Africa to promote the elimination of racial discrimination and achieve genuine independence for Namibia, the Government of Argentina was pleased last May in Buenos Aires to receive, in response to our invitation, a consultative mission of the United Nations Council for Namibia. At that time the Republic of Argentina had the opportunity of expressing its genuine support for the independence plan for Namibia, in accordance with the provisions of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

307. The Republic of Argentina, as we have said before, has made clear within the framework of the United Nations and other international bodies its lasting support for international thinking and activities opposed to the *apartheid* régime of South Africa, not only in statements or rhetoric or by applying decisions adopted by international organizations but also through provisions adopted within our domestic legislation, such as those announced before the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session in 1980. Hence we deeply regret that the Special Committee against *Apartheid* in its report to the General Assembly [A/36/22 and Corr.1], made no mention, following paragraphs 62 to 65, of the letter dated 22 June 1981 which the Permanent Representative of Argentina addressed to the Secretary-General [A/36/340], on the subject of the meeting organized by private organizations and held in Buenos Aires in May of this year, to which were annexed the letter of 15 June 1981 addressed by the Chargé d'affaires, a.i. of the Republic of Argentina to Mr. Akporode Clark, then Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, and the press release of 14 May 1981 issued by the Permanent Mission of Argentina, which reads as follows:

"With regard to press release GA/AP/1212 of 12 May 1981, reproducing a statement by the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, Ambassador Akporode Clark, the issuance and content of which was not known about in advance, the Permanent Mission of the Argentine Republic to the United Nations is obliged to state the following:

"1. The Argentine Government has no connection whatever with the meeting referred to in the above-mentioned statement, which was to be held at Buenos Aires and, according to some news media, was to be called a 'Symposium on Christianity in the Light of the Social Objectives of Western Religions and of the Energy Supply and Strategic Security of the Americas', while according to the sources mentioned by the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* it was to be a 'Conference on Military Strategy'.

"2. In view of the appeal made by the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, and in order to prevent any confusion, it is appropriate to recall the stand constantly taken by Argentina of resolutely and clearly opposing the conclusion of any military pact with South Africa relating to the South Atlantic.

"3. Although it does not believe this to be necessary in view of its well-known position, the Argentine Government reaffirms once again its condemnation of

all forms of racial discrimination, and in particular of the *apartheid* system, which is an affront to mankind. The Argentine Government likewise confirms its resolute support of self-determination and genuine independence for Namibia, a position that has just been reaffirmed in the joint communiqué issued on 12 May 1981 with the mission of consultation of the United Nations Council for Namibia which visited Buenos Aires by special invitation. The Argentine Government also reiterates its desire to strengthen links and expand co-operation with the countries of the African continent, both bilaterally and within the United Nations and the non-aligned movement.

"4. Lastly, the full and sincere collaboration which the Permanent Mission of the Argentine Republic to the United Nations has always extended and will continue to extend to the work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* is well known."

308. The Republic of Argentina will continue to co-operate with the United Nations, and in particular with the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, in its positive and valuable action to eradicate the unjust *apartheid* régime. We are convinced that there will be no repetition of the omissions from this year's report, because that would be at variance with the real sentiments and policies which the Government of Argentina has traditionally supported.

309. I wish to conclude my statement by inviting the South African Government to give the matter some thought so that, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter, it could assume a position which would make it possible to eliminate a situation of blatant violence and injustice in contradiction with the cardinal principles of peace and development of the international community.

310. Mr. IBRAHIM (Indonesia): Virtually from the time of its inception, the United Nations has maintained an unswerving commitment to the struggle against *apartheid* and all forms of racial discrimination, as demonstrated by the efforts of the General Assembly at the first session in 1946, when the racial discrimination was denounced as a violation of the purposes and principles of the Charter. At that session the Assembly, in its resolution 103 (I), called for "an immediate end to . . . racial persecution and discrimination, and . . . the most prompt and energetic steps to that end".

311. From that moment, and to this day, the question of racial discrimination as practised by South Africa through its State policy of *apartheid* has reverberated throughout the world. *Apartheid* has been condemned by the international community and has been written about and discussed possibly more than any other anachronistic policy that is still in effect. However, despite all these efforts, South Africa continues to cling to its *apartheid* policies. Furthermore, it is no less incredible that there continues to exist an opinion in some quarters that the Pretoria régime can be persuaded to abandon *apartheid* without the imposition of mandatory sanctions under the Charter.

312. As the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* indicates, the international community must act against the greatest moral challenge to humanity today: to destroy *apartheid*, and thereby avert a massive threat to international peace and security. The Special Committee has compiled an impressive record of initiatives undertaken, particularly since the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly. These include the Interna-

tional Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, as well as three international seminars on the arms embargo, on loans to South Africa and on publicity and the role of the mass media against *apartheid*. My delegation believes that the declarations issued by these forums provide the best possible guidance for our efforts to eradicate *apartheid* and racism and to force South Africa to comply with international law and the norms of civilized behaviour.

313. President Soeharto of Indonesia stated in his message to the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa: "It is important . . . to undertake a new and stronger concerted drive aimed at eradicating *apartheid*, including the use of comprehensive mandatory sanctions."<sup>10</sup> Indonesia's position has always been to abide by the decisions of the United Nations with regard to sanctions against South Africa and to encourage the Security Council to impose mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter.

