



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/43/PV.65

5 December 1988

ENGLISH

Forty-third session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SIXTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 30 November 1988, at 3 p.m.

President:

later:

later:

Mr. CAPUTO

Mr. BRANCO (Vice-President)

Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vice-President)

(Argentina)

(Sao Tome and Principe)

(Vanuatu)

- Report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country: Report of the Sixth Committee [137]
- Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa [36] (continued)
 - (a) Report of the Special Committee against Apartheid
 - (b) Report of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa
 - (c) Reports of the Secretary-General
 - (d) Report of the Special Political Committee
 - (e) Draft resolutions

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

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

88-64517/A 9326V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 137

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RELATIONS WITH THE HOST COUNTRY: REPORT OF THE SIXTH COMMITTEE (PART I) (A/43/900 and Corr.1)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Before calling on the Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee I shall quote rule 78 of the rules of procedure concerning proposals submitted to the General Assembly. That rule, in its relevant part, states:

"As a general rule, no proposal shall be discussed or put to the vote at any meeting of the General Assembly unless copies of it have been circulated to all delegations not later than the day preceding the meeting."

Since, as members know, we do not have too much time, and as the Assembly wants this question to be considered without delay, I venture to suggest that if there are no objections, that we consider the recommendation contained in the report of the Sixth Committee (A/43/900), although it was distributed only this morning. I would point out that the text of the draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee was distributed yesterday in that Committee.

If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Assembly accepts my proposal.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I call on Mr. Carlos Velasco Mendiola, Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee, to present that Committee's report on agenda item 137.

Mr. VELASCO MENDIOLA (Peru), Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee (interpretation from Spanish): I have the honour to present to the General Assembly the report of the Sixth Committee contained in document A/43/900 and Corr.1 under agenda item 137, "Report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country".

(Mr. Velasco Mendiola, Rapporteur,
Sixth Committee)

As stated in the document, this is but the first part of the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 137. It relates specifically to draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.25, which was considered yesterday by the Committee on a priority basis, and on which the Committee took a decision. The second part of the report on the subject will contain the results of the Sixth Committee's consideration of the report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country.

The draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee for adoption by the General Assembly is contained in paragraph 6 of part I of the report. A mistake has slipped into the English version, and I should like to bring it to the attention of members: in paragraph 5 there should be a blank between the words "than" and "December".

Preambular paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft resolution refer to the request made by the Palestine Liberation Organization through the Secretary-General, for the granting of an entry visa to Mr. Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization, so that he could participate in the forty-third session of the General Assembly, and to the decision of the host country to deny the requested visa in violation of the international legal obligations undertaken by virtue of the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, adopted in 1947.

In accordance with the terms of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would affirm the right of the Palestine Liberation Organization freely to designate the members of its delegation to participate in the sessions and the work of the General Assembly; it would deplore the failure by the host country to approve the granting of the requested entry visa; it would consider that the decision by the

(Mr. Velasco Mendiola, Rapporteur,
Sixth Committee)

Government of the United States of America, the host country, constitutes a violation of the international legal obligations of the host country under the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations; it would urge the host country to abide scrupulously by the provisions of the Headquarters Agreement and to reconsider and reverse its decision; and it would request the Secretary-General to submit a report on the developments in this matter no later than a date to be determined in December 1988. The Sixth Committee adopted the draft resolution by 121 votes to 2, with one abstention.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I have to inform representatives that some delegations have expressed a desire for the report of the Sixth Committee (A/43/900) to be discussed, since they consider this to be necessary.

Bearing in mind rule 66 of the provisional rules of procedure, may I take it that the General Assembly agrees that the report of the Sixth Committee be considered?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the representative of Jordan, who will speak on behalf of the Group of Arab States.

Mr. SALAH (Jordan) (interpretation from Arabic): It gives me great pleasure to speak before the General Assembly on behalf of the Arab States on the item entitled "Report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country". We had hoped not to have to do so. However, the fact that the draft resolution before the General Assembly today in document A/43/900, when it was put to the vote in the Sixth Committee the other day, won almost unanimous support. This question has made it impossible for us not to speak on this important question, albeit briefly, in order to emphasize certain salient points.

The question, as the Assembly will recall, is the decision by the United States of America, the host country, not to issue a visa to Mr. Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), who intended to participate in the deliberations of the General Assembly in his official capacity and for the express purpose of putting to the Assembly the Palestinian point of view regarding the item entitled "Question of Palestine". Mr. Arafat represents one of the two major parties to that question, namely the people of Palestine.

This decision of the host country is truly regrettable and, indeed, deplorable. Under the Headquarters Agreement, the host country has a legal

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

obligation to grant an entry visa to its territory to Mr. Arafat so that he can carry out the official task defined in the visa application submitted to the Secretary-General on 8 November 1988 by the Permanent Observer of the PLO to the United Nations. The visa application showed quite clearly that the purpose of Mr. Arafat's visit was to take part in the deliberations of the forty-third session of the General Assembly.

As stated by the Under-Secretary-General for Legal Affairs and the Legal Counsel, Mr. Fleischhauer, before the Committee on Relations with the Host Country last Monday, it was he who personally handed that visa application to Ambassador Herbert Okun of the United States Mission and drew his attention to the fact that it was worded exactly as all visa applications for representatives of the PLO are worded.

In this regard, I wish to extend to you, Mr. President, our thanks and appreciation for your statement of 26 November in which you affirmed that the United States Administration had an obligation to grant the visa requested for Mr. Yasser Arafat.

I also extend thanks and appreciation to the Secretary-General, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, for his statement of 27 November on the same subject, in which he affirmed that the aforesaid decision of the United States runs counter to its obligations under the Headquarters Agreement.

We feel that a great deal of gratitude and appreciation is due to the Legal Counsel, Mr. Fleischhauer for his lucid, detailed statement, which I have already mentioned. In that statement he refuted all the arguments with which the host country tried to justify its decision. Mr. Fleischhauer, at the end of his statement, emphasized that the host country was and still is under an obligation to grant a visa to Mr. Arafat, Chairman of the PLO, an organization which has been accorded observer status by the General Assembly.

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

In addition to all this, the PLO has the right, like any other member or observer in the General Assembly, to form a delegation to participate in the work of the General Assembly in whichever way it wants, without interference by anyone. The Palestine Liberation Organization, which, since 1975, has been participating as an Observer in the work of the General Assembly, is, by the choice of the Palestinian people and on the basis of its recognition by the majority of the States in the world and the affirmation of the United Nations, the sole, legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, one of the two major parties to the question of Palestine.

As everyone knows, the question of Palestine is one of the most important and serious outstanding problems in the world today. The United Nations and all peace-loving States have the responsibility to strive forthwith and seriously to achieve the peaceful settlement of that question.

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

We had hoped that the positive decisions adopted by the Palestine National Council at its recent meeting in Algiers would elicit the appropriate responsiveness and understanding from all, since they represent a constructive position and a step towards the achievement of a peaceful settlement of the question of Palestine.

Although those decisions were welcomed and supported by a large number of States, the United States chose not to respond positively to decisions that revived the hope of movement in the Middle East peace process and provided the opportunity for a constructive dialogue between the Palestine Liberation Organization, the sole, legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, and the United States, which is a party deeply involved in the Middle East conflict, the very crux of which is the question of Palestine.

It is extremely regrettable that the United States decision under review was not taken on its own relations - or rather lack of relations - with the PLO but rather on the relations between the PLO and the United Nations, which is supposed to have an independent personality and an international standing that should be respected by all.

What has prompted us to say all this, in addition to our keen interest in the peace process in the Middle East and the necessity for the Palestine Liberation Organization to play its role as a principal therein, is our great interest in the United Nations and our belief that it is necessary to preserve its independence and maintain its world standing. The United Nations was established with the intention of making it the conscience of mankind, a forum for the voice of peace in which to study the problems of the world and find solutions thereto, especially problems relating to international peace and security.

The Palestine Liberation Organization, after the recent decisions of the Palestine National Council, has shown that it is a voice for peace, an active party

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

on the side of peace, and a constructive element in the search for peace. The United States, which espouses great principles and far-ranging humanitarian concerns, should have been more understanding of the position of the Palestine Liberation Organization and the important role it can and must play if peace is to be established in the Middle East.

Our great regret and surprise at the aforementioned decision by the host country have been compounded by the stand announced by the official spokesman of the State Department of the United States last Monday, namely, that the decision was final and irreversible. The other day the Secretary of State of the host country reiterated this position, despite his knowledge that the General Assembly was in the process of introducing a draft resolution deploring the failure by the host country to approve the granting of the requested visas considering that the decision of the host country constituted a violation of its international legal obligations under the Headquarters Agreement and, hence, urging it to abide scrupulously by the provisions of the Agreement and to reconsider and reverse its decision.

Such a position on the part of the United States Administration is grave indeed. We fear that it heralds a gradual retreat on the part of the United States Administration from its commitment to uphold international law and a shrugging off of its responsibility in this regard as a State Member of the United Nations that is also a major Power and a permanent member of the Security Council.

These misgivings have been deepened by the Act promulgated by the United States Congress at the end of last year regarding the closing down of the office of the Permanent Observer mission of the Palestine Liberation Organization to the United Nations. That Act which was the subject of intensive deliberations in the General Assembly at the beginning of this year, led to an advisory opinion handed down by the International Court of Justice affirming that the Act runs counter to

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

the obligations of the host country under the Headquarters Agreement. Regardless of any such obligation, a spokesman of the State Department of the host country stated that the United States Congress promulgated the Act knowing full well that by doing so it was contravening the international legal obligations of the host country under the Headquarters Agreement.

We still hope that the host country will reconsider and reverse its decision in order to dispel the misgivings to which I have just referred. We say this in spite of our realization that this hope may be termed unrealistic or unrealizable.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I have to inform representatives that we shall keep the list of speakers open for approximately another 15 minutes, until 4 p.m.

Mr. KITTANI (Iraq): Our peaceful Thanksgiving holiday was shattered last Saturday afternoon by the shocking news from Washington that the Secretary of State of the United States of America, the host country, had decided to deny an entry visa to Mr. Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), for whom we were all waiting to open our debate on the important item on Palestine tomorrow morning.

(Mr. Kittani, Iraq)

This news had shock waves emanating from this building in all directions. On Monday the Committee on Relations with the Host Country met twice. We had a thorough debate on the question and not a single member of that Committee came close to defending the decision of the United States Secretary of State. The report went to the Sixth Committee, and this morning the Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee presented the result of its deliberations and the clear-cut draft resolution which is before us.

My delegation has asked to speak as an exception in this case to the usual explanation of vote for the simple reason that we believe not only that this item is momentous and important in itself but that this is indeed a historic occasion on which all members of the Assembly have an equal responsibility, individually and collectively, to pronounce themselves on this.

We were delighted, Mr. President, that you and the Secretary-General did not wait for Monday morning but even during the weekend were the first to draw the attention of the host country and its Secretary of State to the fact that this decision is wrong and incompatible with the obligations of the United States to this Organization. Since then, we have heard the Sixth Committee, representing all the Members of the United Nations, pronounce itself decisively in similar fashion. I do not believe that a single member of the Security Council, the other principal organ of the United Nations concerned with the matter, has any intention of defending the United States decision. So we have three principal bodies - the Secretariat, the General Assembly, which is about to take a decision, and, by implication, the Security Council. I do not think that anyone in this Hall, including the United States delegation, would doubt that, if we were tomorrow to submit this to the other principal organ, the International Court of Justice, the result would be the same.

(Mr. Kittani, Iraq)

If any proof were needed, we have the opinion of the Legal Counsel of the United Nations delivered Monday afternoon in the Committee on Relations with the Host Country, which should be issued as a historic document. I would recommend that all members should read it carefully. The representative of Jordan has referred to it in detail, but may I simply say, as I said in the Committee on Relations with the Host Country, that this Assembly owes a debt of gratitude to the Secretary-General and his Legal Counsel for that opinion. It is an excellent example of defending the dignity, the authority and the rights of this Organization, and the host country should take that into account in reacting to the resolution we are about to adopt.

I shall read out the last paragraph of that opinion, which ran to some seven pages. Mr. Fleischhauer said:

"To sum up, I am of the opinion that the host country was and is under an obligation to grant the visa request of the Chairman of the PLO, an organization which has been granted observer status by the General Assembly."

(Press Release HQ/494, p.4)

There are no "ifs", "buts" or "maybes". The decision of the Secretary of State of the United States is not acceptable; it is not in conformity with its obligation to the United Nations. I shall have a little more to say about that later; I simply say now that if this decision is not reversed - and we have not entirely given up hope that it will be - a great deal of injury will have been done, not to Mr. Arafat, not to the PLO, not to the Palestinian people, not to the Arabs alone, but to every one of us in this Hall. The day will come when one or more of us at one time or another will regret that more was not done to persuade the Secretary of State of the United States to change its position. That is one reason why we asked to speak.

