



President: Mr. Jorge E. ILLUECA (Panama).

AGENDA ITEM 29

The situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security: report of the Secretary-General (concluded)

1. Mr. LE KIM CHUNG (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*): The Vietnamese delegation wishes, first of all, to express its strong disapproval of the fact that once again the General Assembly is faced with a discussion of the so-called question of the situation in Afghanistan, in spite of the firm opposition of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. This is gross interference in the internal affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, an independent, sovereign State, member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and Member of the United Nations, in flagrant violation of the Charter of the Organization.

2. This is a combined manoeuvre by imperialist and international reactionary forces with the idea of deflecting the vigilance and condemnation of world public opinion regarding the implementation of their criminal plans against the independence and freedom of peoples and of international peace and security in various parts of the world: Grenada, Central America, Lebanon, the Middle East and southern Africa. We all know with what unjustified obstinacy the Western countries, headed by the United States, have exploited this artificial question of Afghanistan as a pretext for sabotaging on many occasions the negotiations aimed at making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace and finding solutions to the urgent and burning problems of disarmament, to spare humanity the scourge of a nuclear war of extermination. The obstinacy of the hegemonist Chinese authorities in persistently invoking the so-called problem of Afghanistan to impede the normalization of relations with the Soviet Union will also be recalled.

3. Those facts sufficiently highlight the interest of reactionary and imperialist forces in continually trying at all costs to impose the so-called question of Afghanistan on the agenda of the General Assembly and improperly involve the United Nations in the internal affairs of a Member State.

4. The appearance and strengthening in South-West Asia of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, following the Afghan people's victory of the April 1978 revolution, were welcomed by progressive forces throughout the world as a major event in the interest of the independence and freedom of the Afghan people and, indeed, of peace and stability in the area. That was a new stinging defeat for the forces of imperialism in the post-Viet-Nam period and following the downfall of the oppressive pro-American régime in Iran. It is not surprising, therefore, that the United States has sought by every possible means to thwart the efforts of the Afghan people to build a new free, democratic and happy life; to undermine the gains

of the revolution and the progressive reforms which have been carried out by the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan; to work for the overthrow of the people's régime, and to reinstall the old pro-American régime.

5. It is worth noting that the United States has benefited in this undermining enterprise since the middle of 1978 from the close collusion of the Peking hegemonists. The natural result of this diabolical collusion was a merciless, undeclared war imposed immediately after the April 1978 revolution against the new Democratic Republic and the Afghan people. The occurrences and vicissitudes, the means employed and the evil effects of that war are only too well known and were reviewed with great authority and conviction by the representative of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan in this Assembly yesterday [66th meeting]. We content ourselves with vigorously condemning this policy of aggression and intervention which so seriously threatens the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, an independent, sovereign State, and is the cause of the present misfortunes and sufferings of the Afghan people and of the serious tension surrounding Afghanistan, to the detriment of peace and security in South-West Asia and throughout the world.

6. The interest of independence and sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan is entirely in accord with the interest of peace and stability in South-West Asia and demands that all armed or other intervention in the internal affairs of Afghanistan be ended.

7. While standing up firmly for the past five years to the undeclared war imposed by the enemies of the Afghan people, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan has shown its good will by putting forward the proposals of 15 May 1980¹ and 24 August 1981² as the most realistic basis for a just settlement of the situation in South-West Asia. These proposals are aimed, on the one hand, at putting an end to all outside armed or other intervention against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, which is the underlying cause of the tense situation around Afghanistan, and, on the other, at normalizing that situation and the relations between Afghanistan and its neighbours on the basis of reciprocal respect for the independence and sovereignty of each country. The Afghan Government has patiently and consistently sought to achieve this legitimate goal through dialogue with the parties directly concerned. It warmly welcomed and appreciates the efforts of the Secretary-General and his personal representative to promote this process of negotiations. It welcomed also the progress achieved in the course of the talks held in Geneva on this subject and has stated its readiness to continue them.

8. This is a display of good will which should be encouraged by the international community. In accordance with the general tendency of our times, peace through dialogue should prevail now in South-West Asia, as in South-East Asia and, indeed, everywhere. Of course, the political will, a sense of realism and a sense of responsibility are necessary in this as in all cases.

9. The delegation of Viet Nam firmly supports the just position of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan

regarding the settlement of the situation in South-West Asia, in the interest of peace and stability in the area.

10. We feel that to impose a solution contrary to the fundamental national rights of the Afghan people by means of misguided resolutions of the General Assembly is to play into the hands of imperialist and reactionary forces and would be completely unacceptable to the people and Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. The community of nations would do better to encourage and promote dialogue between Afghanistan and its neighbours. This is the only wise and realistic approach, the only one that can lead to the just solution of the situation around Afghanistan and to peace and stability in South-West Asia.

11. Mr. ISMAIL (Malaysia): This is the fourth year that the General Assembly has been seized of the Afghanistan problem, yet we have not been able to remove the source of the bitterness and suffering that have been inflicted upon the proud and freedom-loving people of Afghanistan. We need no reminders that the gravity of the situation in Afghanistan continues to be a matter of anxiety and serious concern everywhere. This fact has been clearly underscored in the various statements delivered in the Assembly in the last few days. With the exception of a few, the pronouncements have been explicit and unequivocal, namely, that we cannot accept the continued presence of Soviet troops in Afghanistan, as such presence is not only against the will and wishes of the people there but constitutes a blatant violation of the Charter of the United Nations.

12. The argument that the foreign military intervention in Afghanistan was necessary to defend that country from outside threat is untenable, for it ignores the time-honoured tradition of independence of the Afghan people, who never needed foreign soldiers on their soil to defend the freedom of their country. These simplistic arguments have not been used in the case of Afghanistan only, but have also been applied to justify intervention in Kampuchea and elsewhere. These indiscriminate acts of intervention carry serious implications for global peace, for they have understandably heightened the concern and anxiety of the international community, in particular the small countries. Needless to say, the edifice of trust and confidence so painstakingly built and adjusted among countries, in particular those in the region, has been brazenly vitiated by the single act of international delinquency by a super-Power in Afghanistan.

13. The cost in suffering has been high. Cities and villages have been ravaged and merciless reprisals taken against vast sections of the Afghan people, millions of whom have been forced to flee their homes and to endure the privations of a life in exile. Despite the enormous price of their resistance in blood and suffering, the Afghans are united and determined in fighting for the cause of their freedom from foreign domination. Popular support for the nationalist resistance forces increases with each day, and the invader, its superiority in military technology notwithstanding, has not been able to quell the Afghan freedom fighters.

14. My delegation wishes to express its deep appreciation to the Secretary-General for the steps he has taken to promote a just political settlement of the Afghan problem. The indirect talks conducted in Geneva and the visits of the Secretary-General's personal representative, Mr. Diego Cordovez, to Pakistan, Afghanistan and Iran are indeed steps in the right direction and, it is hoped, would create an impetus to the diplomatic efforts to resolve the Afghan problem. We are gratified at the additional understandings reached on the nature and

operation of a policy mechanism that would be articulated in the comprehensive settlement. While we are encouraged by the progress thus far, we hope that the present momentum can be sustained and produce substantive results consistent with the demands and decisions of the international community, as embodied in draft resolution A/38/L.17, which is sponsored by more than 40 countries.

15. The situation in Afghanistan must not be viewed in isolation. It has far-reaching implications and impact on the climate and course of détente and East-West relations; it affects the entire fabric of international relations based upon respect for the principles of territorial integrity, national independence and political sovereignty. These actions bear directly upon the capacity of States, especially those most vulnerable, to retain their unique identity and to fulfil their aspirations in peace and security. The Afghan people, indeed, are fighting for their own survival, but their struggle definitely has a much broader meaning, especially for those who cherish their freedom, liberty and, most importantly, their dignity and self-respect.