314. As a member of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, my delegation is aware that the Pretoria régime has continued its policy of bantustanization, which in effect is a mass revocation of citizenship of the African majority in their own country. It has created fictitious homelands such as Transkei, Venda and Bophuthatswana as the final solution to the question of majority rule. In implementing this policy the régime has forced over 3 million inhabitants to leave their homes. It continues to take oppressive measures against freedom fighters and all who speak out for their rights. The racist régime refuses to relinquish its control over Namibia and uses its illegal occupation of that Territory as a launching pad for military strikes against the neighbouring States, particularly Angola, Zambia and Mozambique, because of their support for SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people. These acts of aggression are made possible through the ever-expanding military apparatus of South Africa.

315. The Paris Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, which was attended by 122 Governments, adopted several declarations that again stress the need for mandatory sanctions. Furthermore, the report of the Special Committee has warned us that without an intensification of pressure on South Africa, the intolerable situation in South Africa will continue unabated. Therefore, my delegation fully supports the conclusions reached by the Special Committee, particularly the recommendation to proclaim 1982 as the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa. In this regard, it should be noted that the most important action of the international community to date has been Security Council resolution 418 (1977), which provided for the arms embargo against South Africa. However, the Special Committee has also concluded that military collaboration between South Africa and certain States and multinational corporations continues, which accounts for a large portion of South Africa's military expenditures that have reached 2,465 million rand in the current year. My delegation feels that additional measures are necessary to ensure appropriate implementation of resolution 418 (1977).

316. A second primary target of the international Year of Mobilization should be to sever all economic and financial relations with South Africa. While the termination of military, economic and financial relations is the most effective means for bringing pressure on South Africa, my delegation believes that the sports, cultural and aca-

demic boycotts have a strong impact on the morale of the Pretoria régime and should also be intensified.

317. In parallel with the campaign to isolate South Africa, the international community must also expand its assistance to the oppressed masses in South Africa, ANC, PAC and the front-line States.

318. In conclusion, it is the firm conviction of my delegation that the United Nations is in duty bound by the Charter to preserve the integrity of the Organization and totally to eradicate *apartheid*. We should intensify our efforts to compel the Pretoria régime to abandon the policies of *apartheid* and aggression and continue in our firm support for the people of South Africa until they achieve victory by ending the era of *apartheid* and racism. In this connection, I should like to reiterate that, for its part, Indonesia is prepared to co-operate fully with the international community to adopt effective measures, including mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter.

319. Mr. DORJI (Bhutan): South Africa's policy of racism has been the concern of the General Assembly since its very first session when the delegation of India brought it to the attention of the United Nations in 1946. Since then the United Nations has been involved in a most frustrating endeavour to secure justice for all citizens in South Africa. The international community has also very rightly recognized *apartheid* as a crime against humanity.

320. Recognizing the gravity of the situation caused by such a policy of institutionalized segregation, oppression and exploitation, the United Nations has passed over 100 resolutions in connection with *apartheid*. In 1962, the General Assembly, in its resolution 1761 (XVII), established the Special Committee against *Apartheid* constantly to review the practice and policies of *apartheid* in South Africa and its international repercussions. In 1977, the Security Council, in its resolution 418 (1977), called for an arms embargo against South Africa and, in resolution 421 (1977), established the Security Council Committee to renew the implementation of resolution 418 (1977) and to recommend measures to make it more effective. Another landmark in the struggle against *apartheid* was the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* adopted by the General Assembly in 1973.

321. In spite of these and all other laudable efforts, South Africa tries to circumvent criticism and perpetuate the situation prevalent in its society by the process of bantustanization. The *apartheid* régime in South Africa is setting up independent homelands in the poorest and most underdeveloped areas of the country, to which blacks are then banished. This creates a situation where blacks are being made foreigners in their own country and are denied legitimate claims to their inalienable economic and political rights. Furthermore, under this policy, South Africa can exploit the black labour force and may conveniently expel them to their own so-called homelands at any time.

322. In November this year, the Special Committee issued a statement noting that South Africa is proceeding with its plan to proclaim the so-called independence of Ciskei on 4 December this year [see A/36/708, annex I]. In this respect, my delegation will heed the appeal of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* to oppose such a move. This action by South Africa once again reveals its intransigence and its defiance of United Nations resolutions as well as of international public opinion. This ac-

tion on the part of South Africa is also intended to perpetuate the unjust homelands policy and should not be permitted to go unchallenged.

323. Bhutan supported the holding of the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa. We believe that sanctions, properly applied, will be an effective means to ensure South Africa's compliance with the decisions of the United Nations. At the same time, my delegation also expresses its regret over the Security Council's inability to take any concrete action against South Africa. So long as South Africa is assured that it will be shielded from Security Council action, it will continue to defy the decisions of the international community.

324. This year, in its report, the Special Committee recommended to the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly that 1982 be declared the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa. The Special Committee in its second special report considers that:

“... the main purpose of the International Year is to make world public opinion aware of the grave situation in South Africa and in southern Africa as a whole and of the declarations of the International Conference so as to mobilize maximum support for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations”. [A/36/22/Add.2, para. 4.]