(Mr. Kittani, Iraq)

The other reason is perhaps more important. It is - and I shall not go into the substance of the Palestinian question except to the extent that it is relevant to the granting of the visa - that if this decision is not reversed it will constitute a grievous blow to the chances of peace in the Middle East. Much has been written and said by foreign dignitaries, Heads of State, Governments of allies of the United States, friends of the United States, as well as by very honourable, patriotic, eminent personalities in all walks of life in the host country itself. So, instead of wasting the Assembly's time, I will read simply the concluding part of an article written this morning by an eminent columnist in The Washington Post, Mr. Richard Cohen. After criticizing all the points raised by Mr. Shultz in his decision, he had the following to say:

"Whatever the PLO may be, it does no good to ignore it ...

"But ignore it we do. American diplomats are forbidden even to meet with PLO representatives. That's not mere policy; it's the law. In this sense, we are as Israeli as Israel itself. But even in Israel, some people (among them, Yehoshafat Harkabi, a former head of military intelligence) have suggested that the policy of never dealing with the PLO is folly. Their logic is unassailable: you can only make peace with your enemy.

"The upshot is that the United States is tethered to what may be a counterproductive Israeli policy. When it comes to the PLO, we have none of our own. In this sense Shultz's rebuff to Arafat, as understandable as it was, is merely more of the same. What seems like an isolated incident here must seem to the rest of the world, particularly the Arabs, to be further

(Mr. Kittani, Iraq)

proof that our Middle East policy is identical to Israel's. Our support is so fervent, so emotional that we are willing to abrogate the responsibilities as the host nation for the UN.

"The only sure way to eradicate terrorism is to deal with its cause. In the Middle East, that means dealing with Palestinian nationalism - and that means dealing with the PLO. Shultz overlooked that. When he said 'nuts' to Arafat, he was dealing only with his emotions." (The Washington Post,
30 November 1988, p. A.23)

(Mr. Kittani, Iraq)

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to ask a favour of you. For several reasons, I should like to speak in my personal capacity. First, as you know, I am one of your humble predecessors. Secondly, I have had more than three decades of uninterrupted association with the Organization. Thirdly, I have spent most of my adult life in the host country, so perhaps I can say that I am not totally ignorant of political facts in the United States.

It is because of all that that I wish, not only as representative of Iraq but in my personal capacity, to make an urgent appeal to Washington, to the Administration and, in particular, to the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State has a chance to rise to the occasion, to recognize that the decision was grievous, that it was wrong, that it is going to do untold injury to the Organization and its relations with the host country, and that it is going to deal a very serious blow to the chances of peace in the Middle East. Mr. Shultz is a distinguished world statesman. His career as such is about to enter history. He has a wonderful opportunity to remove this blot from that record and to turn it into a magnanimous virtue. Indeed, we have this saying in Arabic: "To correct a wrong is a virtue".

If there was any doubt in anyone's mind that a mistake has been made in this case, that doubt has been removed. We trust that the delegation of the United States will convey that to the Secretary of State and the Administration and that the Secretary of State will carefully read - if nothing else - the opinion of the Legal Counsel of the United Nations.

We are not without hope that this grievous wrong will be righted.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to inform members that 15 minutes have passed since I made the announcement concerning the closure of the list of speakers. Therefore, I now declare the list closed.

Mr. T. M. SALIH (Sudan) (interpretation from Arabic): I am addressing the Assembly today, on behalf of the people and Government of Sudan, in order to state that we deeply deplore the refusal to grant Mr. Yasser Arafat, the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), the right to take part in the General Assembly's deliberations. This is especially deplorable at a time when encouraging progress has been witnessed in regard to the problem of Palestine, as is evident from the decisions taken by the special session of the Palestine National Council held in the capital of Algeria - decisions that, in substance, recognized Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and proclaimed the State of Palestine. These decisions have been greeted by the international community as a welcome positive step towards a just, lasting settlement of the problem of Palestine.

The international community has recognized that the PLO has a well-established right, to participate in Assembly sessions and deliberations, as well as in all its efforts, on an equal footing with other parties.

The resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at previous sessions have expressed the will of the family of nations.

The relations between the PLO and the host country are governed by the provisions of the Headquarters Agreement. It flows from that Agreement that the international Organization and the host country have undertaken to recognize that the PLO has the right to choose which of its representatives will participate in the General Assembly.

What I am stating today only confirms what was said by the Secretary-General on 27 November - namely, that the decision by the Government of the host country has come at a time when new prospects for peace are opening in the Middle East because of the decisions taken by the Palestine National Council. It confirms also what you said, Mr. President, on 28 November - that is, that the Government of the

(Mr. T. M. Salih, Sudan)

host country must grant an entry visa to Mr. Yasser Arafat under section 11 (5) of the Headquarters Agreement. The legal opinion rendered by the Legal Counsel of the United Nations also states that all the formal conditions have been met for the granting of an entry visa to Mr. Arafat and that the host country has the duty of discharging its obligations under the Headquarters Agreement.

The result of the vote in the Sixth Committee yesterday on the draft resolution now contained in document A/43/900 is striking proof of the international unanimity on the need to abide by international obligations. International law is the legal consecration of international unanimity. It is not mere words. That is why it is up to the host country to make a serious contribution to solving the problem of the Middle East, the core of which is the problem of Palestine. It is not by silencing the PLO that that goal will be attained - particularly since the PLO is gaining increasing international support. The family of nations has recognized it as the sole and authentic representative of the Palestinian people.

In conclusion, I ask the host country to heed the unanimous opinion of the international community and reconsider its decision to deny Mr. Yasser Arafat the right to enter United States territory.

The General Assembly is being tested. It is up to the Assembly to meet that test by asking the host country to reconsider its decision and abide by its international obligations.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): In accordance with General Assembly resolution 3237 (XXIX), adopted on 22 November 1974, I now call on the Observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO)): One would never have thought that the host country would venture once again to violate its international legal obligations. After all, this Assembly, through lengthy debates during the months from December to June, was involved in yet another violation - or another attempted violation - by the host country. The result should really have brought the message that the international community does respect obligations and those who really respect their obligations. Unfortunately the host country has once again embarked on a violation, hoping to use misinformation, at least, in order to justify that attempt at violating its international legal obligations.

I say "misinformation", because on 26 November 1988 a statement by the Secretary of State on the visa application of Mr. Yasser Arafat reads:

"On November 24" - I repeat, November 24 - "1988 we received an application from Mr. Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the PLO, for a visa to attend the United Nations General Assembly session in New York City as an invitee."

The fact is that the application was presented through the usual course on 8 November, and not 24 November. But there is something really striking in the statement of the Secretary of State of the United States: he does admit that the visa was applied for so that the Chairman of the PLO could attend the United Nations General Assembly session in New York as an invitee. Chairman Arafat and the Palestine Liberation Organization would, of course, have loved to come as tourists to this country.

But there is something much more significant: the General Assembly, on 22 November 1974, extended an invitation to the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in the sessions and the work of the General Assembly in the capacity of observer. Thus we see that, from the very start of this manipulation, the Government of the United States has been trying to misinform the public. It may be that this is nothing new, but in this particular case it was not stating the facts.

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

The Palestine Liberation Organization informed the Committee on Relations with the Host Country on 23 November that on 8 November an application had been sent for visas for Chairman Yasser Arafat and a number of his colleagues in the Palestine Liberation Organization. The announcement was made in public and definitely nobody commented, but apparently nobody from the United States had been in touch with the Secretary-General to tell him that there was a point of dispute here.

We do know that it is the duty of the host country under the Headquarters Agreement to inform the Secretary-General that it sees some disputable point. But we were informed again that there was no such contact until the passport was presented again - not on 24 November but on 25 November. We all know that we were celebrating Thanksgiving Day on 24 November, so it would have been stupid of us to go and wait for a turkey outside the Embassy in Tunis. Be that as it may, the application was made on 25 November.

The matter was again brought before the Committee on Relations with the Host Country. Lengthy deliberations were held, which should have spared this General Assembly the cost of spending a few hours to restate what was stated there. However, if you will permit me, Mr. President, I shall quote from the statement made by the Chairman of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country when he summed up out the deliberations:

"The vast majority of speakers were of the opinion that the denial of the application for a visa by Mr. Arafat is a violation" - "is a violation" - "of the United States obligations under the Headquarters Agreement. In this regard those speakers concurred with the statement issued by the Secretary-General and the President of the General Assembly."

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

Permit me to express our gratitude to your goodself, Sir, and to the Secretary-General for having taken the position to defend the United Nations, to defend respect for the law.

There is nothing new here. What I have said about the application, and so on, was confirmed by the statement made by the Legal Counsel, Mr. Fleischhauer. He confirms exactly that the application was made on 8 November. I only wish that his statement were already a document before the members of the Assembly, and we hope that eventually it will be.

Let us try to find out something beyond this. Let me express, through you, Mr. President, our thanks to the Member States which yesterday in the Sixth Committee expressed a clear-cut opinion: 121 endorsed the position taken by the Committee on Relations with the Host Country, namely, that a violation had been committed by the host country and - and this is very important - that the host country should be "convicted" of violating the Agreement.

Everybody speaks about wasting money, resources and so on, but here the Government of the United States, the host country, is forcing the Assembly to spend so many hours somehow to redress some injustices brought about as a result of violations of the Headquarters Agreement.

We believe that the General Assembly is duty-bound not to permit the decision taken by the host country to violate its international legal obligations and deny freedom of access to United Nations Headquarters to any Member or invitee. That decision of the United States should not be construed as a precedent. The freedom of action and the performance and discharge of the functions of this body should not be frustrated or sabotaged by the manipulations of the host country, the other party to the Headquarters Agreement.

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

A situation has been created - dare I say, maliciously? - whereby the discharge of our responsibilities and duties has been frustrated, but on this once-in-a-life-time occasion in this Organization - I repeat, this once-in-a-life-time occasion in this Organization - an alternative should be sought, with the provision that the General Assembly will not acquiesce in such manipulations. As people of faith, let us hope that the host country will reconsider its arbitrary decision and reverse it. There is no harm in hoping, especially since a time limit has been fixed.

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

Let us give the host country time to meditate and consult on whether it still wishes to be the culprit in such a case as this. After all, credibility and respect for obligations are basic principles in relations between parties to any agreement, all the more so in agreements between the United States and the international community, as represented by the United Nations.

I can give an assurance that Chairman Arafat will not be prevented from delivering the message of peace and the plan for a realistic and concrete approach for its achievement and the ending of the bloody conflict. The United States will not be allowed to prevent Chairman Arafat or the PLO from bringing that message to this lofty body, be it here or somewhere else. The General Assembly will accord Chairman Arafat the proper welcome, listen to him and express its support for, and identification with, the peace plan endorsed by the Palestine National Council at its meeting in Algiers in November this year.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to draw the attention of the Assembly to a correction in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution which has been pointed out by the Rapporteur. Paragraph 3 should begin as follows:
(spoke in English)

"Considers that this decision ...", instead of "Considers that the decision ...".

(continued in Spanish)

In accordance with General Assembly resolution 477 (V) adopted on 1 November 1950, I call upon the representative of the League of Arab States.

Mr. EL-FARRA (League of Arab States) (interpretation from Arabic): Allow me first to express to the General Assembly, and to all other bodies of the United Nations, our thanks and gratitude for the increasing role they are playing to preserve the concept of the United Nations and to uphold its Charter and the Agreement concluded with the host country, as well as to protect the right of all States, organizations and national liberation movements to designate their representatives to participate in General Assembly sessions.

I have come from Tunisia to hear Mr. Yasser Arafat speak on behalf of the people of Palestine in the deliberations on the question of Palestine here in the General Assembly. I even intended to convey, on behalf of the League of Arab States, our thanks and gratitude to the United States of America, its President, Government and people for the protection granted to Mr. Yasser Arafat. I was preparing to praise the United States for having safeguarded the tradition stemming from the heritage - of which the American people is justly proud - enshrined in the Constitution of the United States. Freedom of speech, or of the press, and the right peaceably to assemble - those are all values that inspired the Founding Fathers of the United States of America.

I was even preparing to express thanks for the demonstrated willingness of the United States to protect those rights.

Unfortunately, when I was at London airport on my way to New York, I was surprised to learn of the decision taken by the host country to deny the entry visa requested by Mr. Yasser Arafat, in violation of its international legal commitments under the terms of the Headquarters Agreement.

Everyone knows about the events that followed, but never could we have imagined that such events could occur. Indeed, we have always considered the United States to be a powerful State having special responsibilities as the host country; we believed that it would not allow Israel, the aggressor State, to deny

(Mr. El-Farra, League of Arab States)

the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) the right to take part in the deliberations on the question of Palestine in this international Organization.

Our opinion is shared by the entire world, including the American people, known for its courageous stand with regard to the protection of human rights, and by the mass media, to which I should like here to pay tribute and to thank for their objective coverage of the events, as well as the media of the entire world.

The whole world has rejected the American position. The Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, has himself expressed regret at the American attitude, which is not in keeping with United States obligations as the host country; and the Under-Secretary-General has pointed out the illegality of the refusal to grant a visa.

The Secretary-General of the League of Arab States, Mr. Chedli Klibi, has called it an "attempt to stifle the voice of peace". The overwhelming majority of States, peoples and Governments have condemned this action.

The Sixth Committee, the Legal Committee, has submitted the draft resolution - now before the Assembly - which was adopted by an overwhelming majority, with only the United States and Israel voting against it, and the United Kingdom abstaining.