16. What happened in Afghanistan should be a matter of the utmost concern to all of us. It is a case of blatant aggression by a super-Power against a small, helpless nation. It is an attempt to use a client leadership, a quisling or a puppet to seek domination, dominance or influence in order to assuage a feeling of insecurity or in fulfilment of a strategic design. This is indeed a worrisome trend, and it becomes all the more frightening when one realizes that the aggression was committed by a super-Power which is a permanent member of the Security Council and which, in our view, should behave more responsibly, particularly on issues which impinge directly on world peace and security.

17. The extent of the violence committed in Afghanistan has caused thousands upon thousands of refugees to flee to the neighbouring countries. At the start of the invasion, when Babrak Karmal was installed by the Soviet Union, the number of refugees who left Afghanistan was 400,000. Since then, the number has increased to the astonishing figure of over 3 million, constituting almost a quarter of the 1978 population of Afghanistan. This is the single largest concentration of refugees for any one national group anywhere in the world. In this regard, my delegation would like to express its deep appreciation to the Government and people of Pakistan for their patience, courage and determination in facing the monumental problems of the refugees who have to be fed and sheltered.

18. Today we have before us draft resolution A/38/L.17, of which my delegation is one of the sponsors. The draft resolution, *inter alia*, stresses the preservation of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and non-aligned character of Afghanistan; it calls for the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from that country; it urges parties directly concerned to work for the urgent achievement of a political solution, and it expresses appreciation and support for the constructive efforts of the Secretary-General. These are indispensable elements for an honourable solution to the problem of Afghanistan, and we urge all those who believe in independence, freedom, self-respect and human dignity to manifest their support for this draft resolution.

19. Mr. WASIUDDIN (Bangladesh): The delegation of Bangladesh has heard with deep interest the statements made by the representatives who have spoken before us, and hence we do not wish to take the time of this body by going at length into the background of the present situation. However, it would be pertinent to mention

the principles on which the clear and unequivocal position of Bangladesh is based. In our previous statements in the General Assembly, we have reaffirmed the obligation of all States to refrain in their international relations from the use or threat of use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of any State. In the meetings of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the Commonwealth countries, we have restated our belief in the inalienable rights of all peoples to determine, through a free choice, their own form of Government and to choose their own economic, political and social system without any outside intervention and interference.

20. This was reiterated by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bangladesh, Mr. Aminur Rahman Shams-ud-Doha when he addressed the General Assembly on 4 October. He stated: "We should permit the peoples of Afghanistan and Kampuchea to determine the governments of their choice. This should be done without the presence or threat of foreign troops." [18th meeting, para. 247.]

21. In considering how this can be brought about, we are firmly of the opinion that it can be achieved only through peaceful negotiations among all the parties involved. We therefore highly appreciate the commendable efforts made by the Secretary-General and his personal representative in their patient and persistent pursuit aimed at fostering dialogue between the contending parties. The Secretary-General's report gives us a measure of satisfaction with regard to the progress made in the diplomatic process he is carrying out. We particularly welcome the Secretary-General's assertion that:

"During the discussions, which were conducted in a very constructive spirit, substantial progress was made in the definition of the contents of the comprehensive settlement, its principles and objectives, the interrelationship amongst its four component elements and the provisions, including time-frames, for its implementation." [A/38/449, para. 7.]

It is regrettable that the Secretary-General did not find it possible, however,

"to bridge differences of attitude and position regarding a number of issues, including some crucial issues, which were left in abeyance" [*ibid.*].

22. We agree with the Secretary-General and regret the slow pace of negotiations, which, by delaying the final settlement of the dispute, only prolongs the sufferings of the Afghan people.

23. It cannot be denied that over 4 million Afghan refugees, of which 3 million have been given asylum by Pakistan, are awaiting the day when they can return to their homes in honour and dignity to shape their future destiny of their own free choice, without being branded as reactionaries, bandits and counter-revolutionaries.

24. At the same time, the gallant and heroic struggle of the Afghan people—men, women and children—against a most powerful and brutal foreign Power, so graphically described by many speakers, has caught the imagination of all freedom-loving people. There cannot be a more positive assertion than that the people of Afghanistan cannot and will not be subjugated and that they will fight to the end. It would be unimaginable to expect the Afghan refugees to return to their homeland before the foreign forces against whom they have so valiantly been fighting are withdrawn from their country and they are assured that they will be able to choose a Government that will command their respect, trust and confidence.

25. The longer the solution to this problem is delayed, the greater will be the loss of human life and the larger will be the number of Afghan refugees and the consequent increase in the burden that Pakistan has borne so nobly and patiently in providing shelter for them. Above all, the ever-growing threat to international peace and security will be increased.

26. We consider that the only solution to the problem is along the lines recommended in draft resolution A/38/L.17.

27. The Secretary-General must be given full support and co-operation in pursuing his efforts, and we urge all parties concerned to strive earnestly to reach an agreement that would recognize the inalienable right of the Afghan people to determine, through free choice, its own form of Government, and to choose its own economic, political and social system without any outside intervention or interference.

28. Mr. KOH (Singapore): A persistent but futile attempt has been made by the Soviet Union and its allies to rewrite history. They continue to argue that Soviet troops entered Afghanistan in December 1979 at the invitation of the Government of Afghanistan and in accordance with the 1978 Treaty of Friendship, Good-Neighbourliness and Co-operation concluded between Afghanistan and the Soviet Union. The critical question is who issued the invitation on behalf of the Government of Afghanistan. It could not have been President Hafizullah Amin, the then President and Head of Government of Afghanistan, because he was killed by Soviet troops on 27 December, three days after the Soviet invasion began. Was the invitation issued by Babrak Karmal? The fact is that on 24 December 1979, Babrak Karmal was not a member of the Government of Afghanistan and therefore had no authority to act on its behalf. He was then living in exile in Eastern Europe. He was brought back to Kabul by the Soviet Union on 27 December when Hafizullah Amin was killed. Significantly, the first announcement that Babrak Karmal was the new leader of Afghanistan came in a radio broadcast from the Soviet Union.

29. The Soviet Union and its allies have argued that the present debate is an unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. This argument is a classic example of double-talk. The Soviet Union's invasion and continued occupation of Afghanistan is apparently not an interference in the internal affairs of that country. It is the discussion in the General Assembly of what the Soviet Union has done and is doing in Afghanistan which is an interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan.

30. This line of argument is totally devoid of logic. It amounts to saying that the world should accept the *fait accompli* perpetrated by the Soviet Union in Afghanistan by force of arms and in contravention of the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law.

31. We shall never acquiesce in the Soviet *fait accompli* in Afghanistan. We reject the Soviet argument that the Assembly's discussion of this item is interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan, because the argument is totally without merit.

32. The Soviet Union may mistakenly think it can discredit the Afghan freedom fighters—the *mujahidin*—by calling them counter-revolutionary bandits. The Soviet Union can hurl whatever abuse it chooses at the *mujahidin*. It will not alter the fact that the international community, including most of the non-aligned countries, perceives the *mujahidin* as heroic freedom fighters

battling at great odds and with primitive weapons against the mighty army of a super-Power.

33. During the past year, the *mujahidin* have intensified their arms struggle and have achieved new successes. Although the number of Soviet troops in Afghanistan has increased from the original 50,000 to over 100,000 today, the *mujahidin* have succeeded in preventing most of the countryside from coming under Soviet control.

34. The history of the past four years shows very clearly that the people of Afghanistan cannot be subjugated by the might of the Soviet Army or by its terror tactics. There can be no military solution to the conflict in Afghanistan. The only solution must be a political one. This is why my delegation attaches great importance to and supports the efforts of the Secretary-General and his personal representative, Mr. Diego Cordovez, to promote a political solution through indirect negotiations. We have taken note of the report of the Secretary-General, in which he states, *inter alia*, that substantial progress was made at the second round of the Geneva talks, held in April and June of this year, in defining the contents of the comprehensive settlement, its principles and objectives, including the time-frames for its implementation [*ibid.*]. We also welcome the agreement that consultations with the refugees are an important aspect of the diplomatic process and that appropriate mechanisms would be devised to carry out such consultations in order to ensure that the conditions for their voluntary return would be satisfactory to the refugees.