This serves as a succinct statement regarding the purpose of the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa, and it is our hope that the programme in 1982 will be an effective mechanism for promoting the establishment of a just society in South Africa. My delegation supports the programme as proposed by the Special Committee [A/36/22 Add.2, annex].

325. My delegation would like to commend the Special Committee for its noteworthy efforts and comprehensive reports which underscore the threat to international peace and security resulting from South Africa's belligerent attitude and policies of *apartheid*.

326. In conclusion, I should like to quote an excerpt from the Declaration adopted at the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, which states:

“Freedom, peace, security and progress cannot be achieved in southern Africa unless the *apartheid* system of institutionalized racial discrimination, exploitation and oppression is crushed and is replaced by a democratic state whose policy will conform to the principles of the OAU, the non-aligned movement and the United Nations”.<sup>11</sup>

327. It is only through joint and individual action on the part of the international community, particularly that of the key Western countries, that South Africa can be coerced into abandoning its policy of *apartheid*.

328. Mr. FRANCIS (New Zealand): New Zealand society is firmly established on the principle of racial equality. That is the very essence of our existence as a people. Our history is a record of the search for a genuine and creative partnership among the different races which have come to live in our country. New Zealanders—Maori, Pakeha, Polynesians, Asians, all of us—are a people totally committed to a multi-racial society based on mutual respect, partnership and equality. Our laws do not just

prohibit discrimination, they seek above all to promote racial harmony. Our commitment to that objective is total.

329. It is only consistent with New Zealand's national history and tradition and with our political and social philosophy that we should be and are utterly opposed to *apartheid*. That system denies the principles of respect for human rights, racial equality and basic freedoms embodied in the Charter of the United Nations. It denies the overwhelming majority of South African people their political rights and economic and social freedom. It gives force of law to policies which distinguish the worth of citizens by colour alone. *Apartheid* is an affront to human dignity. It condones violence against those who dare to speak out against the system, against those who simply want a better life for their children.

330. It is tragic that South Africa should have rejected the calls by the international community and by the majority of its citizens to dismantle the system of *apartheid*. The South African response has been derisory. Its first tentative moves towards relaxation of some of the petty *apartheid* policies have come to a halt, it has persisted in its pursuit of policies, such as the creation of bantustans, which have been utterly rejected by the international community, and in its determination to uphold the *apartheid* system, the South African Government has engaged in acts of aggression against its neighbours which carry with them the danger of wider conflict.

331. South Africa cannot for long keep the majority of its people in subjugation. *Apartheid* will eventually be swept away in South Africa. It is a question of how. South Africa has two options—a steady dismantling of the *apartheid* system law by law, or an inevitable descent into violent conflict. The seeds of conflict have been sown. Violence continues to erupt, despite the arbitrary and oppressive measures which the South African Government has taken to suppress opposition. There will be more violence as long as the *apartheid* system persists. Time is not on the side of the South African Government. The determination of those who claim their freedom is growing. If there is to be an evolutionary and relatively peaceful solution, the South African Government must begin now to bring about genuine change.

332. New Zealand is committed to work with the international community to end the *apartheid* system. We recognize and understand the frustration felt over the generally slow progress towards genuine change in South Africa. We continue to believe, nevertheless, that the efforts of the international community should be directed towards achieving a peaceful solution to the South African problem. Any other approach will bring great suffering to all the people of South Africa. We believe accordingly that the task of the United Nations is to devise ways in which the international community can bring about peaceful but early change in South Africa.

333. For its part, the New Zealand Government has demonstrated its opposition to the *apartheid* policies of the South African Government in many ways. New Zealand has no diplomatic representation in South Africa. Our trade with that country is negligible. We co-sponsored the resolution calling for the end of new investment in that country. New Zealand has supported and will continue to support the various funds, including the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa, which are directed towards helping the victims of *apartheid* and promoting their welfare. Long before the

adoption of a mandatory arms embargo under Security Council resolution 418 (1977), New Zealand observed its provisions voluntarily; and we are willing to go along with a decision by the United Nations to impose economic sanctions against South Africa. There have been no significant cultural links with South Africa. And sporting links, until the regrettable instance of the recent Springbok, rugby tour, have practically ceased.

334. It is against this background that I want to comment in detail on the question of sporting contacts with South Africa. The New Zealand Government's policy on this matter is in every way consistent with the Gleneagles Agreement adopted by the Commonwealth Heads of Government in 1977.<sup>12</sup> Under that Agreement Commonwealth Governments agreed that they would seek to discourage sporting contacts with South Africa by means consistent with their respective domestic laws and practices. The New Zealand Government has fulfilled that commitment just as it has observed the basic principles of United Nations resolutions on sporting contacts. As the policy was put into practice, it became evident that there was widespread support among sports bodies and individual sportsmen and sportswomen in New Zealand for the principles embodied in Gleneagles. The list of contacts between New Zealand and South Africa since 1977 is, therefore, very short indeed. Until the recent Springbok rugby tour of New Zealand there was no contact between national teams of the two countries.