It is not in the interests of the United States, which has a very special responsibility vis-à-vis the United Nations, to yield to pressure by the Zionist lobby, and thereby reject the appeal of the international community to hear the views of Mr. Yasser Arafat. By this action, the United States has its bias in favour of only one party, Israel.

Is the United States aware that, by their decision, it has in effect transferred the conflict to the forces of moderation in the Arab world, that is, their friends in the region, and to the forces of moderation in Palestine itself, represented by Mr. Yasser Arafat?

(Mr. El-Farra, League of Arab States)

How are we to understand this United States action, other than by concluding that Arab moderation is costly and subject to sanctions, whereas Israeli extremism has its rewards?

If the United States Government wishes to be associated with Israeli policy - a policy that sacrifices moderation to extremism and allows Israel to perpetuate its occupation and its expansionist policy - is that in keeping with United States interests?

The decision taken by the United States Government deals a severe blow to the efforts for peace and to the policy of moderation; it is an affront to those Arabs who have wagered on an effective and a constructive participation by the United States of America. That is the effect of the unfortunate position taken by Mr. George Shultz.

(Mr. El Farra, League of Arab States)

At a time when the international community, including the United States, is working towards genuine peace in the region, by its actions the United States is helping Israel turn away from the peace-making efforts and disregard the resolutions that led to its creation.

It is ironic that the United States should put out the red carpet for the terrorist Shamir and welcome him to Washington DC, its capital, as though proud of his continuing use of terrorism against the people of Palestine, yet make it impossible for Mr. Yasser Arafat to visit United Nations Headquarters.

Mr. Arafat's resistance against Israeli occupation is exactly the same as Washington's resistance against British occupation. George Washington's statue in the capital of the United States symbolizes the winning of independence through action and struggle, for it cannot be gained through mere wishes.

It has too often been said that the history of the Palestinian cause is one of lost opportunities. But is it not true that opportunities have been lost because of obstacles placed in the way of the Palestinians? The American decision is yet another such obstacle. It was Mr. Arafat's desire to dispel any doubts that existed with regard to the decisions taken at the Algiers Conference. And it was George Schultz's desire to create another lost opportunity through a conspiracy of silence against the Palestinians. We are convinced he will not be allowed to get away with this.

Mr. OKUN (United States of America): The United States takes its responsibility as host country most seriously. My Government has routinely granted visas to other members of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) who would otherwise be ineligible for entry under American law, thus ensuring that the PLO's view can be heard before the United Nations. My Government consequently does not agree with the tone or substance of the draft resolution and will vote against it.

(Mr. Okun, United States)

The United States set forth its reasons for denying Mr. Arafat a visa at length at the 51st meeting of the Sixth Committee and at the 28 November meeting of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country. We consider these reasons compelling and we stand by the decision.

Briefly put, the denial of a visa to Mr. Arafat is an action fully consistent with the Headquarters Agreement between the United States and the United Nations, and this includes our right to protect our national security, established precedent thereunder and the widely recognized inherent right of any host State to protect its national security.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The positions of delegations regarding the recommendation of the Sixth Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records. I would remind members that under paragraph 7 of decision 34/401 the General Assembly agreed that

"When the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, i.e., either in the Committee or in plenary meeting unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee".

Before calling on the first speaker in explanation of vote before the vote, I should like to inform members that regarding paragraph 5 of the draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 6 of its report (A/43/900), it has been proposed that the date to be inserted in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution should be 1 December 1988.

If I hear no objection I shall take it that the proposal is accepted by the Assembly.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): We have accordingly agreed that the date specified in paragraph 5 is 1 December 1988.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote.

May I remind delegations that in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. NOGUEIRA BATISTA (Brazil): In connection with the consideration of the report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country (A/43/900), I should like to place it on record that Brazil is prepared to support fully the draft resolution contained in that report, the adoption of which has been recommended by the Sixth Committee to the General Assembly.

The collective concern and the request expressed in the draft resolution were individually expressed two days ago by Brazil in a press communiqué released in Brasilia on 28 November. The text of that press communiqué reads as follows:

"Brazil has learned with concern that the United States Government has denied an entry visa to Mr. Yasser Arafat, leader of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), who intends to address the General Assembly of the United Nations.

"As is known and according to resolution 3237 (XXIX) of the General Assembly (1974), the PLO has observer status at the United Nations and enjoys the corresponding rights. The raising of an obstacle that makes it impossible for its leader to speak before the General Assembly is a threat not only to the observer's rights but also to the freedom of speech, which is the essence of this highest international forum.

"The Brazilian Government cannot but regret the decision of denying a visa to the Palestinian leader and expresses its hope that this decision is

(Mr. Nogueira Batista, Brazil)

reviewed in order that it may conform to the legal obligations assumed by the host country".

Let us hope that the competent United States authorities will take seriously into account the collective appeal of the General Assembly which is about to be voiced and that as a consequence those authorities will find themselves in a position to grant Mr. Arafat the entry visa that would allow the General Assembly to hear the PLO Chairman at the United Nations Headquarters in New York.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 6 of its report (A/43/900).

A roll-call vote has been requested.

A roll-call vote was taken.

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, 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, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, 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 Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The draft resolution was adopted by 151 votes to 2, with one abstention (resolution 43/48).*

*Subsequently the delegation of Paraguay advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

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

Mr. TARUI (Japan): My delegation is of the view that, in the light of the close co-operative relations between the United States as the host country and the United Nations since the establishment of the United Nations, it would have been desirable that certain parts of the resolution just adopted be worded more appropriately. However, we regret that the Chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organization has been denied an opportunity to address this session of the General Assembly, and we therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I now call on the representative of Greece who will speak on behalf of the Member States of the European Economic Community.

Mr. ROUKOUNAS (Greece): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the 12 member States of the European Community in explanation of vote on the resolution which has just been adopted. The Twelve have taken note with concern of the refusal by the United States Government to grant an entry visa to Mr. Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organization in order to visit United Nations Headquarters and address the General Assembly on the question of Palestine.

The Twelve believe that, in accordance with the Headquarters Agreement and the opinion of the Legal Counsel of the United Nations, Mr. Arafat should be allowed to address the United Nations General Assembly in New York.

The Twelve are also firmly of the opinion that at this crucial stage of the situation regarding the Middle East it would be important not to hinder the role of the United Nations as a forum before which a leader of a party to the dispute would express his views on the matter. Moreover, the Twelve feel it is necessary to

(Mr. Roukounas, Greece)

maintain and encourage the momentum created by the recent decisions of the National Palestine Council. The Twelve call upon the United States Government to review the legal arguments and reconsider its decision.

Sir Crispin TICKELL (United Kingdom): The Permanent Representative of Greece, speaking on behalf of the twelve member States of the European Community, has expressed my delegation's position on the matter before the Assembly.

My delegation has additionally had occasion to express its views both in the Committee on Relations with the Host Country two days ago and in the Sixth Committee yesterday. Here I shall restate briefly some of the points to which we attach special importance.

I wish to make clear that, in the view of the British Government, Mr. Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization, should have been allowed to come to the United Nations Headquarters in New York. This is the legal obligation of the United States. My delegation endorses the opinion given on this matter by the United Nations Legal Counsel.

But, just as we believe that the United States should show respect for the United Nations, so we believe that the United Nations should show respect for the United States. This mutual respect should have been reflected in the language of the resolution just adopted by the Assembly.

We took the trouble yesterday to work out language which would, without affecting the substance of the draft, have enabled my delegation to vote for it. Unfortunately the authors of the draft were not ready to accept our suggestions. We have therefore abstained.

Mr. FORTIER (Canada): Canada has voted in favour of the resolution just adopted to register its concern at the decision taken by the host country on 26 November 1988. Canada's first priority, which corresponds to the first concrete

(Mr. Fortier, Canada)

step being considered in this resolution, is to determine whether the United States would reconsider its decision.

In that regard we wish to point out for the record that we have some reservations about the language in the resolution. In particular we find that the language used in operative paragraphs 2 and 3 could have been more constructively formulated.

Mr. BOREHAM (Australia): Australia has voted in favour of the resolution which the General Assembly has just adopted. Australia is in agreement with the principles expressed in the resolution. However, Australia would have preferred that the word "Deplores" had not been used in operative paragraph 2.

The Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade, Senator Gareth Evans, said in the Australian Parliament on 28 November that:

"The Australian Government regrets the decision of the United States Administration to refuse a visa to PLO Chairman, Yasser Arafat, to enable him to address the current session of the United Nations General Assembly."

Australia believes that it would have been more appropriate to use the word "Regrets" in this context. Australia also has reservations about the appropriateness of the General Assembly adopting the language contained in the fifth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3 concerning interpretation of the Headquarters Agreement.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): In the light of paragraph 5 of the resolution just adopted, the Assembly will remain seized of this matter. Bearing in mind that item 137 remains under consideration by the Sixth Committee, I should like to reiterate that in principle it is anticipated that the General Assembly will consider this question again on Friday, 2 December, if necessary.

AGENDA ITEM 36 (continued)

POLICIES OF APARTHEID OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA:

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

Mr. MATNAI (Israel): For many years now, a steady flow of representatives from the State of Israel has come up to this rostrum and expressed Israel's categorical rejection of South Africa's system of apartheid. Today, I join my predecessors in once again voicing Israel's total opposition to and rejection of apartheid. We condemn it as we condemn racism in all its forms. It is an expression of man's cruelest inhumanity. It is a moral evil of the first order. It has no place in our world. It should be eradicated whenever and wherever it surfaces.

The State of Israel and its citizens are particularly sensitive to this issue. Just over 40 years ago, 6 million Jews, one third of the world's Jewish population, were murdered in the furnaces of Nazi death camps because of Nazi racism. They were slaughtered for one reason only - because they were Jews. And

(Mr. Matnai, Israel)

even prior to this darkest hour in human history, the Jewish people had suffered for centuries the anguish of persecution and oppression as a result of racism.

This painful historical experience has shaped our unequivocal repudiation of South Africa's apartheid system as well as all other forms of racial discrimination around the world. In Jerusalem, our Parliament - the Knesset - has adopted a number of anti-apartheid resolutions. The Government of Israel and its leaders, past and present, have issued solemn declarations protesting against apartheid. Our representatives around the world have signed joint communiqués with African leaders reiterating our opposition to apartheid, and on numerous occasions we have spoken out and made our position clear before various organs and agencies of the United Nations.

In recent years, the Government of Israel has taken further steps. It has instituted a number of measures and sanctions against South Africa, in line with the policies adopted by the majority of Western democracies. Since March 1987, when these measures were implemented, the Government of Israel has continued to curtail its relations with South Africa. Briefly stated, these measures include: a ban on investments in South Africa; severance of all cultural ties with organizations in South Africa which are connected in any way whatsoever with the apartheid régime - most recently Israel punished Israeli sportsmen who took part in sports events in South Africa; a ban on all scientific co-operation; no promotion of tourism; and a ban on the use of Israeli ports for transit to and from South Africa.

In addition, the Government of Israel has established a special fund to foster the implementation of Israel-based training programmes for representatives of the black community of South Africa in such fields as education, culture and social development.

(Mr. Matnai, Israel)

It is also important to note that the ties between Israel and the black community in South Africa have been strengthened. The Histadrut, Israel's General Federation of Labour, ordered its companies and conglomerates to sever their ties with South Africa and to develop links with black African trade unions. By the end of 1988, Israel will have received more than 100 black African trainees who will have taken part in various courses in the fields of co-operative development at the Afro-Asian Institute and at the Mount Carmel Centre for Community Development. The most recent is an important course being held now, called "The Role of People's Organizations in Community National Development", intended for 25 students from the black community of South Africa. Israel is one of the very few countries that carry out such constructive courses and trainings. We call on all nations to follow suit and create such courses in their respective countries.

Moreover, in keeping with the tradition of past years, a number of prominent black leaders from South Africa visited Israel in the course of 1988. Israel was again one of the very few countries that protested to the South African authorities against their attempt to silence the voice of the opposition Weekly Mail. The editor deemed it necessary to thank Israel for its action.

Israel is confident that these concrete measures will continue to contribute substantially to the international struggle against apartheid and will serve to encourage peace and harmony among all sectors of the South African population. The Government of Israel is also ready to co-operate with other countries to promote training programmes for representatives of the black community of South Africa.

Israel is therefore on the right path in taking major steps towards fighting apartheid, and it will implement further steps in this direction in the future.

(Mr. Matnai, Israel)

We are thankful to those members of the Special Committee against Apartheid that finally saw and mentioned the positive steps taken by Israel. However, I cannot help but make a few observations about what has become an annual ritual during this debate. Ostensibly we are gathered here to discuss the troubling issue of apartheid, but this highly important objective is constantly prejudiced by the recurring tendency to abuse this debate by scurrilous and unwarranted attacks against my country. We are once again honoured by a special report and a special resolution which falsely accuse Israel of special links to South Africa. As long as the Special Committee does not see fit finally to decide that there is no place for discrimination, for singling-out, for name-calling and for outright falsification, we are duty-bound to request Member States to oppose draft resolutions relating to relations between Israel and South Africa, and any draft resolution that cynically singles out Israel.