35. In his statement on 21 November 1983 [64th meeting], the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan gave us a detailed account of the Geneva talks and of the role played by his Government in those talks. I wish to commend the Government of Pakistan for its positive and constructive attitude and, at the same time, to call upon the other parties to do the same.

36. We believe that a political solution is the only solution to the conflict in Afghanistan. We also believe that the Soviet Union will have no incentive to negotiate seriously if the armed resistance by the *mujahidin* were to slacken or if the international community were to lose interest in Afghanistan. This is why this debate is so important; this is why the draft resolution which we are about to adopt is so important. By voting overwhelmingly for draft resolution A/38/L.17, we will be sending a clear message to the leaders of the Soviet Union that the international community has not lost interest in Afghanistan.

37. I would like to conclude my statement by appealing to the Soviet Union to reconsider the course of its present policy towards Afghanistan. I believe that in many ways the decision by the Soviet Union to intervene in Afghanistan was a costly mistake.

38. First, it is costly to the morale of the Red Army. Soviet soldiers are being sent to Afghanistan to fight in an unjust war. The phenomenon of Soviet soldiers defecting to the ranks of the *mujahidin* is adequate testimony of the morale problem in the Red Army.

39. Secondly, the war in Afghanistan is costly in the economic sense.

40. Thirdly, it is costly to the relations between the Soviet Union and the non-aligned countries, to which the Soviet Union attaches great importance. The overwhelming majority of the non-aligned countries has condemned the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan and has voted for the United Nations resolutions on Afghanistan. The much-vaunted Soviet slogan that it is the natural ally of the non-aligned countries has been crushed by Soviet tanks in Afghanistan.

41. Fourthly, it is costly to the Soviet Union's relations with the Islamic countries. The Organization of the Islamic Conference has championed the cause of the Afghan resistance. Islamic countries throughout the world are opposed to the efforts of the Soviet Union to sovietize an Islamic society.

42. Fifthly, it is costly to the Soviet Union's relations with the United States, with Western Europe and with the People's Republic of China.

43. Finally, it is costly to the reputation of the Soviet Union. As long as the Soviet Union remains in occupation of Afghanistan, no one will give any credence to the claim of the Soviet Union that it supports the principle of non-use of force in relations between States, to the claim that it is a peace-loving State, to the claim that it is in favour of détente or of disarmament.

44. For all these reasons, I believe it is as much in the interest of the Soviet Union itself, as of Afghanistan, for Soviet troops to be withdrawn from Afghanistan. I therefore urge the leaders of the Soviet Union to support, in good faith, the efforts of our Secretary-General and of his personal representative to find a political settlement through negotiations.

45. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote. May I remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by representatives from their seats.

46. Mr. JANNUZZI (Italy): The Italian position on the question of Afghanistan has been clearly and repeatedly expressed, on all occasions, by the Government of Italy since the Soviet troops invaded that country. The position has been stated on many occasions by the representative of Italy in the debates on Afghanistan, including the one made during the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly [81st meeting]. It was reaffirmed in clear terms by the Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs in his statement at this session [11th meeting]. This position remains even more valid today, and Italy fully shares the views and concerns expressed by the representative of Greece, speaking on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community [64th meeting].

47. The problem of Afghanistan has been before us for four years now. In the last 10 months, the active resumption of the negotiating initiative of the Secretary-General had given rise to some hope. It is a matter of grave concern and regret to us to note that, in spite of the untiring efforts deployed by the Secretary-General and by his personal representative, Mr. Cordovez—and I wish to express to both of them our deep appreciation—no real progress has been possible.

48. In the meantime, the tragedy of the Afghan people goes on, and it is indeed very sad to hear that in this very Assembly someone has just defined this tragedy as an artificial question. It is indeed a tragedy, made up of Soviet military occupation, the violation of freedom and elementary human rights, and utter disregard by the occupying Power for the safety of the civilian population, and, outside the country, the misery of more than 3 million refugees, with the implied hardships involved and the heavy burden imposed on the neighbouring countries.

49. Previous resolutions of the General Assembly have consistently laid down the principles on which a solution to the Afghan problem must be based: the withdrawal of foreign occupation forces from the country; the return of the refugees to their homes in honour and dignity;

the right of the Afghan people freely to choose their own government and their own destiny through a process of self-determination. These principles are reiterated in the draft resolution A/38/L.17. No acceptable solution is possible, in our view, until such requirements are met.

50. Consistent with its previous stand and in coherence with Italy's full adherence to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the Italian delegation firmly and fully supports draft resolution A/38/L.17 and will therefore vote in favour of it. We strongly hope that the renewed call contained in the draft resolution will receive the broadest support from the Assembly and, furthermore, that this time it will not be brutally disregarded.

51. Let us restate our firm belief that the cause of freedom, independence, self-determination and respect for human rights will ultimately prevail.

52. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I shall begin my brief statement with a verse from the Holy Koran.

“And why should ye not fight in the cause of God and of those who, being weak, are ill-treated (and oppressed)?—men, women and children, whose cry is: ‘Our Lord! Rescue us from this town, whose people are oppressors; and raise for us from Thee one who will protect; and raise for us from Thee one who will help!’” [Surah IV:75.]

That verse explains the situation in Afghanistan and the situation of the Muslim people of Afghanistan.

53. The position of my Government regarding the oppressed Muslim people of Afghanistan, whose homeland has been invaded by the military forces of a permanent member of the Security Council, allegedly and ironically responsible for the preservation of international peace and security, is well known to the international community. It suffices to recall that the Government and the people of the Islamic Republic of Iran, in spite of the exceptionally heavy economic burden of the Iraqi-imposed war, and when we could hardly fulfil our obligations towards millions of our own citizens who had lost their homes and livelihood due to the Iraqi invasion of the western provinces of my country, and in spite of all the economic sanctions and embargoes imposed upon us by the imperialist Powers, have been hosting millions of our Afghan brothers and sisters without any assistance from any national or international organization. This is because the Muslim *Ummah* is one united body and, therefore, our commitment to support the brave Muslim fraternal nation remains resolute.

54. My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/38/L.17 only because it stands at least partially in favour of the inalienable right of the Muslim people of Afghanistan. However, my delegation has reservations with regard to the spirit of the draft resolution simply because it is not strong enough; it does not contain really what the people of Afghanistan deserve.

55. The Islamic Republic of Iran has on numerous occasions reiterated its basic position with regard to the question of Afghanistan. It is our firm belief that only the people of Afghanistan, in exercise of their inalienable right to self-determination, can choose their own form of government and their own economic, political and social system based on their own cultural heritage and free from outside intervention, subversion, coercion or constraint of any kind whatsoever.

56. In order to create favourable conditions for the Afghan people to exercise their right to self-determination, the immediate, total and unconditional withdrawal of Russian troops from Afghan territory and the non-interference of any foreign Power in the internal affairs

of Afghanistan must be achieved, and the *mujahidin* freedom fighters of Afghanistan must return to their homeland.

57. On the basis of the aforementioned position of principle, the Islamic Republic of Iran rejects any efforts, including negotiations, in which the true representatives of the Afghan people do not take an active part. To be more specific, from our viewpoint draft resolution A/38/L.17 is lacking in the following ways.

58. First, it ignores the Islamic nature of the struggle of the Muslim people of Afghanistan and therefore fails to appreciate that the Muslim people of Afghanistan, as an Islamic duty, stand against any oppression, whether Eastern or Western. The misunderstanding of the nature of the struggle thus entails the miscalculated solution, which is inevitably ineffective. The draft resolution shies away from naming the aggressor forces.

59. Secondly, paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/38/L.17, which

“*Reiterates* that the preservation of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and non-aligned character of Afghanistan is essential for a peaceful solution of the problem”,

fails to recognize that it is the restoration of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and non-aligned character of Afghanistan that is the solution to the problem rather than their preservation that is a prerequisite for a peaceful solution to the problem.