335. The register of sports activities with South Africa, whatever else it purports to do, demonstrates that significant fact. Only three New Zealand names—two tennis professionals and one golfing professional—appear on the list of those individuals who have had contacts with South Africa in the sporting field. That result was achieved precisely because sporting organizations and people in New Zealand, by their own decisions or in response to the advice of the New Zealand Government, concluded that sporting contacts with South Africa should end. And sporting bodies continue to respond to the New Zealand Government's persuasion. The New Zealand Golf Association, the New Zealand Cricket Council and the New Zealand Swimming Association have all in the past few weeks chosen to turn down invitations to play against South African teams. Regrettably, the persistence of one sports body, the New Zealand Rugby Football Union, has obscured a record which few other countries can match.

336. It will be no surprise therefore when I say that my delegation takes exception to paragraphs 149 and 352 of the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* [A/36/22 and Corr.1], which allege that the New Zealand Government did not take firm action to stop the Springbok rugby tour. The fact is that the Rugby Union persisted with its mistaken policies despite endeavours by the New Zealand Parliament, the New Zealand Government and a majority of the New Zealand people to persuade it to recognize its obligations to New Zealand and to the international community.

337. The Minister for Foreign Affairs repeatedly urged the New Zealand Rugby Union not to proceed with the tour. The Government made it clear that it did not want the Springboks to come. It withdrew its financial grant to the New Zealand Rugby Football Union. Parliament, in an unprecedented move, addressed an appeal to the Rugby Union. It was in the face of these appeals and these actions that the Rugby Union went ahead with its plan to invite the South African Springbok team to come to New Zealand. The New Zealand Government made it

clear that it deeply regretted the fact that the Rugby Union, alone among sporting bodies in New Zealand, had failed to live up to its responsibilities under the Gleneagles Agreement, a responsibility that was as clear as was the right of sports bodies in a country committed to democracy to make their own decisions on sporting matters.

338. The New Zealand Government's policy on the independence of sporting bodies is clear. So too is its policy on the question of visas. These policies go hand in hand. They rest on two principles. The first is the Government's belief in the responsibility and autonomy of sporting bodies. It is both an expression of faith in the ability, integrity and sense of responsibility of New Zealand's sports administrators and an assurance that decisions on sporting matters will be left to sportsmen and sportswomen themselves. In other words, it is a principle based on a commitment to freedom of choice.

339. The second principle is a clear statement that there should be no political interference in sport in any form. In conformity with that principle, it is not the practice of the New Zealand Government to withhold passports from New Zealand sportsmen and women who intend to travel overseas or to refuse visas to overseas sportsmen and women who are invited to come to New Zealand.

340. In the light of those two principles the New Zealand Government could not agree to deny visas to the South Africans. To have done so would have been to undermine the commitment to uphold the freedom of sporting bodies to make their own decisions. The Rugby Union clearly made the wrong decision. But that in itself was no justification for withdrawing that freedom to choose. It is, after all, precisely the concept of freedom which the international community, and rightly so, is determined that all South Africans should enjoy, whatever their race or colour—the freedom to choose their political leaders, the freedom to decide whom they will marry, where they live, where and how their children should be educated, what jobs they wish to pursue and, if I may say so, freedom to choose with whom they want to play sports. It is another aspect of that freedom, upheld in New Zealand but denied to South Africans, that during the Springbok tour New Zealanders were free to protest and to demonstrate their disapproval of the Rugby Union's decision and their abhorrence at and rejection of the *apartheid* policies practised in the country which the Springboks represented. And they did so, in their tens of thousands, in what were the greatest demonstrations ever seen in New Zealand and surely among the greatest anti-*apartheid* protests held anywhere.

341. In conclusion I should simply like to quote from something the New Zealand Prime Minister said at the recent Commonwealth meeting. It was that

“... the overwhelming majority of New Zealand sports bodies have accepted the Government's advice against playing sports with South Africa and I believe that there is still great support in the New Zealand community at large for the voicing of our opposition to *apartheid* in this way. That is because New Zealand is a multiracial democracy in which full equality is guaranteed to all by law in line with the internationally accepted conventions on human and civil rights.”

To suggest that New Zealand is soft on *apartheid* is totally at variance with the basic foundations of equality and justice on which our society is based.

342. Mr. GEORGES (Haiti) (*interpretation from French*): The crime of *apartheid* is once again the subject of deliberations by the General Assembly. However, only the real victims of that racist doctrine, which is without precedent in the history of mankind, can describe its true horror. Several generations of the oppressed people of South Africa have helplessly witnessed the regimentation of their lives under that inhuman system, which does not even give them the most elementary rights of the human person.

343. The right to vote does not exist for the majority of the South African population. Although it is a fundamental freedom of any citizen, that is certainly one of the least serious failings one can attribute to that inhuman régime. The forced separation of families and the transfer of populations brought about by the cynical application of the policy of bantustanization constitute a challenge to the conscience of mankind. However, what is most revolting is that the situation has worsened in recent years. Repression has been stepped up alarmingly, and unjustified arrests, and the torture of innocent victims—men, women and children—follow one another at an alarming rate. At the present time six patriots belonging to ANC are in danger of capital punishment under the unjust laws of the *apartheid* régime.

344. The attitude of defiance of that minority régime towards the Organization and the international community as a whole is based on the simple fact that it is not completely isolated and to a certain extent feels that it is tolerated and consequently encouraged by influential Members of the Organization.