Since the start of this debate a number of Arab delegations, predictably, have made a number of claims that supposedly shed light on the so-called unique relationship between Israel and South Africa. We have been accused ad nauseam of having links with South Africa; this is all fabricated and false. Never mind that not one of these charges has ever been proven to be true; the truth counts for little in this debate.

The most regrettable result of the Arab campaign to discredit Israel is felt by those nations that are struggling against apartheid. Arab attacks against Israel only serve to trivialize the battle against apartheid. To the Arab representatives who have accused Israel, who have manipulated the issue in search of political capital, the issue of apartheid is merely another propaganda ploy in their escalating campaign against my country.

But there is light at the end of the tunnel. As each year passes it becomes clearer that the Arab campaign to drive a wedge between Israel and black Africa is

(Mr. Matnai, Israel)

failing. Various Arab nations are discovering that Africa cannot be led astray by distorted facts, convenient travesties of the truth and outright lies. Arab falsehoods are slowly being exposed. Publicly, Arab countries are finding it increasingly difficult to influence African countries not to renew ties with Israel. Privately, African representatives are simply fed up with the cynical manipulation of the issue of apartheid by some Arab countries for reasons of political expediency.

In previous debates my delegation has addressed and refuted each and every allegation made against us. Our trade with South Africa is miniscule - less than 1 per cent, according to the International Monetary Fund (IMF). And the Secretary-General himself has confirmed that the notion of nuclear collaboration between Israel and South Africa is preposterous. My delegation has also addressed the issue of so-called Afro-Arab solidarity. We have pointed out in previous statements the record of the Arab slave trade in Africa and its enduring legacy. We have informed Member States of Libya's successful efforts to recruit PLO and other Arab mercenaries to assist in Libya's war against Chad. Last year the Chadian representative confirmed the use of PLO terrorists in Libya's war against his country.

In previous debates my delegation has also focused on the extensive oil trade between some Arab nations and South Africa. Constant efforts by certain Arab Governments to conceal their own trade with South Africa in order to guarantee immunity from public exposure have played a major role in the Arab campaign to inflate Israel's alleged relations with South Africa.

Last year and the year before we prepared an extensive report on this oil trade. Our sources were beyond reproach - the Shipping Research Bureau, a Netherlands-based anti-apartheid organization, and the Lloyd's of London shipping

(Mr. Matnai, Israel)

register. The results of our investigation were mind-boggling: from 1980 to 1984 Arab oil exports to South Africa amounted to nearly \$US 10 billion. Since our last report the Shipping Research Bureau has issued a new report, dated September 1988. Its research shows that nothing has changed. It clearly indicates that in an eight-year period, from 1979 to 1987, more than 50 million tons of crude oil were delivered from the Persian Gulf to South Africa. This is, of course, in direct violation of the embargo against South Africa.

My delegation also wishes to bring to the attention of Member States the report of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa (A/43/44). In it a number of Arab countries are singled out for their complicity in shipping oil to South Africa.

Regrettably, such disturbing facts do not seem to matter. Israel continues to be a scapegoat. It is singled out for activity it has never engaged in. It is judged by double-standard criteria.

Apartheid is too great an evil to be cynically manipulated through a campaign of defamation and slander, perpetrated as a tool of obsessive hatred against my country. Instead, there should be unity for the benefit of all mankind in a common effort to wipe out apartheid and all other forms of discrimination and intolerance that plague our world.*

Mr. JAYA (Brunei Darussalam): The philosophy of apartheid categorizes people on the basis of colour, of skin pigment, and leads to a firm belief that the white minority in South Africa is qualified by virtue of its colour to rule a country, while the majority blacks live in segregated areas and mostly in

*Mr. Branco (Sao Tome and Principe), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Jaya, Brunei Darussalam)

deplorable conditions. It is a system of inhuman repression of the blacks, a system that is an insult to the human race and should have been abolished long ago.

Yet each year members present in this Assembly have had to address the issue, and indeed this year is no exception. We have adopted resolution after resolution condemning the evil policies of the apartheid régime and have consistently voiced our solidarity with the oppressed people in South Africa. Everything that has to be said about the issue has been said. However, we must remind ourselves that we must never let our guard down, for to do so would only prolong and strengthen the stubbornness and arrogance of the apartheid régime. We must never regard our debates on this issue as mere rituals, for we strongly believe that the international community has a moral responsibility to ensure that justice prevails. The black population must be allowed to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and to decide for themselves their own future.

Even as we speak, the suffering people of South Africa continue to be subjected to the Draconian measures imposed by the tyrannical régime. In June this year the Pretoria régime renewed the state of emergency for another 12 months. This is yet another clear illustration of the fact that the régime is adamant in its policy of "apartheid now, apartheid for ever".

Atrocities are also being perpetrated not only against the blacks in South Africa but also against the people of neighbouring independent African front-line States. My delegation is fully conscious that apartheid is not a problem merely of South Africa; the racist and aggressive policies of the Pretoria régime have seriously undermined the peace and security of the southern Africa region and threatened international peace and security.

Brunei Darussalam's opposition to apartheid has been unswerving, and I stand here again today to restate our consistent and unequivocal condemnation of apartheid in all its forms and manifestations. The Foreign Minister of Brunei

(Mr. Jaya, Brunei Darussalam)

Darussalam, in his statement during the general debate last month in this very Hall, called upon the international community to continue to apply political and economic pressure on South Africa so that its apartheid policy may be dismantled. We will remain steadfast in our position until the abhorrent system is brought to an end. Only by the complete abolition of the system will the triumph of the oppressed people of South Africa in their courageous struggle be realized.

In conclusion, my delegation would like to commend the admirable commitment and tireless efforts of the Special Committee against Apartheid, under the chairmanship of Mr. Joseph N. Garba, to achieve our noble aim. We must intensify our actions against this abhorrent system and alleviate the suffering of our fellow men.

Mr. TEEHANKKEE (Philippines): In a week from now, we will be celebrating the fortieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. For 40 years now, the Declaration has stood as the corner-stone of all human rights instruments painstakingly drafted and adopted by our Organization to serve as the pillars supporting the noble principles and objectives enshrined in the United Nations Charter.

It cannot be gainsaid that over the years the principles outlined in the Declaration have inspired - as they continue to inspire - the adoption of national constitutions and laws and international conventions that have ensured respect for man's fundamental rights and the dignity of the human person, after the genocide and moral outrage of the Second World War.

While this achievement could well serve as the basis for a meaningful celebration of the Declaration's anniversary, we are saddened by the glaring fact that in its 40 years of existence, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights has not been allowed to touch and dignify the lives of the oppressed black people of South Africa because of the inhuman imposition of apartheid by their Government.

For so many years now, the black South Africans have suffered immeasurably from the evil grip of apartheid, the institutionalized system of racial discrimination perpetrated by the racist régime in Pretoria in order to maintain the supremacy of the white minority in the country.

As far as the South African Government is concerned, the fundamental human rights embodied in the Declaration should not be enjoyed by its black people simply because they are black - in defiant mockery of the lofty ideals and principles that the United Nations was organized and stands for.

It seems that the issue of the universally condemned apartheid policy of South Africa has been considered by this august body for an eternity. Every year, almost

(Mr. Teehankee, Philippines)

since the birth of the United Nations, debates have been held and resolutions and decisions adopted to put an end to this brutal policy. So long has this question been on the agenda of the General Assembly that many have increasingly expressed the apprehension that the debates have become a routine annual exercise in futility.

The Philippines shares the view of many others, however, that our debates express the unyielding determination of the Member States of this Organization to fight and banish apartheid, which has no place and cannot be tolerated in a civilized society.

The Member States must muster the strong political will, over and above all political and economic and other extraneous considerations, in order to win this battle against oppression, injustice and man's inhumanity.

Since last year's debate on this item, the situation in South Africa has seriously deteriorated. The régime has escalated its repressive acts against the long-aggrieved opponents of apartheid. The state of emergency, which has claimed many lives and sent thousands of people, including children, to gaol, has again been extended. Under the cover of emergency, South African authorities have openly returned to their policy of large-scale forced removals of the black population designed to perfect their plan of consolidating what they call the "homelands". In order to suppress news of all these atrocities, severe restrictions have been imposed on the media, both foreign and domestic. Separate elections for whites and blacks have been held, all aimed at depriving the indigenous African majority of their fundamental rights.

The list is long, endless. Shall there be no end to the struggle of black South Africans for freedom and equality? Shall peace continue to evade the hapless black people of South Africa and the region?

It is time to cast aside those false hopes brought about by Pretoria's promised reforms, which are but transparent acts of appeasement.

(Mr. Teehankee, Philippines)

It is time to realize that persuasion will not work, as events have shown. It is time to give greater consideration to respect for basic human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all men without distinction as to race, colour, sex, or religion, than to diamonds, uranium, coal, gold and other precious metals.

The Philippines firmly believes that the time for the exercise of the needed strong political will to fight and vanquish apartheid is now. The international community is left with one peaceful means to force the rulers in Pretoria to abolish apartheid, and that is the imposition of mandatory and comprehensive sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter.

We appeal to the members of the Security Council to meet their responsibilities in this regard. Only the imposition of mandatory and comprehensive sanctions against South Africa will make the régime in that country understand that its continued and unjustifiable defiance of the United Nations resolutions condemning its apartheid policy will be tolerated no longer.

Mr. MOHIUDDIN (Bangladesh): That at this time and age the worth of men and women should be determined by the colour of their skin is a shameful commentary on our generation.

It is even more reprehensible that the global community should allow the continued perpetration of this vile injustice in silence and without protest.

Apartheid is an odious system that must be dismantled. It boggles our mind to think that there are many today to whom this state of affairs is acceptable. It saddens our hearts to perceive that there are still many who believe that reforms can invest the system with respectability.

That cannot happen. Apartheid cannot be reformed. It must be abolished in its entirety. Otherwise it will keep gnawing at the body politic of humanity like a malignant cancer. If Pretoria will not do it by itself, the world must force its hands.

(Mr. Mohiuddin, Bangladesh)

Every delayed hour means added pain. Every delayed day means more suffering. I speak not just of the thousands of Mandelas languishing in incarceration in South African gaols; I speak of the whole nation that is in prison. We cannot deny them justice by indefinitely delaying it. Evil unchallenged is evil condoned.

The United Nations Charter embodies the aspirations of our generation. It must therefore strengthen our faith in the most cherished ideal of our age - that all men are created equal. This is by no means a value to which Pretoria subscribes. We have reasoned with South Africa. We have argued with it. We have cajoled it, pleaded with it. We have left no peaceful non-violent means untried, save one - that is, comprehensive mandatory sanctions. Could there be more appropriate circumstances for the implementation of action under Chapter VII than these?

(Mr. Mohiuddin, Bangladesh)

To our mind, there are at least four critical areas in which we must desist from all contacts with South Africa:

First, we must all, without exception, refrain from supplying South Africa with equipment and technology, which, whatever their stated purpose, would enhance its military capability. Such dual-purpose items as computers, radar and electronic equipment, must be included.

Secondly, essential commodities, such as oil and gas, that will shore up the régime, must not be provided. Business concerns must be rewarded for complying with this. The Special Committee against Apartheid should exercise the utmost vigilance, so that if there are any unethical trading houses seeking to reap benefits from this, they are internationally exposed.

Thirdly, all financial flows into South Africa, whether they be investments, credits, or loans, both private and governmental, must cease. We applaud the spirit of those who have stopped lending to South Africa.

Fourthly, human interaction with South Africa, such as sporting contacts or visits should be reduced to a minimum. The psychological pressure of isolation is great. I have no doubt that this would contribute to the achievement of our goals.

It has been argued that such measures would increase the sufferings of the black majority. The majority appear to believe that they are willing to undergo the hardship for the sake of a future life of dignity and honour. They are indeed right. I come from a nation, Bangladesh, which paid a heavy price in sweat, blood and tears for its freedom. It has not regretted it. The sacrifice will make the freedom earned dearer still.

Bangladesh adds its voice to the unequivocal demand that Pretoria release immediately all prisoners, detainees and persons subject to restrictions. The media must be allowed to report objectively. All discriminatory laws must be

(Mr. Mohiuddin, Bangladesh)

abrogated, and all workers granted trade union rights. The bantustan structure should be eradicated. Marauding South African troops in southern Angola should be withdrawn. Pretoria must initiate political dialogue with the genuine leaders of the majority of the population for the purpose of establishing a representative Government. South Africa must heed the urgings of the world reflected in the resolutions of the United Nations or be banished from the international community as a despicable pariah.

We urge the minority in South Africa to dissociate themselves from their abhorrent régime. Surely their conscience would be more at peace if they did so. We pledge them our fullest support and co-operation in assisting the development of a harmonious relationship with the majority. That can be done and must be done. It is a challenge all communities in South Africa must take up together, so that together they can peacefully enjoy the blessings of their bountiful land.

South Africa is a blot on our conscience. That is so because of the irrational behavior of a mindless, irresponsible racist régime. The world cannot forever bear that heavy burden of guilt.

It is up to us to act, and act in unison, so that the pressure is removed. Our actions might not bear fruit today, or even tomorrow, but they would contribute to the process, and most of all, we would exonerate ourselves from arraignment before posterity by having really tried.