60. Thirdly, paragraph 4, which

“*Calls upon* all parties concerned to work for the urgent achievement of a political solution, in accordance with the provisions of the present resolution, and the creation of the necessary conditions which would enable the Afghan refugees to return voluntarily to their homes in safety and honour”,

becomes completely redundant if paragraph 3, which requires the immediate withdrawal of the foreign troops from Afghanistan, is implemented. From our point of view, the people of Afghanistan, a mature people with a great cultural heritage, can easily handle their own affairs if the forces of aggression and occupation evacuated the country. There will then be no need for any other party to work for any solution for the Muslim people of Afghanistan. As a matter of fact, that is what sovereignty and self-determination really are.

61. Fourthly, paragraph 7, which deals with the Secretary-General's efforts, has a major constitutional handicap in that the good offices of the Secretary-General, in spite of his exceptional diplomatic skill and good will, are constitutionally restricted to negotiating with the puppet régime which is ruling Afghanistan, simply because it holds the reins—or let us say because the Russian troops hold the reins for it. The very capable employer of the good offices just cannot recognize the Muslim people of Afghanistan who are bravely struggling for their independence, and cannot negotiate with them, simply because they are deprived of their right to sovereignty and self-determination. This recognition of the illegitimate and lack of recognition of the legitimate stem from the malicious constitutional character of this international body, and hence all the good will and sincere efforts of the Secretary-General regrettably remain futile.

62. For these and many other reasons which I do not think need to be elaborated upon at this stage, my delegation reiterates its reservation concerning the general spirit of the draft resolution, but we shall vote for it.

63. Mr. MIZERE (Malawi): It will be recalled that the General Assembly has been debating the situation in

Afghanistan since 1979 and that the resolutions adopted so far on this subject have not been effective. There is a stalemate.

64. There is general agreement on certain principles that govern international relations in general and that pertain to Afghanistan in particular. As regards Afghanistan, the consultations that have taken place have focused on the withdrawal of foreign troops; non-interference in internal affairs; international guarantees of non-interference; and the return of Afghan refugees to their homes safely and with honour. Malawi supports these endeavours without any reservation whatsoever.

65. Malawi has observed with the greatest concern that the cardinal principles of the non-use of force and respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of any State, which are indeed enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, have not been respected, let alone implemented. They have been ignored. Moreover, it is common knowledge that Afghanistan is one of those countries in the world today of which foreign troops are in effective occupation. The General Assembly has deplored and condemned the occupying Powers in vain.

66. It is against this background that my delegation feels that there should now be a change of strategy, and it takes this opportunity to appeal to the Member States to continue to support the Secretary-General's consultations with the parties involved in the conflict in Afghanistan with a view to finding a satisfactory political solution to this dispute.

67. In conclusion, my delegation believes in the policy of contact and dialogue in solving international disputes. Because of the doubts just expressed, Malawi will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/38/L.17.

68. Mr. MONCADA ZAPATA (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Nicaragua made a statement in similar circumstances at the thirty-seventh session [82nd meeting] which we believe remains valid. Today, as last year, we are deeply concerned about the polemical and recriminatory tone that characterizes the debate on this subject. We believe that, instead of facilitating the initiation of a dialogue, the tone of the debate divides us, encouraging adherence to inflexible positions. We have seen how some countries exploit the situation and make it more acute in order to support their own global interests. In particular, we do not understand how a permanent member of the Security Council can invoke in the case of Afghanistan the sacred principle of the non-use of force or the threat of the use of force against the independence of a State, but not apply, or even admit the validity of, the same principle in the case of Central America or Grenada; how it can condemn the Soviet presence in Afghanistan but remain silent about and support the occupation of Namibia and acts of aggression against front-line countries; how it can encourage the Muslims in Afghanistan while supporting those who kill Muslims, Palestinians and Arabs in the Middle East.

69. Nicaragua considers that stability, security and peace are broad-ranging and indivisible. Our very condition as a threatened country and a victim of aggression leads us to emphasize that the use of force or the threat of the use of force, as well as any kind of intervention or interference, are very serious causes of regional destabilization and insecurity.

70. Within this context, Nicaragua continues to maintain its position of principle, insisting that political solutions must be in keeping with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and, in particular, must

be based on the complete cessation of all forms of interference and intervention in the internal affairs of States.

71. We cannot accept artificial differentiation between overt and covert interference. Such a distinction is incompatible with the Charter, with our status as a non-aligned country and with our commitment to defend the inalienable right of all peoples to be masters of their own destiny and to choose their own form of government.

72. Basing ourselves on these principles, which were emphasized in the Political Declaration of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983 [see A/38/132 and Corr.1 and 2, annex, sect. I], Nicaragua will support all efforts designed to promote constructive dialogue that will protect the interests of all countries and peoples in the region.

73. As we have stated on many occasions in connection with Central America but including other regions of conflict in the world, dialogue should be based on objective recognition of the political realities of each region, taking into account ideological pluralism and the process of social transformation, in order to achieve peaceful coexistence.

74. We repeat that it is incumbent upon the international community to avoid any heightening of tension in areas of conflict in the world, and that it can only do so by promoting conditions conducive to dialogue. In this connection, it is clear that resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on the situation in Afghanistan have not had a significant impact on the situation. The flexibility and moderation so essential to dialogue and to political settlement of disputes are not reflected in draft resolution A/38/L.17.

75. In view of what I have said and the Secretary-General's efforts and reports, Nicaragua, although it shares the ideas contained in some paragraphs of the draft resolution, would like to have a more up-to-date, far-reaching and conciliatory wording of the draft resolution which would reflect the present situation in its true dimension. For these reasons, my delegation will, as in the past, abstain from voting on draft resolution A/38/L.17.

76. Mr. MUÑOZ LEDO (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mexico will vote firmly in favour of draft resolution A/38/L.17.

77. The situation in Afghanistan continues to be a cause of deep concern for the international community. The reason is that, although several years have elapsed since the events we deplore occurred, a solution that would put an end to foreign intervention, restore international legality and bring about permanent conditions of security in that region has not yet been found.

78. Since December 1979, Mexico has categorically condemned the presence of foreign troops in Afghanistan which led to the overthrow of one political régime and its replacement by another. This practice, which, unfortunately, is multiplying in various regions, threatens the integrity and independence of developing countries, particularly those which are neighbours of the most powerful nations or which for some reason have been elevated to the rank of strategic border zones.

79. Since the days of the League of Nations, and now, when we have the Charter of the United Nations, Mexico has invariably and repeatedly condemned flagrant violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States and denial of the right of self-determination of peoples.

80. At a meeting of the Security Council,³ Mexico sponsored the draft resolution which led to the convening of the sixth emergency special session of the General Assembly to consider the question of Afghanistan in the

first few days of 1980. At the time, we said that the attention and vigilance the international community should show with regard to the foreign intervention in that country would also have to be displayed in future whenever any State was a victim or an aggressor in similar cases of violation.

81. Consistent with its firm and constant policy of principle, my delegation has actively supported the competence of the relevant organs of the United Nations to prevent invasions, aggressions and interference in the internal affairs of States. In these dangerous times, we consider it particularly necessary to reiterate the obligatory and absolute character that the Charter attaches to the prohibition of the use or threat of the use of force in international relations.

82. A policy of principle presupposes similar criteria for similar acts and similar solutions for similar problems, independently of the type of alliance, political affinity or ideological militancy involved. Nowhere, in no case, should we allow the Charter to be violated in any confrontation between East and West or as a consequence of hegemonistic claims along neo-colonial lines. First and foremost, we must prevent any sanctioning or a pernicious balance of impunity.

83. As I have already stated, we shall vote in favour of draft resolution A/38/L.17. We believe that it is of particular importance to reiterate the need to preserve the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and non-aligned character of Afghanistan. We consider it essential to seek a peaceful, just and lasting solution of the problem, which would call for the withdrawal of foreign troops and unlimited respect for the principle of non-intervention.

84. We trust that the United Nations will be able to act in this case and in all similar cases with the energy and consistency that our times demand, so that successive violations of international law will not propel us towards an irreparable breakdown.

85. Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): The delegation of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, in explaining its vote on draft resolution A/38/L.17, would like at the outset to point out that it considers the submission of this draft resolution to be a gross violation of the Charter of the United Nations and outright and flagrant interference in the internal affairs of a Member State. My delegation has categorically objected to the inclusion of the so-called question of Afghanistan in the agenda of the General Assembly and therefore firmly rejects any discussion of its internal matters in this Assembly or in any other international forum.

86. In blatant violation of the Charter, the sponsors of this draft resolution have arrogated to themselves the right to advise the Afghan people as to the kind of social, economic and political system they should adopt. We must emphasize that the Afghan people have already chosen their path and that nothing will deter them from following it.

87. Despite the imperialist hegemonistic and reactionary undeclared war launched against our revolution and people, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, with the resolute support and backing of the people, has continued with firm determination to implement a comprehensive programme of economic and social reforms in the interests of the overwhelming majority of our proud and noble people.

88. Draft resolution A/38/L.17 also contains a reference to the so-called refugees. In a very irresponsible and deliberate manner, the number of refugees has been grossly exaggerated. The main purpose is, of course, to

give a highly dramatic magnitude to the problem and to pocket more income under the name of refugees.

89. Revelations by some United Nations sources fully substantiate what we have been stating for the past few years about double-registration, over-registration, fraud and embezzlement and registration of nomads and local inhabitants as refugees.

90. As for the *bona fide* refugees, following the declaration of general amnesty for all Afghans temporarily living abroad, the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan issued a decree to that effect on 18 June 1981. The National Fatherland Front of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan only last month issued a statement in this regard [A/38/559 and Corr.1].

91. It is regrettable that every effort is being made by the Pakistani authorities to prevent the dissemination of those declarations, statements and decrees among the Afghans living in Pakistan. But, despite the deliberate obstacles placed in the way by Pakistan and the counter-revolutionaries, many thousands of those Afghans have already returned to their homes.

92. There is also a reference, in paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/38/L.17, to the "withdrawal of the foreign troops from Afghanistan". We must state emphatically that the limited Soviet contingents are in Afghanistan at the request of its lawful and legitimate Government. They were invited for the sole purpose of repelling armed aggression from outside. These contingents will be withdrawn by agreement between the Afghan and Soviet Governments only when the armed aggression against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan ceases. Therefore, the sooner the undeclared war is stopped and international guarantees secured for its non-resumption, the earlier those contingents will return to their peaceful country.

93. The divorce between the words and deeds of the Islamabad régime and its imperialist and hegemonist supporters is obvious in the light of the fact that greater quantities of increasingly sophisticated arms and equipment are being channelled into the hands of the counter-revolutionary bands stationed in Pakistan. By providing those armaments, they are making it more difficult to reverse the present dangerous pace of the developments and thus prolonging the withdrawal of these contingents.

94. The draft resolution also pays lip-service to the diplomatic process of negotiations between the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and Pakistan, conducted through the intermediary of the representative of the Secretary-General.

95. No one should fail to notice the stark contradiction between the propagandistic and hypocritical nature of this exercise imposed on the Assembly, on the one hand, and the seriousness of the negotiating process, on the other. Common sense and wisdom dictate that, for such negotiations to achieve success, it is necessary to create an atmosphere of trust and confidence between the two parties. We do not believe that such an atmosphere can be created by demagogic revelations of a distorted picture of negotiations that are supposed to be strictly confidential, and by the unleashing of slanderous and baseless accusations against the other side. This is a very harmful and dangerous attitude, which should only be deplored by all.

96. Based on those reasons, and in conformity with its position of principle, the delegation of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan strongly rejects draft resolution A/38/L.17 and will vote against it. Even if adopted, the resolution will be void of any legal validity and will

in no way be binding on the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. We are confident that no realistic and acceptable solution will be forthcoming through the adoption of such one-sided draft resolutions.

97. The only correct and realistic path for such an acceptable settlement is the path of direct negotiations as proposed by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan on 15 May 1980¹ and 24 August 1981.² It is with that in mind that the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan is engaged with the utmost sincerity in the process of negotiations with Pakistan, through the good offices of the Secretary-General. If there is any desire for the success of those negotiations, the present futile and harmful exercise in the Assembly should be discouraged and abandoned once and for all.

98. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/38/L.17 and Add.1. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution is contained in document A/38/597. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Algeria, Benin, Cape Verde, Congo, Cyprus, Finland, Guinea-Bissau, India, Iraq, Malawi, Mali, Nicaragua, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Uganda, Upper Volta, Yemen.

The draft resolution was adopted by 116 votes to 20, with 17 abstentions (resolution 38/29).

99. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their votes.

100. Mr. ALI (Democratic Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation voted against draft resolution A/38/L.17 and Add.1 for the following reasons.

101. First, the debate in the General Assembly on the so-called situation in Afghanistan should be considered

interference in the internal affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan because it is against the will of the people of that country.

102. Secondly, the draft resolution does not serve the interests of security and stability in South-West Asia; rather, it intensifies tension in the region and impedes a rapid political settlement that would serve the interests of all the peoples and nations of that region.

103. Thirdly, Democratic Yemen recognizes the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and condemns all imperialist plans aimed at undermining the independence and sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

104. Fourthly, Democratic Yemen reaffirms its support for the constructive proposals of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan to settle the differences with the neighbouring countries and calls upon all countries bordering on Afghanistan to respond favourably to those proposals so as to bring about a political settlement that will ensure stability in that region.

105. Mrs. ASHTON (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/38/L.17 and Add.1 for two basic reasons. The first is its attachment to the principle of non-intervention, which my country has been systematically and consistently upholding in this forum; the second is that Bolivia believes that we should support the Secretary-General so that he will have the backing of the international community in his efforts to achieve a just and lasting solution in this delicate matter.

106. My delegation wishes to place on record a clarification with regard to paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, since the Bolivian Government, although it supports the principle of self-determination, does not prejudice the legitimacy of the Government of Afghanistan or question its efforts to apply programmes of social change and economic development.

AGENDA ITEM 32

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

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

107. Mr. WABUGE (Kenya): Many years have passed since the Assembly first urged Member States and the Security Council to make serious efforts to bring an end to the inhuman practices of the policy of *apartheid* in South Africa. During those years, numerous resolutions and decisions have been adopted, yet the racist minority Government of South Africa continues to defy them all. The régime has shown by words and deeds that it is not prepared to listen to and heed the will of the international community. Instead, it has taken and continues to take steps to extend and tighten its tentacles of oppression of the black people of South Africa. The recent referendum conducted among its white population is a case in point. Can this referendum ever be considered to express the wishes of all the people of South Africa? For my delegation the answer is "No, it cannot". We call for the total restoration of political rights to all the people of South Africa.

*Resumed from the 63rd meeting.

108. Internal opposition to *apartheid* is met with brutal force against defenceless people, among them women and children. As we deliberate here today, the racists in Pretoria continue their brutal repression of the black majority with ever-increasing ferociousness. Those gallant sons of South Africa who have dared to oppose the system of *apartheid* have been silenced with an iron fist. Others, including women and schoolchildren, have been murdered in cold blood by the trigger-happy forces of Pretoria. Neither we nor the world can ever forget the Sharpeville massacre, the Soweto murders, the deaths of Steve Biko and Neil Aggett or the illegal detention of Nelson Mandela and many other political leaders. We call for the immediate and unconditional release of those detained.

109. The list of the acts of repression committed by this racist régime grows longer with every passing day. Yet, in spite of the world-wide outcry, no appreciable action appears to have been taken. Before it is too late, the Assembly and the international community as a whole must take stronger action against the racist régime to bring to an end the practice of *apartheid* in South Africa.

110. Many international gatherings have been held to expose and condemn with equal force the practices of the evil system of *apartheid*. It appears in these gatherings that all are agreed to bring to an end the practices of *apartheid*. Yet all efforts to get stronger action taken against South Africa continue to meet with crippling resistance. We appeal to those that have thwarted the efforts to get stronger action to reconsider their position and co-operate fully in the struggle against *apartheid*.