345. Haiti's position on this question has never faltered. It has always been clear and precise, and whatever the circumstances Haiti will always support the just struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa. The Haitian people feel directly concerned by this problem not only because of racial affiliation but also because the problem represents a direct attack on the dignity of man.

346. At the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa in Paris, a large consensus emerged regarding the need to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against that régime which, through its wanton and repeated attacks against neighbouring States, endangers international peace and security. It is in this context that its increased militarization must be interpreted. Furthermore, the nuclear activities of that irresponsible régime are a cause of grave danger for mankind.

347. South Africa is not in a position to embark upon that outright militarization without outside support. However, we have difficulty in understanding that Governments which claim to be devoted to the protection of human rights maintain such dangerous and reprehensible relations with a régime universally condemned for its repressive character and its irresponsibility. We must unfortunately note that those same States are reluctant to implement the resolutions in the adoption of which they had played a large part. Notwithstanding the adoption of Security Council resolution 418 (1977) providing for a mandatory embargo on arms to South Africa, the military capabilities of the *apartheid* régime have since then increased at an alarming rate. My delegation would like once again to make an urgent appeal to the permanent members of the Security Council to act in accordance with the Charter and allow the sanctions envisaged in Chapter VII of the Charter to be applied against South Africa. That would be one of the most important factors

in the international community's struggle against the *apartheid* régime and would demonstrate the real political will of certain influential Members of the Organization to contribute sincerely and unequivocally to the solution of one of the most serious blots in the history of mankind.

348. Resistance within South Africa is being increasingly organized on a determined basis and the brutal repression resorted to by the South African authorities only strengthens the resolve of those who are fighting. Many examples confirm this opinion and history will once again follow its inexorable course. However, unless all States redouble their efforts to deal the final blows to the iniquitous system of *apartheid* and put an end to the suffering of the oppressed people of South Africa, we fear that the parties concerned may resort to extreme measures and that the conflict may then spill over the borders of South Africa and extend to the whole of the African continent and even beyond. The risk of a generalized conflagration cannot be ruled out in view of the nuclear potential possessed by the irresponsible régime in South Africa.

349. There is no doubt about the legitimacy of the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa. That is why we call on all members of the international community to side with those who are struggling for justice and dignity. The unanimous adoption and the effective implementation of the recommendations of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and of the draft resolutions submitted on this agenda item would constitute an important victory not only for the oppressed people in South Africa but also for all mankind.

350. Mr. BLOMBERG (Finland): Once again, the General Assembly is called upon to deal with the *apartheid* policies of the Government of South Africa. The response of the international community is clear: the United Nations firmly rejects those policies and requests an immediate end to this institutionalized violation of human rights and human dignity. To single out the policies of South Africa year after year is justified as long as the system of *apartheid* has not been dismantled.

351. The position of the Government and people of Finland on *apartheid* is clear and remains unchanged. We categorically denounce all forms of discrimination and segregation based on race, creed or colour. For us, *apartheid* is to be condemned for its total incompatibility with our Nordic conception of justice, equality and dignity of the human being.

352. While respect for human rights is far from perfect in any country, *apartheid* constitutes the most systematic and massive violation of basic human rights anywhere. It stands in complete contradiction with the principles of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. On this, the whole international community is united. The system of *apartheid* practised by the South African Government is a continuous challenge to these basic norms and therefore to the international community as a whole.

353. By clinging to its archaic policies of racial discrimination, South Africa has made itself increasingly isolated. While the system of *apartheid* persists, its isolation will only deepen. The so-called reforms, for example, in the field of labour relations are but palliatives, as ineffective as they are belated. Only one kind of change will work: the abolition of *apartheid*.



354. Violence is an inevitable consequence of *apartheid* both internally and externally. Acts of aggression committed against South Africa's peaceful neighbours are one facet of this. The recent attacks against Angola, launched from the Territory of Namibia, illegally occupied by South Africa, are the most massive instances of this violence.

355. *Apartheid* stands at the root of most of the problems in southern Africa. Yet, the international community cannot afford to despair in the face of the situation in the region. Colonialism and racism are anachronistic remnants of the past. The trend in southern Africa is towards freedom, equality and independence. Angola and Mozambique are evidence of this. Zimbabwe has achieved its independence and a stable multiracial society through free and fair elections after long years of violence. Namibia is no longer far from that goal.

356. So far the international community has responded to the challenge posed by *apartheid* by instituting a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa. Thus, for the first time in its history the United Nations has applied mandatory sanctions against a Member State under Chapter VII of the Charter. It is evident, however, that further measures by the Security Council are needed. As one such measure my delegation, together with the other Nordic countries, has, since the thirty-first session of the General Assembly, sponsored a resolution aimed at preventing new foreign investments in South Africa. Such investments are particularly relevant in the context of the substantial increases in the military budget of South Africa. In the view of my Government, the Security Council should, as a first step, take decisions aimed at preventing new foreign investments in that country.

357. Internal oppression exercised by the South African Government has been graphically documented in the detailed report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. In this connection, I should like to pay a tribute to Mr. Clark of Nigeria for his invaluable services as Chairman of the Special Committee and welcome Mr. Maitama-Sule as his successor, who has already shown his ability to direct the work of the Committee.