Mr. VASILYEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The United Nations decided that one of its urgent tasks was to be the elimination of the South African racist régime which is based on the policy of apartheid. Its incompatibility with the principles of universal ethics and international law is clear. The General Assembly has so often reaffirmed, inter alia in its resolution 42/23 C, that apartheid is a crime against mankind and constitutes a threat to international peace and security. But despite the growing

(Mr. Vasilyev, Byelorussian SSR)

indignation of all honest people, apartheid continues to exist. Moreover, an increasing number of victims are falling prey to the terror and repression used by the Pretoria racists in an attempt to suppress the mass demonstrations of the people of southern Africa struggling for their basic human rights.

Only recently the Security Council and other bodies of the United Nations adopted resolutions, decisively condemning the policy and practices of the apartheid régime and the mass arrests and murders committed by the racists, and urgently demanding the release of all political detainees. Those resolutions also emphasize that a just, long-term solution to the South African problem is possible only on the basis of the complete eradication of apartheid and the creation of a unified, multiracial and democratic State.

The whole point of the struggle waged by the patriotic forces of South Africa, first and foremost by their recognized vanguard, the African National Congress, is precisely to build that kind of society.

The report of the Special Committee against Apartheid emphasizes that:

"... the racist régime escalated its repression in South Africa, trying to crush every form of opposition in the country and impose its political designs." (A/43/22, para. 183)

That has been demonstrated by the fact that the Pretoria régime, in February this year, banned the political activities of a number of mass democratic organizations, including the United Democratic Front and the Congress of South African Trade Unions. A number of church leaders were arrested while they were on their way to Parliament to protest against that measure and demand a reversal of the decision. The ban on the activities of democratic opposition organizations has again exposed the true face of the racist South African régime, which has been trying to stifle completely any progressive movement in the country.

(Mr. Vasilyev, Byelorussian SSR)

Those actions of the racist régime were unanimously and resolutely condemned by the overwhelming majority of international community during consideration of that question at the meetings of the Security Council in March this year. They are quite rightly viewed as a new manifestation of political violence, another link in the chain of crimes committed by the racist régime against the people of their own country, and a violation of the generally recognized principles of law and freedom.

The report of the Special Committee against Apartheid, and the statements of representatives at this session, mention many facts attesting to the worsening of the situation in South Africa. The Pretoria régime has renewed and stepped up the state of emergency, extending it to the whole territory of South Africa. As a result, a virtual curfew has been imposed on towns with a coloured population and there is an almost complete ban on press activities. Arbitrary mass arrests have been stepped up, as well as detentions without trial, and the torture and killing of many imprisoned African patriots. However, the mass repression, the violence and the severe restrictions imposed under the continuing state of emergency have not been enough to stifle the people's anger and the protests.

The apartheid régime is considering further legislative measures to force their opponents into complete silence. It has been pointed out many times from this rostrum that the apartheid régime has not only caused enormous suffering to the people of South Africa, but has created a real threat to world peace and international security by conducting a policy of aggression, destabilization and terror against independent African States.

It is no secret that the defiant attitude of the Pretoria régime can be explained primarily by the direct and indirect support provided to it by a number of Western countries and their transnational corporations.

(Mr. Vasilyev, Byelorussian SSR)

Many facts in this regard are contained in the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid. Here I should like to refer to something the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid has said:

"Apartheid is the greatest mockery of mankind's conscience. We can only be surprised that countries that so ably invoke human rights close their eyes to the ugly actions of the régime".

There is no doubt that the collaboration of certain Western countries with the apartheid régime is a main reason for the failure of the efforts of the international community effectively to isolate and boycott that régime. The actions of the racist authorities of Pretoria inside and outside the country make even more urgent the demands of the United Nations, other international organizations and broad international public opinion for the stepping up of political and economic pressure against apartheid. Even the supporters of the apartheid régime now recognize that its end is just a matter of time. The state of emergency and the deepening economic crisis clearly attest to the régime's inability to find a proper political solution to the country's problems.

It is for the United Nations to adopt new, more effective measures to eliminate the dangerous enclave of colonialism, racism and apartheid in southern Africa.

In this connection, my delegation fully supports the growing demands of the international community for the urgent imposition on South Africa of comprehensive mandatory sanctions. We favour strict compliance by all States with the decisions already taken by the Security Council, particularly that imposing a weapons embargo on South Africa.

In keeping with our constant position of principle on the Pretoria régime's criminal policies of apartheid, we strictly comply with the provisions of the

(Mr. Vasilyev, Byelorussian SSR)

well-known international agreement and the decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly that seek to eliminate that shameful phenomenon. Our position of principle on the policy of apartheid is confirmed by the fact that the Byelorussian SSR has sponsored five draft resolutions under this item.

My delegation fully supports the position that the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter would be the most appropriate, effective and peaceful way to eliminate apartheid and to discharge United Nations obligations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security, which is being threatened and violated by the apartheid régime.

The Byelorussian SSR is on the side of the peoples of southern Africa. We favour the attainment of a political settlement. We support the struggle of the people of South Africa for the complete elimination of apartheid and exercise of their right to self-determination in a free, democratic, united and non-racial South Africa.

Mr. TANASIE (Romania): This session of the General Assembly is taking place at a time when significant efforts are being deployed bilaterally and multilaterally to improve the international political climate. The United Nations has an important contribution to make in creating new opportunities for solving disputes, restoring and strengthening peace and increasing hope that confrontation will give way to co-operation.

Unfortunately, such positive evolution is not to be seen in all parts of the world. That is the case with South Africa, where the situation is further deteriorating. The primary cause is certainly the continued existence of apartheid, which the international community has declared a crime against humanity.

(Mr. Tanasie, Romania)

Since the imposition of the state of emergency and other subsequent regulations, there has been a dramatic escalation of the brutal and indiscriminate repression of the black population of that country. Opponents of apartheid, freedom-fighters, leaders and other activists of anti-apartheid organizations have arbitrarily been sent to prison. The South African régime continues its illegal occupation of Namibia and unprovoked acts of aggression against the neighbouring States have been committed.

We are deeply concerned that the system of apartheid is an increasing affront to very basic human rights and a serious threat to international peace and security. The abolition of apartheid has therefore become a primary objective and responsibility of all States Members of the United Nations and the entire international community.

Today it is more evident than ever before that apartheid cannot be reformed; it can only be condemned and totally eradicated in all its forms and manifestations. Peace and stability in South Africa and in the whole region can be guaranteed only through the establishment of a democratic régime based on equality and full and free exercise of adult suffrage by all the people in a united and undivided South Africa.

Romania's position regarding apartheid is well-known. It has been reaffirmed on many occasions in various United Nations and other international forums.

Firm condemnation of the policies and practices of apartheid and militant solidarity with the liberation movements for the realization of peoples' aspirations for a free and dignified life represent the corner-stone of Romania's position on this matter.

In our view, the elimination of racism and apartheid should include appropriate measures to secure full equality of rights and obligations for the

(Mr. Tanasie, Romania)

entire population of that country. It also requires measures aimed at improving the economic, political, social and cultural conditions of that population, in order to remove the grave inequalities in the areas of employment, nutrition, health, housing and education.

We hold the view that the international community in general, and the United Nations in particular, should continue to give highest priority to programmes for combating racist policies and apartheid.

Romania firmly rejects South Africa's so-called reforms, which fall short of the goal of termination of the existing state of emergency. We call for the abolition of the apartheid laws, the dismantling of the bantustans, the lifting of the bans on all political organizations and parties, the release of all political prisoners, and the return of all political exiles and freedom-fighters.

Using all means at its disposal, Romania lends active support to the peoples fighting against apartheid, so that they can fully exercise their right to free and independent development. There is no doubt that eliminating apartheid and ensuring equal rights for all people are imperative requirements of our times. My country is fully convinced that this is the only way to meet the aspirations of the peoples for progress, socio-economic development and peace. Romania has consistently denounced the illegal occupation of Namibia and the repeated aggressions of the racist South African régime against independent African nations, and called for the cessation of such acts and full observance of the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of those nations.

Romania has always paid great attention to the development of relations of friendship and co-operation with the African countries.

(Mr. Tanasie, Romania)

We believe that the abolition of the policies of apartheid and racial discrimination and the creation of conditions to enable peoples in South Africa freely to participate in shaping their own future represent a major international objective that must be duly taken into account in the adoption of effective actions by the United Nations and the international community as a whole.

(Mr. Tanasie, Romania)

We are witnessing an ever-increasing number of United Nations Member States pronouncing themselves in favour of effective measures against the policy of apartheid and supporting the just demand of the African countries for the adoption of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa.

In that respect my delegation would like to state again that Romania does not have any relations with the authorities of South Africa.

Therefore, it seems to us to be quite natural that the international community should continue to give the highest priority to the implementation of programmes adopted by the United Nations for combating racism and apartheid.

Romania believes that in present circumstances it is most important to act energetically for the complete liquidation of the policy of apartheid, which represents defiance of the whole international community and creates a serious danger to world peace and security.

In conclusion, I should like to express again to the people of South Africa Romania's full support for and militant solidarity with their struggle for equality and freedom, and express the conviction that the efforts of the United Nations to achieve the abolition of the anachronistic policy of apartheid will contribute to the attainment of this noble goal and to the elimination of the discrimination against and exploitation of the people in South Africa so that they can fully enjoy their rights to freedom and full equality.

Dame Ann HERCUS (New Zealand): As the Assembly has long acknowledged, apartheid is an abuse which has no parallel. Speaking in the general debate, my Prime Minister recalled that shared abhorrence. No other violation of human rights has united international opinion in the same way. But, regrettably, events over the past year have shown that the South African minority régime continues to cling tenaciously to the apartheid system despite worldwide condemnation.

(Dame Ann Hercus, New Zealand)

South Africa's response to criticism has been predictably negative and unconstructive. Restrictions on freedom of expression, association, movement and the press have been strengthened and widened. The régime has extended the state of emergency yet again, and has proposed legislation to strengthen provisions of the Group Areas Act. Pretoria talks about political evolution. While it has relaxed some insignificant elements of the apartheid law, it has left intact the major pillars of that abhorrent system.

Like others, New Zealand has urged Pretoria to bring the system of apartheid to an end by peaceful means. We have looked in vain for an indication that the South African authorities are prepared to undertake genuine negotiations with credible black leaders. But, instead, the black majority in South Africa remain foreigners in their own land, with no say in their own future. We take heart in continuing efforts by elements in the white community to reach out for peaceful change, in the realization that the status quo cannot continue. But, as shown most recently by the municipal elections, the white minority have yet to acknowledge the injustice of the South African situation and to accept the need to bring the apartheid system to an end. Nelson Mandela, South Africa's most respected leader, remains imprisoned. In July my Prime Minister made a joint statement with the Prime Ministers of Australia and Ireland calling for the unconditional release of Nelson Mandela and for the removal of the ban on the African National Congress. That would act as a clear signal to those who respect freedom and the democratic process that the South African Government is prepared genuinely to take part in a peacefully negotiated settlement.

New Zealand rejects apartheid and all its stands for. We do so on the basis of our experience and beliefs as a multiracial democratic society. The reality is that apartheid must end, leading to the creation of a multiracial State based on

(Dame Ann Hercus, New Zealand)

equality, non-discrimination and mutual respect. The South African authorities will not, however, be dissuaded from their course by words alone. It is clear that only through increasing international pressure on South Africa will that régime face up to the need for change before the situation descends further into violence and bloodshed. The international community has a responsibility to bring home to the South African régime the need for change. International pressure is most likely to be effective when measures are targeted and can be accepted and carried out by all countries.

New Zealand looks to join with other countries in efforts to bring an end to apartheid. We regard economic sanctions as an effective means of maintaining and increasing pressure. New Zealand has already implemented all the measures recommended by the Commonwealth, and carries out all measures adopted by the Security Council, whether mandatory or voluntary. Indeed, as a result of sanctions implemented in April 1987, New Zealand's imports from South Africa in the period 1987 to 1988 have been substantially reduced. New Zealand remains committed to the application of whatever further measures are agreed by the Commonwealth or the United Nations. We have been pleased in particular to work as an active participant in the Intergovernmental Group on the oil embargo. We look for an improvement in the effectiveness of the embargo on this trade, which is of such importance to South Africa.

Among other activities, the Nassau accord of 1985 established the foundation for current Commonwealth action against apartheid. The 1987 Okanagan statement and programme of action on southern Africa provided further direction. New Zealand commends the work of the Commonwealth Committee of Foreign Ministers, established to provide leadership in pursuing Commonwealth goals in South Africa. Among these is the wider, tighter and more intensified application of economic and other measures.

(Dame Ann Hercus, New Zealand)

We look for effective action by more countries if the prospect for real change in South Africa is not to remain bleak. The burden of those actions is, in our view, for the international community as a whole to share. We can expect South Africa to take every step to protect its position. It has, for example, scorned the voices of reason and moderation - such as those of the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group. Instead it has chosen to pour vast resources into propaganda in an attempt to present South Africa under apartheid in a favourable light.