111. The repressive activities of Pretoria have not been confined to South Africa. The régime has made every conceivable effort to export its *apartheid* policies to Namibia while illegally occupying that Territory. Had it not been for the protection and defence of *apartheid* South Africa, Namibia would by now be a free, sovereign State. South Africa has consistently crossed its borders and committed acts of aggression against its peace-loving neighbours, notably Angola, Mozambique, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland. The United Nations has condemned these acts of aggression and terror against independent, sovereign African States. However, the condemnation has fallen on deaf ears.

112. In the struggle against the *apartheid* policy practised by the minority Government of South Africa, at least one thing has become increasingly clear: that the racist régime by its words and deeds has declared that it follows a policy of continued non-co-operation with the international community, including the United Nations. It is time for us to ask ourselves what should be done at this juncture.

113. In the view of my delegation, the entire membership of the United Nations, including all the permanent members of the Security Council, should firmly uphold and defend the rights and freedoms of humanity irrespective of race and social standing so that the dignity of all in freedom may be realized. To that end, we call for the application in the case of South Africa of the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations against that country's practices of the policies of *apartheid*.

114. We do so because we are of the view that the racist minority Government of South Africa still continues to flourish defiantly despite the selective sanctions adopted against it. We are disappointed that the resolutions related to this question have failed to have effect because they are flouted by some Members of the United Nations. Many Governments, multinational concerns, financial institutions and so forth have continued to do business

as usual with South Africa, despite the world-wide condemnation of such actions. By that fact alone, South Africa has been encouraged to defy further the United Nations in the knowledge that it has supporters among the Members of the Organization. Any Government and any institutions under its jurisdiction that continue to do business with South Africa must realize that they are committing a crime against humanity and stand condemned by the entire human race. We in Kenya reject any form of collaboration with South Africa in all fields.

115. In conclusion, I would like to state that Kenya will continue to support all the resolutions of the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity [OAU] and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries with regard to the struggle against *apartheid*. We shall accept measures in all fields that are aimed at the total isolation of South Africa by the international community. We shall resist and condemn any efforts by any Government that would like the international community to act otherwise. We shall do this because we are strongly opposed to the practice of *apartheid* and racial discrimination in all its forms.

116. Let me underline the fact that Kenya is not—I repeat, not—opposed to the white population of South Africa, but rather we are totally opposed to the few misguided so-called leaders who pursue and perpetuate the policies of *apartheid*. What Kenya would like to see in South Africa is the elimination of *apartheid* and the establishment of a society in which all the people of South Africa as a whole, irrespective of race, colour or creed, will enjoy equal and full political and other rights and participate freely in the determination of their destiny. We consider the practices of *apartheid* as a crime against humanity.

117. We will continue to support the efforts of the liberation movements of South Africa in their struggle against *apartheid* and will continue to consider South Africa unworthy of credibility as long as it continues to practice the policies of *apartheid*.

118. Finally, I wish to pay a tribute to the Chairman and members of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* for their enduring efforts to give the Assembly detailed reports on the many aspects of the practices of the policies of *apartheid* by the minority Government of South Africa.

119. Mr. ALI (Singapore): Although the General Assembly has been considering and condemning the *apartheid* policy of the Government of South Africa for the past three decades, the subject, unlike the proverbial horse, is still alive and kicking, and it behoves us to continue to flog the beast until it is dead.

120. Why do we oppose the *apartheid* policy of the Government of South Africa? We do so because we recognize racial prejudice as a dangerous sickness threatening the healthy development of the human race and because we recognize racial discrimination as an unmitigated evil in society. Although South Africa is the worst practitioner of the evil of racial discrimination, it is not the only offender. All of us, in accordance with our commitment to the principles of racial equality enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, have a responsibility to eliminate the evil of racial discrimination from our respective nations.

121. The statements of preceding speakers have painted a uniformly bleak picture. I do not deny that the Pretoria régime is economically strong and militarily powerful. The struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa for racial justice is therefore not an easy one. I would like, however, to point to a number of positive facts of the

past year with respect to our common struggle against *apartheid*.

122. First, during the past year the resistance to *apartheid* inside South Africa has continued with greater vigour and unity. Workers, students, journalists, teachers, church leaders and black community organizations have intensified their opposition to *apartheid*. Secondly, South Africa's bantustan policy, which is aimed at creating a South Africa without black citizens, has failed to gain any international support. The four bantustan homelands have not been recognized by any country except South Africa. Thirdly, the new constitutional amendment to create a racially segregated tricameral legislature for whites and for Coloured and Indian minorities has failed to attract the support of the majority in the Coloured and Indian communities. The opposition of the Coloured and Indian communities to the constitutional amendment which would have the effect of excluding the African majority from participation in Parliament was expressed at the National Forum Conference at Hammanskraal on 11 and 12 June 1983 and at the launching of the United Democratic Front in Cape Town on 21 August 1983.

123. The international community can support the oppressed people of South Africa in their struggle for racial justice in three ways. First, by isolating South Africa politically, diplomatically, militarily and economically; secondly, by giving all necessary support to the oppressed people of South Africa and to their national liberation movements; and thirdly, by mobilizing public opinion and encouraging public action in support of the efforts of the United Nations.

124. The *apartheid* leaders seem determined to use any means to maintain the *status quo* and to resist the winds of change. Although the Pretoria régime is strong and powerful and those struggling against it may appear weak and vulnerable, I believe that in the end, *apartheid* will be overthrown and racial justice will prevail in South Africa. I shall conclude by appealing to those countries in the West that have leverage in Pretoria to apply pressure on South Africa in order to induce it to abandon its *apartheid* policy and to embark on the path of racial equality before the whole of southern Africa explodes in a violent conflagration.

125. Mr. HOUFFANE (Djibouti) (*interpretation from French*): In this world there is no more odious, more repugnant or more revolting policy than the policy of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa, a policy of abominable and inhuman racial segregation which the international community has universally condemned as a crime against humanity and a threat to international peace and security. But this racist policy, in spite of the numerous resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, is gaining ground and making the situation in southern Africa ever more explosive.

126. It is highly regrettable that the Pretoria racist régime, in spite of repeated appeals by the international community, should recently have taken further measures to strengthen its policy of *apartheid* towards the black majority of the population of South Africa. This self-proclaimed constitutional reform was explicitly and firmly condemned by the General Assembly in resolution 38/11 of 15 November 1983, adopted by the overwhelming majority, in which it declared

“that the so-called ‘constitutional proposals’ are contrary to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, that the results of the referendum are of no validity whatsoever and that the enforcement of the proposed ‘constitution’ will inevitably aggravate tension and conflict in South Africa and in southern Africa as a whole”.

The General Assembly also rejected

“the so-called ‘constitutional proposals’ and all insidious manoeuvres by the racist minority régime of South Africa further to entrench white minority rule and *apartheid*.”

127. By these new manoeuvres, South Africa is trying to deprive the African indigenous majority of all its fundamental rights, including citizenship, thus transforming South Africa into a country reserved to the exclusive use of whites. The situation is therefore becoming ever more explosive.

128. It is our view that the present state of tension and confrontation will continue and that no peaceful solution will be possible in the region unless the system of *apartheid* is dismantled and the fundamental rights of the African majority established.

129. For this reason it is regrettable that the Pretoria racist régime, in spite of constant appeals from the international community, should refuse to give up these practices of *apartheid*, in defiance and in flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

130. In South Africa, as in Namibia, the black African majority is oppressed in every possible way and deprived of its most basic human rights. Those who comprise that majority are considered as subhuman, unworthy of a decent life. They are denied freedom of movement and residence, as well as freedom of opinion. For them, education is nothing but a system which prepares them for servitude. To perpetuate this servitude, the Pretoria racist régime uses force and spends vast sums of money on the implements of warfare. The régime appears to believe that, by the threat of the use of arms and imprisonment, it can force the black African population to give up its struggle against racism, *apartheid* and oppression. It has also intensified executions of freedom fighters, in spite of appeals for clemency from the General Assembly and the Security Council and from the international community throughout the world. Summary and arbitrary executions of detainees are becoming ever more frequent.