358. In the annals of the United Nations the chapter of *apartheid* has remained open for too long. The sooner it will be closed the better. It will be better not only for the different races in South Africa, not only for South Africa itself, but for the world community as a whole.

359. Mr. KEITA (Mali) (*interpretation from French*): The system of *apartheid*, described as a disgrace to humanity and a crime against mankind, is unfortunately still on the agenda of the General Assembly. In deciding to continue to take it up, the Assembly must surely be doing so with the intent of defending the noble purposes and principles of the Charter and the highly relevant provisions of the many international instruments concerning the defence and protection of basic human rights.

360. The remarkable report that the Special Committee against *Apartheid* has just submitted to the Assembly is an implacable catalogue of the racial folly of the retrograde régime that has usurped power in South Africa. In pointing out once again the nature and dangerous ambitions behind the intolerable defiance of the supporters of *apartheid*, that document still manages to give a glimmer of hope, namely, that an ever-widening circle of well-meaning and sensible men are joining together to enable our society to develop in harmony and in peace.

361. This is a good occasion for my delegation to address its warm congratulations to the members of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* for the work they have done. It calls upon them to increase their efforts and their vigilance and to enlighten and mobilize international public opinion to an even greater degree with regard to the most baleful manifestations of *apartheid* and to all the forms of support that, unfortunately, that ignoble system is continuing to enjoy.

362. The unspeakable acts of morbid racism practised by the Pretoria régime in South Africa are well known to all. The voices that rise up from the martyred cities of South Africa, such as Soweto, the voices of the victims blindly cut down by the rabble army of the system of *apartheid*, the incarceration without trial of South African patriots, the systematic practice of bantustanization, all serve to remind us of them daily.

363. The leaders of Pretoria cultivate racial hatred. They undermine the very foundations of democracy and human civilization by depriving the black majority of its most elementary right, which is the recognition of the dignity of man. However, wonderful instruments, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Charter of the United Nations, have been adopted by international society to preserve that dignity.

364. Obviously, the South African régime is a master at violating the principles of the Charter. In Namibia, it has denied the people the exercise of their sovereignty; in Azania, it denies the black majority its fundamental rights. The racist régime of South Africa is thus in open conflict with the whole of the international community because it is guilty of deliberate violations of the Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

365. Young people, trade-union organizations, religious and university organizations, as well as non-governmental organizations, have thus been mobilized throughout the world and even in South Africa to inform the world of the nature and seriousness of this conflict. It is in that context that the National Anti-*Apartheid* Committee of the Republic of Mali has tirelessly been waging, both within and outside our country, a vigorous campaign against the odious system of *apartheid*.

366. The United Nations, for its part, has no other alternative than to ensure respect for the Charter, and in particular Article 39, through recourse to the application of sanctions against Pretoria. In order to do that, it is important that all resolutions adopted against South Africa be implemented to the letter, particularly with regard to the supply of military matériel, the sale of oil products and the severing of political, economic, diplomatic, cultural and sporting relations.

367. Furthermore, the United Nations should ensure that effect be given to the recommendations of parliamentary organizations, as well as to the decisions adopted by the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa. It is also extremely urgent that the Security Council consider the report that the Council Committee established by resolution 421 (1977) submitted to it in 1980.<sup>13</sup>

368. For their part, the patriots of Azania have valiantly taken up arms to honour their people and to free them from racist oppression in accordance with the sacred principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of the OAU.

369. At a time when we are preparing to commemorate the thirty-third anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it is inadmissible that freedom fighters should be languishing in South African gaols. We trust in the future. The victory of the people of Azania is inevitable. Neither the strengthening of *apartheid*, the use of ever more sophisticated weapons nor arbitrary and massive arrests can crush the will and the ability to resist of the heroic people of South Africa.

370. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We have heard the last speaker on the list for this evening.

371. I shall now call on those representatives who have asked to speak in exercise of their right of reply. I would remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements made in exercise of the right of reply are limited to a maximum of 10 minutes and must be delivered by speakers from their seats.

372. I now call upon the representative of Iraq.

373. Miss AL-TURAIHI (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): We all agree that the item under consideration is vital and serious, not only for the continent of Africa, to which we are bound by ties of friendship, fraternity and mutual interest, but for the rest of the world as well.

374. I have asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply in order to answer the observations made at the 77th meeting by the Khomeini representative, which were a further evidence of his ignorance of the elementary principles of debate and of his disrespect for the rules governing meetings, as evidenced by his attempt to divert attention from such a vital and important question. His attempt showed him to be unrealistic and, as is his wont, out of context.

375. The representative of the Khomeini régime has once more spoken of my country in a manner that is inappropriate and that would be unsuitable coming from any representative other than one from his own country. One need only refer to that country's so-called constitution, which states that the presidency of the Republic should be entrusted only to a citizen of Persian origin, out of all the nationalities living in Iran, to see only one of the many manifestations of the racist and chauvinist nature of the Khomeini régime.

376. As for his accusations against my country, everyone knows that such accusations are falsehoods and that even the representative of Iran himself does not believe them. He may be acting in ignorance or deliberately covering up their racism and the atrocious crimes perpetrated against people of other nationalities living in Iran, such as Arabs, Kurds, Turkomans and Belush.