Moreover, Pretoria's response to protest by its neighbours has included repeated armed attacks upon their territorial integrity, as well as economic destabilization. For example, assassinations directed against the African National Congress are a deplorable aspect of Pretoria's terrorist campaign. The New Zealand Government does not condone violence in the struggle against apartheid but, in the light of continuing provocation by the South African régime and the inherent violence of apartheid, we understand the frustrations of those who seek a just and democratic society in South Africa.

Similarly, we are concerned at the grave situation in southern Africa, the result of a calculated policy of destabilization against the front-line States.

(Dame Ann Hercus, New Zealand)

The plight of neighbouring countries such as Mozambique has rightly come to be a focus of international concern and we are encouraged by the increasing willingness of the international community to assist countries in the region.

To conclude, we reject utterly South Africa's policy of apartheid. We will continue to show that opposition in various practical ways. We renew our commitment to work with other members of the international community to bring apartheid to an end.

Mr. NOGUEIRA-BATISTA (Brazil): Since last year's debate on the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa certain developments in the southern African region have given reason for optimism. First and foremost, the start of the implementation in the near future of the belated independence process for Namibia appears now to have become a distinct and concrete possibility. A lessening of tension between South Africa and the front-line States seems also to be detectable. These are events that point in a positive direction and that it is hoped will confirm a lasting trend.

It is clear that progress in the peace process in southern Africa will not by itself bring about any fundamental change in what is the root cause of tension in South Africa itself and in the area: the ignominious apartheid régime.

Despite isolated positive events, such as the commutation of the death sentences of the Sharpeville Six, the situation in South Africa, in which since 1985 the people have been living under a protracted state of emergency, has in fact continued to deteriorate. In February the régime severely restricted the activities of 17 leading anti-apartheid organizations and 18 community leaders. It also limited the activities of the largest trade union federation in the country.

(Mr. Nogueira-Batista, Brazil)

Acts of violence continue to be perpetrated by the South African authorities, including forced removals of the black population and detention without charge of individuals who oppose apartheid.

The Brazilian delegation's view coincides with that expressed by the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid that significant political measures will have to be adopted by the South African authorities to ensure opportunities for the majority black population to express its views freely and to participate effectively in the political life of their country. That would be possible only through a broad and representative dialogue with authentic black leaders and would require, inter alia, the lifting of the state of emergency, the release of all political prisoners, the removal of the bans on political organizations and the ending of repressive policies and violent practices.

Brazil believes that the international community should continue to exert pressure to induce the Government of South Africa to eradicate apartheid completely. We remain persuaded that comprehensive mandatory sanctions are a most effective means for the international community collectively to exert such pressure and at the same time to express in specific terms its common will to repudiate apartheid.

Brazil's interest in the eradication of apartheid is also linked to the aspirations of the South Atlantic countries to have an apartheid-free South Africa participating in the zone of peace and co-operation in the area. We thus fully support the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the South African racist régime as

"a means of achieving the objectives of the Zone of Peace and Co-operation in the South Atlantic" (A/43/512, para.11), as stated in the Final Document of the first meeting of the States of the zone in Rio de Janeiro last July.

(Mr. Nogueira-Batista, Brazil)

Apartheid is universally repudiated in its practice and concept and for Brazil it is all the more condemnable in that it negates the most fundamental characteristics on the basis of which the Brazilian society has been built as a nation culturally and racially integrated. Through its attitudes and behaviour, South Africa has progressively isolated itself from international life and, in a way that is inherently interlinked with its heinous policies of apartheid, has been unable to entertain peaceful relations with its neighbours.

The situation in South Africa is dangerous and explosive also as a consequence of the domestic implications of inherently contradictory policies: on the one hand the increasingly modern process of industrialization and urbanization, which by definition requires the integration of the black majority as producers and consumers, and on the other hand the anachronistic and abhorrent intensification of the political and social segregation of the black community. It seems not only totally unjust but also outright futile to continue to discriminate against the majority of the South Africa population while upholding apartheid, a régime which is condemned to disappear.

Brazil wishes once again to reiterate its unequivocal solidarity with the just struggle of the black South African patriots for the elimination of apartheid, the root cause of injustice and tension in South Africa and a main obstacle to a lasting peace in the southern African region.

Mr. MAHALLATI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I shall begin my statement with a verse from the Holy Koran:

"And of his signs is the creation of the heavens and the earth and the diversity of your tongues and colours; most surely there are signs in this for the learned." (The Holy Koran, XXX:22)

(Mr. Mahallati,
Islamic Republic of Iran)

Once again the General Assembly is meeting to consider the critical and perennial issue of apartheid, which has been the subject of endless debates in this Organization and which we hope will soon be totally eradicated in all its manifestations.*

* Mr. Van Lierop (Vanuatu), Vice-President took the Chair.

(Mr. Mahallati, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

Policies of apartheid and racism are the worst forms of violation and crime against humanity. Thus, the axiological perspective of all States Members of the Organization regarding apartheid is more or less the same. Ironically enough, even those who support and collaborate with the abhorrent apartheid régime usually do not hesitate to condemn apartheid or the policies of the apartheid régime. In spite of the unanimity of opinion regarding the immoral and criminal nature of apartheid, practical approaches vary greatly. Some, most regrettably, demonstrate in practice so much accommodation as to maintain technical, economic, military and nuclear co-operation with the apartheid régime.

Co-operation in nuclear technology between the United States, the Zionist régime and South Africa, as well as the economic activities of the United States and some Western European countries with the apartheid régime, are only some of the outstanding examples of the discrepancy between words and deeds. The same countries consistently impede the implementation of all resolutions the United Nations has so far adopted to suppress apartheid. They procrastinate, impede, filibuster, use all obstructive techniques and finally veto every serious and effective decision that could otherwise abolish the apartheid policies of South Africa.

As a result of the policies of certain States, entailing a low-profile though extensive co-operation with the Pretoria régime, the system of apartheid still survives. It survives despite the fact that year after year for twenty-five years, eloquent speeches have been made in this lofty Assembly in condemnation of this evil system. It survives, despite the fact that this system has repeatedly been condemned by every Member State. All through this long, agonizing period of pain, suffering, deprivation, poverty, torture and oppression which the South African

(Mr. Mahallati, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

majority has undergone, it is a cluster of rich, developed Western countries which should have been blamed.

The same fact obtains in occupied Palestine, where unlimited economic, financial, military and technological support offered by the United States and certain other Powers has resulted in the Zionist persistence in continued occupation of Palestine and suppression of the Palestinian struggle for four decades. Since Zionism and apartheid are the ugly manifestations of the same crime against humanity, all anti-apartheid countries should treat the régimes in South Africa and occupied Palestine in the same way.

Forty years have elapsed since the United Nations first addressed the question of Namibian independence, and it has been 22 years since the United Nations terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia by General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of October 1966 and placed the territory under the responsibility of the Organization. Ten years ago the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), setting a framework for the independence of Namibia, but South Africa has continued its illegal occupation of that Territory.

The apartheid régime is not merely a problem of brutal repression in South Africa or illegal occupation of Namibia; the South African racist régime has pursued a systematically hostile policy towards its neighbouring countries, waged an undeclared war of aggression and carried out a campaign of destabilization and economic sabotage against them, resulting in destruction and hardship among their populations.

The perpetuation of the policies and practices of the apartheid régime and its defiance of the international community must be a matter of urgent concern for all Member States. The dangerous situation and conditions in South Africa require the international community to restore its credibility by imposing comprehensive

(Mr. Mahallati, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

economic and military sanctions against the apartheid régime, under Chapter VII of the Charter, and putting an end to the constructionist policies of some Western countries in this regard.

The world community is indebted to the sanguinary struggles of the innocent, unarmed people of South Africa and the people of Namibia, which are both resisting the brutal gunfire and aggression of the apartheid régime with their flesh and blood. Our support for the oppressed people of South Africa and Namibia is not new, nor is our condemnation of the apartheid régime and the variety of help generously extended to it. We have always insisted that support for the righteous struggle of the South African people and those of Namibia, led by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), and a serious approach by the international community to bring all-embracing pressure to bear upon the Pretoria régime and its supporters constitute the sole means of ridding the world of the roots of this régime, the shameful product of colonialism.

We hope to see a united front in the international body for the eradication of the racist régime of South Africa and the restoration of equality and freedom for all peoples, of all races and ethnic origins, living in that part of the world. All those involved in the revolutionary struggles and the Muslim combatants fighting against the South African régime may rest assured that the Islamic Republic of Iran extends its full support to them.

Mr. OSMAN (Somalia): For more than 25 years the United Nations has been continuously seized of an item that many here had hoped would disappear from its agenda, in view of the intensive pressure of the community. Regrettably, however, the item in question, entitled "Policy of apartheid of the Government of South Africa", is once again before the General Assembly and, despite the many efforts

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

undertaken at the level of the United Nations and other international forums, there appears to be no solution in sight.

My delegation is compelled to address this important issue because there is a preponderance of evidence of South Africa's non-compliance with the Charter of the United Nations and with internationally recognized principles of human rights. This is adequately reflected in the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid to the forty-third session of the General Assembly, including its annexes (A/43/22).

This document brings to light the prevailing grave situation in South Africa and the region as a whole. In a bid to cling to white minority rule, arbitrary power and racist supremacy, the apartheid régime escalated its ruthless repression against the African population and intensified its policy of terror and aggression beyond its borders by sending death squads abroad to abduct and kill anti-apartheid activists on foreign soil.

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

Last year the international community witnessed intolerable intimidation, harassment and brutal massacres of black people on a wider scale. The bombardment and arson perpetrated against the black population had been unprecedented in magnitude and gravity. On 31 August the headquarters of the ecumenical South Africa Council of Churches at Khotso House was bombed. On 12 October the headquarters of the Roman Catholic Church went up in flames. Earlier this year offices of the Congress of South African Trade Unions and the black civil group were destroyed. Almost one month ago the headquarters of the National Union of South African Students was fire-bombed - one more incident which Pretoria's specially appointed police unit was unable, or reluctant, to clarify.

The outcome of the fraudulent and racially constituted municipal elections has given proof of the fact that black South Africans are not taken in by pseudo-democratic manoeuvres of the white racists. Even the international community denounced "Pretoria's racial 'municipal elections'" by an overwhelming vote of 146 in favour in General Assembly resolution 43/13 of 26 October 1988. Taking this overwhelming consensus into consideration, Somalia is convinced that this year the General Assembly will vote on all anti-apartheid resolutions with a renewed commitment and with a thorough understanding of the fact that a piecemeal approach cannot change the situation in South Africa for the better; what is called for is strict application of effective, co-ordinated and comprehensive measures against the South African régime. If this is implemented by the whole international community and complemented by the renunciation of any form of collaboration with the apartheid régime, then a long-lasting and just solution of the South African conflict can soon be realized.

Somalia continues to reaffirm its strong support for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa because they are the only peaceful and sufficiently forceful measures available to the United Nations. We appeal to the

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

Security Council to exercise its responsibility and authority for removing threats to peace and security by taking action against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter.

As we are all aware, there are of course other important actions and measures against apartheid that must also be taken by Member States. In this regard reference must be made to the recommendations contained in the Special Committee's annual report and reinforced by the resolutions before us. They all deserve to be fully supported and faithfully implemented. Towards that end Somalia will lend its continued support, in solidarity with the oppressed people of South Africa, to the work of the Special Committee, of which it is an active member.

In speaking of continued internal upheaval and cross-border violence by the apartheid régime, one has also to reflect on the new opportunities that have emerged for finding a swift and lasting solution to the conflict in southern Africa. In this connection Somalia joins other States in welcoming the quadripartite talks aimed at ensuring the speedy implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Persistent diplomatic efforts have led to the elimination of one of the extremely dangerous sources of tension in the region, namely, South Africa's military occupation of Angolan territory. We hope that the process of negotiation that has been initiated will lead to the immediate and unconditional independence of Namibia. It remains to be seen, however, whether the South African régime will meet its obligations emanating from the regional peace process or whether, as has often happened in the past, it will once again defy the trust of the international community and its hope that a negotiated solution of the South African conflict can be achieved.

Somalia also hopes that the international community will measure Pretoria's intention to contribute to the resolution of the conflict in South Africa against its actual behaviour in implementing Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

eliminating apartheid once and for all. Since apartheid was and still is the root cause of the conflict, its abolition would be the only indicator of real progress towards a true solution of the conflict. Any other move by the apartheid régime to attract diplomatic support or external co-operation should be exposed as camouflage and a useless attempt to penetrate its diplomatic isolation and divert world public opinion from the actual character of apartheid.

Following this General Assembly debate the Pretoria régime should not be left in doubt that the international community considers its racist and oppressive policies and practices to be abhorrent and totally unacceptable. We believe that the racist régime has to be isolated and excluded from the normal interchange of international relations until it establishes a free, democratic and non-racial society in South Africa, consistent with the many relevant United Nations resolutions and the true aspirations of the majority of the South African people. Such a move would be consistent with the noble principles of freedom and human dignity which we shall all continue to uphold and promote in support of the legitimate cause of the people of South Africa and Namibia.

Mr. JAYASINGHE (Sri Lanka): Throughout the ages, man's full development has always been thwarted by the intolerance of his fellow man, resulting from a deep-seated, irrational fear and hatred, which have often led to unspeakable acts of cruelty. Manifested in the worst form of repression, this cruelty has brought untold suffering to millions of human beings. Such is the situation in South Africa.