131. Under these circumstances, the black majority of the people of South Africa, as well as of Namibia, have the legitimate right to fight by all means at their disposal, including armed struggle, against the practices of segregation, racism and racial discrimination, against continuous brutal repression and the genocide being perpetrated by the South African racist régime.

132. We commend the South African and Namibian peoples for their struggle, under the aegis of their national liberation movements, to win back their freedom. The international community should give its whole-hearted support and solidarity to the South African and Namibian peoples in their struggle against *apartheid*, racism and racial discrimination, and occupation.

133. In its awareness of this crime against humanity and the danger it poses to international peace and security, the General Assembly has for more than 20 years called on Member States, separately or jointly, to take effective measures in accordance with provisions of the Charter of the United Nations to put an end to the racist régime. In resolution 37/69A of 9 December 1982, the General Assembly

“Reaffirms its conviction that comprehensive and mandatory sanctions imposed by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, universally applied, are the most appropriate and effective means by which the international community can assist the legitimate struggle of the oppressed

people of South Africa and discharge its responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security;

“*Again urges* the Security Council to determine that the situation in South Africa and in southern Africa as a whole, resulting from the policies and actions of the *apartheid* régime of South Africa, constitutes a grave and growing threat to international peace and security, and to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the régime under Chapter VII of the Charter.”

Mr. Pelletier (Canada), Vice-President, took the Chair.

134. Unfortunately, hardly was the ink on the resolution dry when South Africa attacked the Kingdom of Lesotho, a peace-loving, land-locked country.

135. The racist régime of South Africa is increasing its barbarous acts of armed aggression in Angola and Mozambique. Following closely in the footsteps of its Zionist counterpart in Tel Aviv, the *apartheid* régime has even carried its criminal activities into the refugee camps.

136. In spite of all this, the Security Council has been prevented from taking the necessary measures. It has become clear that South Africa could not have engaged in this policy of oppression and aggression and defied in this way the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations if it had not been encouraged by the collaboration, collusion and support of certain countries, and of Israel. The report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* [A/38/22 and Add.1] provides very clear evidence of this collaboration, which in our view is an abuse of confidence and a betrayal of the just struggle of the South African and Namibian peoples for their freedom and independence.

137. The policy of *apartheid* of South Africa and the policy of the Zionist entity in Tel Aviv have identical aspects. That is why co-operation between the two racist régimes remains very close. This growing collaboration between Israel and racist South Africa, particularly in the military and nuclear fields, constitutes a threat to peace and stability in Africa and throughout the world and represents a serious challenge to the United Nations. The International Conference on the Alliance between South Africa and Israel, held in Vienna from 11 to 13 July 1983 [see A/38/22, paras. 63-73], unmasked the constant development of relations between the two racist régimes in all fields: military, nuclear, economic, scientific and cultural. The Conference exposed the lies and spurious arguments of Israel, which claims that it has no relations with the South African régime.

138. Any policy against the elimination of *apartheid* is against the most elementary human rights concerning the elimination of slavery and subjugation. We also believe that any policy which supports or tolerates the South African *apartheid* régime is incompatible with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and is doomed to failure.

139. We vigorously condemn the policy of bantustanization, the sole aim of which is to create a permanent pool of cheap labour.

140. We also condemn the criminal acts of terrorism and armed aggression, which are increasing in number, against the front-line neighbouring States. Those States have the right to defend themselves against these repeated acts of aggression and intimidation, the aim of which is to destabilize them so that they will be unable to help the valiant peoples of South Africa and Namibia and their national liberation movements. We pay a tribute to them for the courageous and praiseworthy role they are playing in giving all possible moral and material support

to the freedom fighters, struggling against *apartheid* and occupation.

141. We applaud the efforts of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, which, under the enlightened and dedicated leadership of Mr. Maitama-Sule, of Nigeria, has stepped up the mobilization of support for sanctions against the South African racist régime.

142. The delegation of Djibouti fully endorses the Committee's conclusions and accordingly supports its recommendations [see A/38/22, chap. III] and the Programme of Action against *Apartheid* that it has proposed [see A/38/539].

143. Mr. ADAN (Somalia): The report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* [A/38/22 and Add.1] reminds us that we cannot overestimate the importance of the task of eliminating *apartheid*. This task remains one of the foremost challenges of our time, because the institutionalized racism of South Africa's minority régime strikes at the fundamental objectives of the United Nations.

144. My delegation hopes that long familiarity with this issue will not lead Member States to become complacent about *apartheid* or to lessen the intensity of their efforts to eliminate this evil system. *Apartheid* has rightly been designated a crime against humanity, and as long as it exists it will be a symbol of racist oppression and the denial of human rights.

145. A redoubling of efforts to respond to this challenge is called for, since the situation in southern Africa created by the racist and colonialist policies of the Pretoria régime has never been more dangerous. Nearly two decades ago, the Security Council recognized that those policies could threaten regional and international peace and security. Today, the threat has become a grim reality, and tension and conflict are endemic in the area.

146. It could hardly be otherwise when the dispossession and alienation of the indigenous majority in South Africa continues to be vigorously pursued through the gross injustice of the bantustan plan. At the same time, increasingly brutal police-State measures are used to crush any opposition to *apartheid*.

147. The so-called constitutional changes recently approved by the white minority are, of course, only a cover-up for the continued disenfranchisement of the black majority, the denial of their citizenship and the denial of their humanity. Only a few days ago, on 15 November, the General Assembly adopted, by an overwhelming majority and without opposition, resolution 38/11, declaring those “constitutional proposals” contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and rejecting them as insidious manoeuvres.

148. The external policies of the Pretoria régime are as barbaric and provocative as its internal ones. The undeclared but none the less violent war being waged against freedom fighters and neighbouring States is a constant breach of the peace of southern Africa. Regrettably, the *apartheid* régime is able to direct its acts of economic and political subversion and of military aggression against sovereign States with impunity, since the condemnations of these actions by the Security Council are mere formalities.

149. South Africa's belligerent policies clearly violate international law. They are to be doubly condemned because they are aimed at terrorizing countries which support liberation struggles declared legitimate by the United Nations.

150. The vicious bombing of civilian populations and of refugees from *apartheid*, the arming and financing of

dissident groups and the military occupation of neighbouring territory must all be seen in conjunction with South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia and its suppression of the aspirations of the Namibian people to freedom and independence. Clearly, the world community is faced with an attempt by the *apartheid* régime to establish by brute force a racist and oppressive hegemony over the southern African region.

151. In view of the critical nature of the situation in and around South Africa, the international community should give strong and active support to the three main lines of action against *apartheid* proposed by the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, namely, the isolation of the Pretoria régime, support for the liberation movements and the mobilization of world public opinion and action [see A/38/22, para. 306].

152. In the view of my delegation, the total isolation of South Africa must remain a major international goal until its minority régime is prepared to establish a just society in that country.

153. Unfortunately, the collaboration of a small group of States, and particularly of Israel, with the Pretoria régime in economic, military, diplomatic, political and social fields contributes directly to the entrenchment of *apartheid*. It also strengthens the régime in its defiance of United Nations resolutions and undermines the international campaign against *apartheid*.

154. We urge those States to engage in joint consultations to explore how best they might take concerted action in compliance with United Nations resolutions on South Africa.

155. In the view of my delegation, the imposition of comprehensive, mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations would be the most effective measure against *apartheid*, and we note that this measure has gained added validity from the findings of the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in 1981.⁴

156. We believe also that high priority should be given to strengthening the arms embargo so that it includes a ban on the supply of any nuclear technology or material to South Africa. The build-up of South Africa's sophisticated military machine and the supply of nuclear weapon technology to this belligerent violator of international law has been a particularly dangerous development.

157. With regard to the southern African liberation movements, it must be emphasized that the black people of South Africa have exhausted all possible means of bringing about peaceful change. Their armed struggle is now firmly established and should be accorded respect and support. It must certainly be seen as part of the long historical process in which peoples have courageously resisted intolerable oppression. In our view, the liberation movements recognized by the OAU deserve increased humanitarian, educational and political assistance from the United Nations system and all necessary support from Member States.