377. As for the other acts committed by that régime which constitute flagrant violations of human rights, I believe that everyone is aware of the odious acts committed and the trials staged every day, with capital sentences being imposed on dozens of Iranian citizens, including women and children; and there is thus the bloody liquidation of all progressive forces. The régime commits crimes against human rights in the name of Islam, a tolerant religion which has never in its history witnessed such blind and racist fanaticism. It wishes to take the society back to an era similar to that of the Inquisition, which has never been known before in the history of Islam.

378. Furthermore, the representative of Khomeini claims that he is concerned about the problem of the people of Palestine, while his régime, as is seen from its official statements, receives assistance and arms from the Zionist entity, which collaborates with the racist Pretoria régime. They have made statements, which were broadcast by Radio Teheran two days ago, in which they admitted that they received arms from the Zionist entity. In trying to justify this atrocious act, they said that the purchase of military material from the Zionist entity was in payment of an earlier debt and that the Supreme Council had previously decided to receive arms from the Zionist entity. Iraq has pointed out the facts in document A/36/518, which refers to the armament collaboration between Iran and the Zionist entity.

379. Finally, the representative of the Khomeini régime makes not one statement without making observations against my country which are mere falsehoods. These ideological falsehoods are part of the method adopted by the representative of Iran and by his own Government. Therefore it is not surprising that the representative of such a régime resorts to such falsehoods in order to cover up the plans of his aggressive régime, impelled by racist ambitions dating back in history and aimed mainly at Iraqi interests.

380. Mr. SABZALIAN (Iran): Regrettably, Saddam's régime is so deeply involved in the distortion of the truth inside Iraq for the prolongation of its shaky Fascist régime that it expects the whole international community also to buy these cheap and baseless fabrications. My delegation wishes that Saddam's henchmen would open their apparently deaf ears and listen. Who is the aggressor, and what is the definition of aggression? According to the Definition of Aggression [*see resolution 3314 (XXIX)*], military occupation, even temporarily and for a short period of time, or the seizing of another's land or part of that land by the use of force, is aggression.

381. The savage military machine of the criminal Saddam has been occupying Iranian territory from 22 September 1980 up to this very moment, in clear violation of all international laws and the Charter. For more than 14 months Saddam's criminal hands have been stained with the blood of thousands of my people. Now that Saddam's demoralized army is crumbling to pieces, by the use of 9-metre long-range rockets it does not even spare defenceless civilians, hospital patients or even school-children.

382. I should like briefly to shed some light on the true nature of Saddam's régime and the baseless allegations of its representatives.

383. First of all, in regard to racism, let us see who is racist. Today it is no longer a secret that, parallel with acts of aggression by Israel against Palestinians, the Government of Iraq set out to expel from Iraq large groups of Iraqi citizens, after the confiscation of their belongings, simply because of their racial and ancestral ties with Iranians.

384. The highly insecure régime of Saddam, fearful of the slightest possibility of opposition, has continuously shipped thousands of innocent elderly and young Iraqi men, women and children to the Iranian borders and dumped those defenceless people in a manner very similar to the unloading of bricks and masonry and left them unprotected in severe conditions.

385. The arrogance of Saddam's régime goes so far as to be sheer stupidity and racism. In November 1980 Saddam—whose representative described his defence of Islam as valuable—in the so-called parliament of Iraq said: "The Persians are not Moslems, because the Koran is in Arabic. The Prophet was an Arab, and Islam belongs to the Arabs." I remind representatives that there are almost one billion Moslems in the world and our Arab Moslem brothers and sisters constitute only about one tenth of the total Moslem population. Does that arrogant statement by Saddam and his henchmen mean that he plans to transfer the terror to all those people?

386. With regard to the issue of arms sales, let us discuss briefly who is buying from whom and for what reason.

387. Saddam's henchmen expect the whole world community to believe this fiction fabricated by a single reporter in a British newspaper heavily financed by the Ba'athist régime for the publication of news in favour of Saddam's régime and against the Islamic Revolution of Iran. I will not dignify this clownish allegation by Saddam's régime any further, since we have already published documented proof of this under-the-table deal between the two parties through a Swiss bank. I might also point to the recent statements made by the Palestine Liberation Organization's Ambassador in Teheran, who refuted that baseless allegation and considered that Ba'athist rumour to be nothing but another part of the continued conspiracies of the imperialists against the Islamic Revolution of Iran.

388. According to undeniable documented facts, found in Israel's so-called Embassy in Teheran during the reign of the deposed Shah, the Iraqi security and information organization has been co-operating deeply with the notorious Mossad of Israel and the vicious SAVAK of the deposed Shah.

389. How shameless was Saddam when, in conformity with American and Zionist foreign policy, he said, at the beginning of 1980: "Now is not the time to put hand upon hand and witness the Revolution of Iran. Now is the time to take the most advantage possible of the weakened state of Iran and attack Iran in one fell swoop." For almost 14 months he has been trying to do that and he cannot do it. This comment becomes more meaningful when we hear the statement made by the Zionist leader, the terrorist Menachem Begin, who said that he was very happy when Iraq attacked Iran. Quite expectedly, Ezer Weizman of Israel said, "We could never have designed a better plan for Israel than Iraq's attack on Iran".