(Mr. Jayasinghe, Sri Lanka)

For years the international community has focused attention on the situation in South Africa, calling for the dismantling of the abhorrent policy of apartheid, considered an affront to human dignity. The United Nations has rightly denounced this policy, which represents the most repressive and institutionalized form of racial discrimination, as a crime against humanity. It is a tragic commentary on our times that, despite all efforts to bring about its elimination, apartheid still remains in force.

Among the purposes and principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter are the promotion and encouragement of respect for human rights and fundamental freedom for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights further affirmed these fundamental freedoms by stipulating that all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.

The continuance of the policy of apartheid, in contravention of all those civilized norms and values, is a crime against the conscience and dignity of mankind, and is incompatible with the dignity of man. Only the immediate elimination of apartheid, by the establishment of a non-racial, democratic society, based on the principles of self-determination and majority rule, and the full and free exercise of universal adult suffrage by all the people in a united and non-fragmented South Africa, can bring this situation to an end.

In spite of various efforts, the international community continues to be a helpless witness to the arrogance and defiance of the racist minority régime in Pretoria. The response of South Africa to these efforts has been to maintain apartheid with even greater brutality. Current developments are ample testimony to this effect. The expansion and strengthening of a nationwide state of emergency, during which the world has witnessed unjustifiable and arbitrary detention and torture of innocent people, near-total censorship of local and foreign media which

(Mr. Jayasinghe, Sri Lanka)

expose racially repressive policies, the banning of trade unions and other forms of democratic and peaceful means of protest against apartheid policies, the gaoling of political opponents and other forms of repressive measures, are the order of the day.

There is no sign whatsoever that the apartheid régime is genuinely interested in dismantling this obnoxious system. Therefore, there is a greater need for more concerted action by the international community to bring the system to an end. There is also a pressing need to remind the South African régime that the clamp-down on political expression will aggravate existing tensions within the country and lead to untold violence, and that it cannot continue to deny the inalienable birthright of the indigenous people of South Africa.

Forty years of apartheid are an embarrassment to human civilization. Sooner or later this iniquitous system will have to give way to a just and rational order. The sooner it is achieved, the less will be the cost of this inevitable change. This becomes increasingly clear with developments we witness every day.

The arrogance of the South African régime and its defiance of world opinion are partly due to the encouragement it receives from certain sections of the international community through various forms of co-operation with the régime. We appeal to those who continue to collaborate with the racist régime to re-examine their policies and not to give sustenance to a régime which continues to flout the collective wish of the international community with impunity.

We have reached a stage at which we cannot subscribe to the continuance of a policy which inflicts untold suffering on millions of innocent people who are fighting for their just rights. We cannot be a party to the misconception that sanctions against South Africa would result in greater suffering for the black people of South Africa and would also affect the well-being of neighbouring African

(Mr. Jayasinghe, Sri Lanka)

States. What greater suffering can a human being undergo than a continued assault on his dignity and denial of his inalienable right to equal treatment? Some among us are very vocal in seeking compliance with democratic rights elsewhere in the world, but when it comes to South Africa they fail to use the same yardstick.

As we approach the twenty-first century there arises an irrepressible need to address critical issues, such as the apartheid policy in South Africa, with frankness and honesty. It is the deep conviction of the international community that the time has come to put an end to South Africa's defiance of the United Nations and its contemptuous disregard of world public opinion. The world community must stand up and be counted. We must reaffirm our determination to eliminate racism and racial discrimination, wherever they may exist, with concrete action.

In this context, there is no longer any valid reason for delaying the adoption of effective measures, particularly comprehensive mandatory sanctions, under Chapter VII of the Charter. Our continued inability to take decisive action can only help further to buttress South Africa in continuing its inhuman policy. This is the hard truth we have to face. Any attempt to disregard this reality will only contribute towards prolonging the bitter struggle which will even affect unborn generations of South Africans.

We observe that the South African régime has recently taken some cosmetic steps, such as the holding of municipal elections, aimed at mollifying the black African people and deceiving international public opinion. The people of South Africa have expressed their total contempt by the near boycott of that election. We are inclined to believe that the recent commutation of the death sentence passed on the Sharpeville Six and better treatment for the imprisoned South African patriot Nelson Mandela constitute yet another deliberate attempt to deceive the international community.

(Mr. Jayasinghe, Sri Lanka)

We in Sri Lanka have always opposed any form of racial discrimination and we shall continue to do so. We shall continue our efforts, in concert with the rest of the international community, to dismantle the system of apartheid. We are convinced that the only effective and peaceful means to eliminate this abhorrent policy is the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter.

Mr. PHOOFOLO (Lesotho): The leader of my delegation extended felicitations to the President. In echoing those fraternal and warm sentiments I further express our utmost admiration and emotional satisfaction at the able manner in which he has so far conducted the affairs of the current session, and wish for him a very successful conclusion of the forty-third session of the Assembly.

The temporary gale force wind that has just risen should not be permitted to distract us from our sailing course. We are confident that under the President's able leadership at the controls we shall all land safely on the coast of calm and peace.

In addressing ourselves to agenda item 36, on the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa, it is proper and fitting to express our utmost admiration of the reports before us, inter alia, by our Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, and by the dynamic representative of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, Mr. Joseph N. Garba, in his worthy capacity as Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid. We congratulate all concerned and take note of their reports.

Before addressing ourselves to the main thrust of the issue before us, we wish to express our overall satisfaction with the content of the reports, save for our total disappointment and displeasure at the content of paragraphs 100 and 183 in the Special Committee's report (A/43/22), dated 27 October 1988. It is indeed regrettable that the Kingdom of Lesotho is for the first time among the only three southern African countries to be singled out as assisting the evasion of sanctions. The textile industry sources claim referred to in paragraph 100 of the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid is unfortunate, unfounded and devoid of fact, and we view it just as the revelation of a blissful ignorance of Basotho values and our social fabric.

(Mr. Phoofofo, Lesotho)

The Government of the Kingdom of Lesotho seriously disturbed by this unfortunate claim, stands ready to disprove that malicious contention by co-operating fully with all members of the Special Committee against Apartheid to look into all legal and legitimate textile operations in the Kingdom of Lesotho, as well as the Government institutions involved in textile industries in Lesotho.

It is most regrettable that the Kingdom of Lesotho - it is hoped not because of its geographic position - should be the unfortunate victim of the accusing finger, to the protection and joy of the culprits, which are well known by all those fully versed in all issues pertinent to the socio-economic and political matrix of the policies of apartheid.

The Kingdom of Lesotho is on record as having refused to allow its soil to be used to avoid sanctions imposed on South Africa. In early May this year a certain Jerry Brahm from South Africa brought into Lesotho 1,000 ostriches from the Cape, in South Africa, with the sole purpose of exporting them from Lesotho. The export permit was refused by the Lesotho authorities as it was believed that the export permit for the birds was required to avoid the economic sanctions against South Africa. The expatriate official who assisted in the importation of these birds into Lesotho was quickly assisted to leave our country.

In the textile industry permits have never been issued for goods not manufactured and produced in Lesotho, as our legal machinery prohibits such practices. Detailed official documentation, positively proving that remedial efforts are always taken by the Lesotho Government and the Lesotho National Development Corporation whenever cases of fraudulent abuse of Lesotho origin of export goods or import permits are discovered, has been submitted to our beloved and trustworthy Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, Mr. Garba, for appropriate action. This swift action by Lesotho is indicative of the seriousness

(Mr. Phoofofo, Lesotho)

with which Lesotho views the unfortunate allegation. The Kingdom of Lesotho has thus far exercised the necessary vigilance.

The Kingdom of Lesotho stands accused and judged as not having been vigilant and as having allowed Pretoria to evade sanctions. This is a direct consequence of the poorest and obviously gross, deliberate and sinister motive, designed for international consumption. What a price the Kingdom of Lesotho has to pay! What a betrayal of the cause of the Special Committee against Apartheid!

If what the Kingdom of Lesotho has just experienced is how name-calling is determined and decided upon, then, we are sorry, the Kingdom of Lesotho cannot be a party to such a process until such time as the actual - I repeat "actual" - and well-known evil-doers or violators are called by name.

Duty calls, and when professionals do their research they must apply professionalism. In our case they did not. As a self-respecting and peace-loving country, the Kingdom of Lesotho is the last country to point the finger at other sister countries. But we sincerely plead to be respected for our worth, inasmuch as we are the only country directly and deeply affected by the policies of apartheid to such a large degree in the sub-continent, and we are facing a formidable challenge.

The Kingdom of Lesotho has always maintained the steadfast position that the unfortunate doctrine of apartheid is at variance with peace, progress and social justice. The policies of apartheid have consistently engendered hatred, human suffering and tragedy in the southern African region, to the overall detriment of the economic and political development of southern Africa, thus rendering the policies of apartheid a negative phenomenon of the present era.

The Kingdom of Lesotho, as a peace-loving country opposed to the repugnant policies of the apartheid system, supports all the commendable efforts aimed at the

(Mr. Phoofofo, Lesotho)

holding of an internationally sponsored all-party discussion on the eradication of apartheid and the ultimate creation of a mass-based, constitutional, non-racial democracy committed to respect for the political and economic rights of all South Africans, irrespective of colour, race or creed.

Admittedly, and rightly, the ultimate responsibility for abolishing this costly and pernicious system rests squarely with all South Africans of good intention who yearn for peace and the brotherhood of man - created in the image of God, as taught by those that profess to have brought civilization to our part of the world.

A more determined and concerted effective diplomatic initiative, which includes all of Western Europe, the United States of America, Japan and the USSR, holds the key to the elimination of apartheid as a fundamental, basic position. The New York Times of 28 May 1988, under the caption "The Superpowers vs. S.A." proposed that President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev announce a co-operative approach towards southern Africa. It called on them to start a multinational effort to aid the States that border South Africa to squelch the idea that the region is another arena of East-West rivalry; to expose the root problem; to signal unmistakably that opposition to apartheid knows no ideology. The message as expressed in the proposal is sound and clear to all people of goodwill and lovers of peace and justice in southern Africa.

Just as the Kingdom of Lesotho welcomed the recent agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to eliminate all medium-range and shorter-range missiles, so we plead with the two super-Powers to show that same constructive and positive spirit by assisting with the elimination of apartheid policies, which are by nature and content inimical to peace and stability in the region.

(Mr. Phoofofo, Lesotho)

The Minister of Foreign Affairs of Lesotho, Colonel Thaabe Letsie, in addressing the current session of the General Assembly, clearly and unambiguously stated that southern Africa continues to remain a hotbed of tension and rightly identified apartheid as the root cause of the uneasy malaise. He called for the initiation of round-table negotiations with all concerned parties in South Africa without any discrimination, and urged all those countries in a position to do so, to act promptly before it is too late. It is for the General Assembly to respond to that call.

The draft resolutions before us directed at the policies of apartheid are calculated to achieve the desired and expressed goal of ensuring the full participation of all men and women in South Africa irrespective of colour, religion or creed.

The Kingdom of Lesotho has always recognized the right of the international community to take whatever steps are necessary to dismantle apartheid. The measures so desired should be accompanied by relief for nations directly affected, such as the Kingdom of Lesotho, through the provision of moral, material and financial support. Lesotho is in a difficult and complex situation, given its historical and geographic position vis-à-vis South Africa as viewed by the international community.

At a recent meeting with South Africa's President, P.W. Botha, His Majesty King Moshoeshoe II minced no words in conveying the message that the Kingdom of Lesotho is a loyal Member of the United Nations, of the Organization of African Unity, the Non-Aligned Movement, the Commonwealth of Nations, the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC) and other international political and economic organizations, and that we find our membership in them essential for the survival of our country as an independent and sovereign State. He further stated

(Mr. Phoofofo, Lesotho)

that we adhere to the cause of peace, international solidarity and international co-operation, and that apartheid is unacceptable.

The Kingdom of Lesotho firmly stands for the total cessation of all acts of destabilization and aggression in the region.

While we fully recognize the right of the international community to take whatever steps are essential to dismantle and obliterate the policies of apartheid, our freedom of action is severely limited by geo-political circumstances not of our creation and beyond our control. Ours is a particularly complex and difficult situation in the whole scenario now being addressed.

The sons and daughters of South Africa, displaced through no deliberate choice of their own but because of the policies of apartheid, turn their tearful eyes to the international community for salvation, so that they too can enjoy their birthright in their homeland.

It is against this background that the Kingdom of Lesotho will not hesitate to support some of the draft resolutions before us. Our positive vote should be construed as a sincere demonstration of Lesotho's peaceful efforts towards seeking the eradication of racism, racial discrimination and apartheid in South Africa. We shall steadfastly continue to support all noble efforts calculated to achieve, through dialogue and the full participation of all interested and involved parties, a peaceful solution to the problem created by apartheid.

Mr. JARRETT (Liberia): As we continue the debate on the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa year after year, it becomes more and more clear that it is only through decisive and sustained action by the international community that the oppressed non-white population of South Africa will be freed from the tyrannical apartheid policies of the white minority racist régime of Pretoria.

(Mr. Jarrett, Liberia)

My delegation, in its intervention on this agenda item last year, reiterated its request that the Security Council consider the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, as such action is the only peaceful means at our disposal to compel the racist régime in Pretoria to abandon its policy of institutionalized racism.

Although we can conclude from reports emanating from South Africa during the past months that the end of minority rule is not yet in sight, events taking place in the country, particularly the stringent economic situation threatening the comfortable lifestyle of the white minority, give cause for hope that its end is not a pipe dream. However, what is taking place at the moment is a continuous escalation of repressive action against activists and mass-based organizations which support peaceful opposition to apartheid and the murder and maiming of members of liberation movements, as well as a systematic plan of action to discredit those movements and their leadership and an increasing exploitation of the black labour force. Furthermore, the racist régime in Pretoria, in implementing its "carrot and stick" policy, on the one hand intends through coercion to consolidate its control in the country, utilizing to the fullest the régime's massive security apparatus, while on the other, through its "upgrading schemes" in housing and infrastructure in townships known for militancy, as well as the introduction of so-called political reforms, it woos the hearts and minds of the masses. Through deception the régime tries to win some support base among the black population in order to gain legitimacy.

It is well known that apartheid thrives on the violence of the security forces of the racist Pretoria régime. The black population is constantly harassed and incited to violence so as to give the police State a pretext for brutalizing black people. President Botha knows very well the source of violence in his country. Nelson Mandela and Zephania Mothopeng also know that violence is the instrument by

(Mr. Jarrett, Liberia)

which their people continue to be deprived of their inalienable right to freedom, justice and human dignity. Archbishop Desmond Tutu, commenting on this subject, put it succinctly when he said the violence of South Africa is the violence of apartheid.

To substantiate the foregoing, let us recount some of the repressive measures which the Pretoria régime utilizes.

(Mr. Jarrett, Liberia)

Under the cover of the prolonged state of emergency, which was renewed again last June, the régime has utilized the combined power of the armed forces, the police, other security forces and the courts in a systematic campaign to eliminate all opposition to apartheid. In executing its nefarious policies, the Pretoria régime has also resorted to the use of surrogate forces such as vigilantes, assassins and right-wing extremist groups to destabilize communities across the country.

This new method of suppression has replaced the old strategy of detention without trial, which has been universally condemned as a violation of human rights. Nevertheless there are at present between 2,000 and 2,500 persons being held in detention without trial, some 250 of whom are children no more than 17 years of age.

To compound this sorry state of affairs, the number of executions in South Africa has increased greatly. Amnesty International's 1988 report points to an unprecedented increase in the application of death sentences to political offenders. The ordeal of the Sharpeville Six, who were convicted under the doctrine of "common purpose" and who had their death sentences commuted, should still be fresh in our memory. We should not lose sight either of the case of the United Democratic Front leaders who faced hanging because a judge accepted Pretoria's argument that speech and constitute can constitute treason. Commenting on this subject, a New York Times editorial stated:

"At the moment that Pretoria should be freeing prisoners and opening talks, it embraces a legal formula for filling jails and discouraging contacts. How much wiser if there were more gestures like Mr. Botha's commutation of the death sentences of blacks convicted for sharing a 'common

(Mr. Jarrett, Liberia)

purpose' with the mob killers of a Sharpeville councilman. How much better if Pretoria matched its pragmatism abroad by dealing as maturely with the majority of its own people."

Judging from the evidence at hand, racist Pretoria is not deserving of conciliatory consideration. It continues to be my delegation's considered opinion that South Africa has no intention of denouncing its apartheid policy. What seems to be happening in that country is a resurgence of ultra-right-wing conservatism which has as its primary objective the reintroduction of whites-only accommodation in towns that conservatives captured during the last municipal elections. The Conservative Party's success at the polls is being interpreted in some quarters as a mandate for the reactivation of discriminatory laws. We therefore have to be vigilant and take effective action for the eradication of apartheid, a crime against humanity; this can be achieved only through the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against racist South Africa. That is the only peaceful means at our disposal for accomplishing this goal.

There are those who for selfish reasons oppose sanctions on the grounds that they cannot be effective and that they would hurt rather than protect the rights of the non-white population. In rejecting that argument we need only study closely the South African economy to realize how effective voluntary sanctions have been. The South African Reserve Bank's Governor, commenting on this subject, said, "No one should underestimate the harmful effects of these constraints". While there are those racists who feel that sanctions have been tested and are not working, there are others - and they constitute the majority - who accept the fact that "in this day and age there is no such thing as economic self-sufficiency, and we delude ourselves if we think we are different".

(Mr. Jarrett, Liberia)

That is an affirmation of the effectiveness of sanctions imposed by South Africa's leading trading partners. The international economic pressure on South Africa, limited though it is, has resulted in a net capital outflow of almost \$10 billion since 1985, as was reported in the media recently. This worsening situation of the South African economy is bound to have its political consequences as the economy deteriorates further. We need, then, to galvanize our efforts and sustain the economic pressure, so as to achieve the desired result, which is to deprive the white minority racist régime of Pretoria of access to economic and financial support for the maintenance of its apartheid policies. An interesting point to note is that the deteriorating economic situation in South Africa has resulted in the abandonment of some racial laws, albeit marginal ones. While views vary on this observation, there is sufficient ground for optimism.

Leading South African businessmen are seriously concerned about the effectiveness of selective sanctions levied against their country by South Africa's leading trading partners. They know that those sanctions are profoundly affecting the South African economy. Comprehensive mandatory sanctions, collectively imposed and faithfully sustained, would no doubt eventually compel the white minority racist régime in Pretoria to abandon its obnoxious apartheid doctrine.

On behalf of the delegation of Liberia, I should like to commend the Special Committee against Apartheid, under the dynamic leadership of its Chairman, Ambassador Joseph Garba, for the excellent manner in which it always executes its mandate and for the crucial role it continues to play in sensitizing international public opinion about the plight of the oppressed people of South Africa. The Committee's report before this Assembly in document A/43/22 is replete with factual, up-to-date accounts of all aspects of the apartheid problem, including valuable information on the increasing brutal repression of the black majority

(Mr. Jarrett, Liberia)

population of South Africa, aggression against and destabilization of neighbouring States, the heroic resistance of national liberation movements and the courageous stand of religious leaders against the evil and despicable policy of apartheid.

The Government of Liberia reaffirms its solidarity with the oppressed and brutalized people of South Africa and wishes also to reiterate that it will not support any superficial reforms designed to divert attention from the heroic struggle of our South African brothers and sisters, who in defence of their inalienable rights are resisting the might and fury of a terrorist State equipped with sophisticated weapons of destruction.

Apartheid cannot be reformed. It must be eradicated. It is a crime against humanity and its elimination would offer prospects for peace in the southern African region. Apartheid must be uprooted and replaced by a just and democratic State encompassing all the peoples of South Africa and based on equality of civil and political rights.

Mr. McDONAGH (Ireland): My delegation fully associates itself with the views expressed by the representative of Greece on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community in condemnation of the policy of apartheid practised by the Government of South Africa.

We feel it appropriate to add Ireland's voice to those of others in the Assembly. It is important that the South African Government should understand what this debate is about. The message of the Assembly on apartheid must not be considered as a mere annual routine. It is the reiteration of a fundamental challenge by the members of the international community to a system that is universally deplored. In a way perhaps unique in history, they are saying in unison, "Your system of apartheid is unacceptable, it is an affront to all of us and it debases the standards of justice and reasons by which we aspire to live".

In this Assembly we often consider issues where the correct course of action may not be readily apparent, where complexities do not easily yield to clarification of right and wrong. Apartheid is an exception. It is a wholly evil system built on fear and violence, a system that separates men and women by race and colour. Its laws and regulations are based on and designed to perpetuate that separation. It refuses dignity to those who suffer under it and it endeavours to perpetuate the status, power and wealth of some at the cost of the rights of others.

We do not only say that apartheid is wrong and contrary to conscience and reason. We say also that the system undermines those who practise it as well as those who are its direct victims. Its bondage is a bondage of fear. Institutions built on fear and on division contain the seeds of self-destruction. A truly viable community, a community worthy of respect, must have some regard for ordinary human values.

Year after year we experience frustration in this debate. It is difficult to find words that can give hope to those oppressed by apartheid or can help to

(Mr. McDonagh, Ireland)

release the practitioners of apartheid from their own self-created bondage. What we must do, of course, is to persist in condemning the system unequivocally. In making such condemnation we must again draw attention to the principles that are the basis of our Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and say that nowhere, to such a degree and for so long, have those principles been violated as in South Africa.

Ireland therefore adds its voice to the condemnation of a philosophy of government that is an affront to those values that we cherish as the basis of any civilized society. We condemn apartheid not just for the way that it is administered or operates, or in this or that particular aspect. We condemn it because of its fundamental basis, its insistence on the inferiority of one race as against another and the denial that we all share a common dignity and common rights.

The South African Government has sought to entrench racism in every aspect of the State and society. Its policy of "homelands" and separate development denies to black Africans the most basic rights in their own country. Ireland joins the rest of the international community in denying the "Bantustans" any legitimacy, any recognition.

The situation in South Africa has grown even more sombre over the past year. The state of emergency has led to increased violence and deepened division. Earlier this year, 17 South African organizations peacefully opposing apartheid were prevented from operating and their activities were barred. The activities of the Council of South African Trade Unions have been severely restricted. The South African Government has threatened to remove external funding from such organizations. Countless trade union, church and political leaders have been arrested. The report of the United Nations Special Committee against Apartheid paints a grim and frightening picture of detentions, of townships occupied, of forcible removal of tens of thousands of people from their own homes. Media

(Mr. McDonagh, Ireland)

coverage of events in South Africa has been drastically restricted so that the world generally is denied any graphic view of developments.

Ireland joins in expressing special concern at the conditions in which many detainees are being held. There can be no doubt that far too many, including children, are being imprisoned in unacceptable conditions. Many have been tortured or brutally mistreated. That some being detained are children is a crime in itself.

My Government appeals once again to South Africa for meaningful political reform. We strongly advocate that apartheid should be ended by peaceful means. Those responsible for the administration of the apartheid system should re-think their position and consider whether their future and the future of all would not be best served by the initiation of a true dialogue that would bring progress towards a free, democratic, united South Africa. A change in policy that pointed clearly in that direction would deserve and would receive understanding from the international community in general.

There are certain obvious minimum steps that should be taken. The state of emergency must be ended. Existing restrictions on political organizations must be removed. Leaders of the black community must be set at liberty. The release of Nelson Mandela would be a sign that South Africa is not only righting a great wrong but is acting to reduce the present dangerous and tense climate. The international community honours Nelson Mandela as a great South African leader. He represents a moral force far outside his own home country.

Ireland welcomes the decision by President Botha to commute the death sentences imposed on the Sharpsville Six. We hope that the South African Government will now take further measures to ease tension.

To the extent that its resources make possible, Ireland seeks to register condemnation of apartheid in every way open to us. We do not maintain diplomatic relations with South Africa. Official contacts with South Africa are minimal.

(Mr. McDonagh, Ireland)

There is no Irish public investment in South Africa. Trade and other economic relations are not encouraged. The importation of agricultural produce from South Africa is not permitted. There are no Irish companies with subsidiaries in South Africa. There are no cultural, scientific or sports agreements between Ireland and South Africa. The Government gives no financial assistance to Irish sports organizations that engage in contacts in South Africa. We have also prevented representative South African teams from taking part in sports competition in Ireland.

(Mr. McDonagh, Ireland)

As a member of the European Community, Ireland has consistently supported the adoption of common measures to place pressure on the South African Government. We operate with our partners in the Community a range of restrictive measures, including a ban on new investments, a ban on the import of iron and steel and gold coins from South Africa, and a ban on oil exports to South Africa. We will continue to co-operate with our Community partners in strengthening and, where appropriate, expanding these measures.

For many years, Ireland has supported the imposition by the Security Council of a range of mandatory sanctions against South Africa. We believe that mandatory sanctions, selected carefully and applied in a gradual manner, would serve to bring South Africa to realize that apartheid has to be abandoned. Such sanctions would have to be fully implemented by all of us, with full rigour. We have again this year joined in sponsoring the draft resolution on concerted international action against apartheid. It is now clear that the international community accepts and endorses the need for sustained international pressure on South Africa.

We do not forget the need to provide humanitarian and legal assistance to the innocent victims of apartheid. Ireland supports the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and the United Nations Educational and Training Programme. We support too the valuable efforts of a number of non-governmental organizations in their work for those who have suffered from apartheid. We participate in the work of the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference. We recognize the need for the international community to assist those countries in southern Africa that have suffered from South African aggression and are subject to economic dependence and deprivation.

(Mr. McDonagh, Ireland)

Every country has an obligation to play its part in bringing an end to apartheid. It is an ill world where such an evil survives. We must surely accept the moral duty to bring South Africa to see its folly. The peaceful building of a multiracial society will not be easy, but it is possible. It remains one of the greatest challenges facing this Assembly today. We ask the Government of South Africa to reflect on the message from this Assembly and to realize that it is not too late, even now, to turn from self-destruction towards a new beginning of hope and justice.

The meeting rose at 7.25 p.m.