390. Since the Zionists and the United States imperialists could not attack Iran directly, they resorted to their savage indirect attack after all of their other conspiracies, whether economic sanctions, the partial invasion of Iran or the instigation of internal subversion, miserably failed.

391. May I add one more statement, that of Brzezinski, the Security Adviser to the Carter Administration, who said: "America in a total way is out to change the direction of the Islamic Revolution of Iran, and in order to do this we must give complete support to Iraq." Also, the ex-Secretary of State under the Carter Administration, Edmund Muskie, said: "Iraq in the future will play an important role for the East and West of the region." No wonder the American and Zionist officials are so happy and so interested in the fact that Iraq attacked Iran.

392. I would like briefly to point out some of the advantages of American imperialism obtained from this aggressive war designed by United States imperialists and implemented by Saddam's army, which was synchronized by and for the interests of United States imperialists. This destructive war has brought many political, military and economic advantages for the United States, including military movement into the region, the creation of a rapid deployment force, the sale of modern weapons in the region, the presence of AWAC aircraft for military surveillance, the strengthening of its naval fleet, and extending the North Atlantic Treaty Organization pact into the Persian Gulf region and then to the Far East.

393. Saddam's representative claims that the refugees in Iraq who were kicked out of the country were aliens, non-Arabs and non-Iraqis.

394. Miss AL-TURAIHI (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I have asked to speak to say that the representative of the Khomeini régime has raised points which have nothing to do with the item under consideration. As for the allegations he has been making, they are mere falsehoods, because Iraq has stated its case more than once before the organs of the United Nations since the beginning of the Iranian aggression against Iraq on 4 September 1980.

395. As for the violations and aggression committed by them, there is a complete file and documents on those aggressions. Everyone knows how Iraq has responded positively to the efforts aimed at reaching a peaceful and just solution. It is a well-known fact that Iraq has co-operated positively with all those who have exerted such efforts. It was Iran which frustrated those efforts and continues to frustrate them, because the followers of Khomeini wish to perpetuate aggression in order to portray themselves as rulers of the area.

396. As for his allegations concerning those who were exiled from Iraq, those who were not Iraqis—this became clear from the statement of the Iranian representative, who said that they were sent out of the country due to the fact that they were of foreign origin—they were sent out of the country because they had entered Iraq on an illegal basis and in violation of all the laws recognized by all the world.

397. Finally, his attempts to cover up the collaboration of his régime with the Tel Aviv régime and the South African régime is no strange matter, because birds of a feather flock together.

398. Mr. SABZALIAN (Iran): First of all, in regard to the refugees from Iraq, which the representative of Iraq called of foreign origin, alien to Iraq, my question is: why all of a sudden did they realize there were tens of thousands of so-called illegal citizens who, according to Saddam's régime, were sometimes terrorists, sometimes aliens and sometimes given other names, who, by the way, interestingly enough could never speak one word of Persian? Why were they all dumped in an inhuman manner like masonry and dirt near the border and left to the severe climate without any protection? May I ask the Fascist régime of Saddam Hussein why innocent Iraqi citizens were sent towards Iran through heavily mined roads to their death?

399. In terms of Iraq's positive co-operation and Iran's frustration, may I remind the representative of Iraq that

the Fascist régime of Saddam Hussein, being on the verge of defeat and collapse, is now trying to buy time and sympathy by offering a deceitful cease-fire, or something of that nature, but they can fool no one but themselves. Occupying the lands of other nations and then asking for a cease-fire or negotiations is an old trick, an eternal formula of all aggressors. We have witnessed many parallel examples from the Zionist régime of Israel upon the lands of our Arab brothers and those of the Palestinians from 1948 to the present. Yet the savage régime of Saddam Hussein, as well as their imperialist masters, should know that neither destruction of industrial plants or oil installations, nor bombardment of our citizens and the killing of children and many innocent people will stop our determination in the struggle against the aggressors until the eradication of all injustices.

400. Because of time limitations I cannot go further. I want to end my statement by saying that the Iraqi régime should abandon hypocrisy and face reality.

*The meeting rose at 9.10 p.m.*

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1938th meeting.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, *Thirty-third Session, Plenary Meetings*, 82nd meeting.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, *Thirty-fifth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 92nd meeting, paras. 184-186.

<sup>4</sup> See A/AC.109/672, para. 37.

<sup>5</sup> The delegations of Botswana, Jordan and Lesotho subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

<sup>6</sup> See *Report of the World Conference for Action against Apartheid* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.77.XIV.2 and Corrigendum), sect. X.

<sup>7</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year*, 2269th meeting.

<sup>8</sup> A/CONF.107/8, sect. X.

<sup>9</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Nineteenth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1964*, document S/5658, annex.

<sup>10</sup> See A/CONF.107/8, annex VIII.

<sup>11</sup> See A/34/542, annex, para. 78.

<sup>12</sup> Commonwealth Statement on *Apartheid in Sports*. See *Final Communiqué of the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting in London*, 8-15 June 1977 (London, Commonwealth Secretariat, 1977), pp. 21-22.

<sup>13</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1980*, document S/14179.