158. One of the most successful of the activities promoted by the Special Committee against *Apartheid* has been the dissemination of information and the encouragement of public action by governmental and non-governmental organizations and by concerned individuals.

159. My delegation believes it is particularly important to call attention to the persecution of political leaders in South Africa. As we are all aware, banning orders, detention without trial and the brutal murder of political detainees are commonplace. We are gratified by the

support given to the international campaign to release Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners. We hope it will be widely recognized that the Afrikaner *gulags* are no less symbolic of repression and the denial of human rights than their counterparts elsewhere.

160. In conclusion, my delegation appeals to all countries to co-operate in implementing the peaceful measures available to the United Nations to put an end to the crime of *apartheid*. In doing so, they will be fulfilling an important obligation flowing from their membership of the Organization.

161. Mr. MOLI (Uganda): The General Assembly has once again taken up the question of the *apartheid* policies of the Government of South Africa, a question on which the whole international community is united in its condemnation of the practices of that régime. The international community is united because *apartheid* stands in complete contradiction to the ideals and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In these debates, we have every year for the last three decades adopted resolutions calling for an immediate end to the institutionalized violation of human rights and human dignity, an end to the *apartheid* system in South Africa.

162. However, the reaction of South Africa to its ever-deepening isolation and to the pressure from the international community has been defiance, resistance and systematic perpetuation of its policies through an ever-increasing resort to violence and repression and the imprisonment, assassination and murder of opponents of the *apartheid* system.

163. Today, Nelson Mandela and other political detainees continue to languish in South African prisons. Fresh arrests on flimsy grounds and the enactment of humiliating laws against trade unions, students, journalists and women have continued unabated, while torture and ill treatment of detainees have remained widespread. Unexplained deaths in the hands of the South African police and prison authorities continue to occur, while no member of the security forces of South Africa has ever been convicted in connection with such deaths. The opponents of *apartheid* have also continued to suffer banning, repressive laws and censorship by the racist régime.

164. In June of this year, the racist régime of South Africa committed in cold blood a triple murder of African National Congress [ANC] freedom fighters. In carrying out the barbaric executions of those young men, the racist régime ignored the appeals of the General Assembly and the Security Council and of many Heads of State or Government for clemency and commutation of the death sentences of the freedom fighters.

165. As part of the attempt to deny the black population citizenship of their country, that majority population, particularly helpless women and children, continue to be herded into remote and barren homelands, where the problems of unemployment, lack of arable land, poverty, malnutrition and disease have worsened. As the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* states:

“The situation in the bantustans assumed such tragic proportions that the South African Council of Churches launched the Hunger Relief Fund to help the most needy. In KwaZulu about half a million people were suffering from malnutrition, while 300,000 others were suffering similarly in Gazankulu, Transkei and Ciskei. In some areas, one child died of starvation each day.” [A/38/22, annex I, para. 108.]

166. In spite of this appalling situation in the bantustans, the racist régime, in furtherance of the bankrupt

bantustan policy, has announced its intention to grant the same status to KwaNdebele by 1984.

167. The forcible removal and evacuation of large numbers of the population by the racist régime of South Africa must be viewed in the context of its policy of transforming South Africa into a white man's country by depriving the entire African population of their citizenship. These policies are closely geared to the racist régime's desperate but ultimately futile attempts to perpetuate its Fascist rule in the face of growing national resistance and the advancing forces of liberation.

168. In an effort to cover up its racist schemes, South Africa has put out extensive propaganda aimed at gaining acceptance of its cosmetic racial changes. The recent attempt to hoodwink the international community through proposals for constitutional reforms for the Coloured and Asian population which would permit them to participate in Parliament with a status inferior to that of whites, and totally excluding the black majority population, is yet another device designed further to entrench the *apartheid* system and perpetuate white minority rule and also to divide the oppressed people of South Africa.

169. The South African collaborators in certain Western countries have been busy trying to deceive the world into believing that the Pretoria régime is committed to changing its *apartheid* policies. Much propaganda has been unleashed to glorify the so-called reforms in the *apartheid* system.

170. The cosmetic operations of the South African authorities do not and cannot change the racist, anti-human purpose of the *apartheid* system in South Africa. They seek to weaken the struggle of the oppressed people and to divert the wave of wrath and protest of international public opinion. The verdict of the General Assembly on the proposals for the so-called reforms was confirmed by the adoption, on 15 November 1983 by an overwhelming majority, of resolution 38/11 rejecting those proposals. By this action, the United Nations once again demonstrated its total opposition to cosmetic racial reforms. Therefore, nothing short of the total eradication of *apartheid* in all its forms and manifestations and the establishment of a democratic State in which all the people of South Africa, regardless of race, colour or creed, will enjoy equal rights, including the right to elect a representative national Government, will satisfy the oppressed people and put an end to their just struggle.

171. Three decades of discussion of this question have not eliminated *apartheid* but have contributed decisively towards the mobilization of various forces for the struggle against the abhorrent policy of *apartheid*. The resistance movement in South Africa has in fact assumed new dimensions and has grown on an unprecedented scale. All attempts by the racists to break the resistance struggle, whether through the so-called reforms offered or through brutal oppression, have failed.

172. On the contrary, the execution of freedom fighters, the deaths in detention of several political detainees and the systematic and widespread torture, political trials, bannings and harassment meted out to the opponents of *apartheid* have only strengthened the resolve of the oppressed people of South Africa to unite and fight for the eradication of *apartheid* and the establishment of a non-racial and democratic society. In the growing armed struggle against *apartheid*, freedom fighters have escalated the military action aimed at new targets, including the régime's military establishment.

173. Alarmed at the growing resistance in the country, the racist régime has resolved to increase military aggression and destabilization against the independent States

of the region. This year alone, South Africa has committed unprovoked aggression against Lesotho, Angola and Mozambique, causing loss of lives and other casualties. Today, South Africa not only occupies parts of southern Angola but is also striving to expand its occupation further north. There is a growing feeling among many countries that the racist régime is determined to secure its positions at all costs, including the possible occupation of some of the territory of the front-line States to serve as buffer zones against the mounting liberation struggle. The aggressive course of confrontation pursued by the Pretoria régime is fraught with grave dangers to peace not only in Africa but in the whole world.

174. It is regrettable to note that the international effort to isolate the racist régime has been nullified by the support and co-operation that régime receives from certain Western countries in the political, economic and military fields. The transnational corporations and banks of these countries have continued to finance the economy and the enormous military expenditures of racist South Africa. The arms embargo has proved ineffective because of the military and economic collaboration with South Africa by certain Western countries and their multinational corporations, and also Israel. As a result of this collaboration, South Africa's nuclear-weapon capability has reportedly improved, and South Africa now has enough material and sufficient technology to produce a number of nuclear weapons. This situation, coupled with South Africa's aggressive behaviour in the region, clearly threatens international peace and security.

175. The report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* [A/38/22 and Add.1] clearly confirms where the responsibility lies for the deteriorating situation in southern Africa. This responsibility lies with the Western Powers and with the multinational corporations and other interests which have, in defiance of the United Nations resolutions, continued to co-operate with that régime in the military, technological and economic fields. The international community cannot look on at this development without taking action. Resolute steps on the part of the United Nations are needed to call a halt to this situation.

176. The Special Committee Against *Apartheid* has continued to spearhead the United Nations efforts effectively in the eradication of *apartheid*. Because of the commitment and dedication of the Special Committee, the campaign against *apartheid* has reached new heights. Men and women of conscience all over the world have been aroused, and the struggle against *apartheid* has become truly universal. In this regard, I should like, on behalf of my delegation, to commend the members of the Special Committee and particularly its Chairman, Mr. Maitama-Sule, of Nigeria, whose initiatives and dynamism have continued to contribute greatly to the successful work of that Committee.

177. My delegation is happy to give its full support to the recommendations of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* [see A/38/22, chap. III]. We believe that, as the struggle against the racist régime heightens, the international community must continue to maintain a united front in the struggle to eliminate *apartheid*. We condemn those countries which continue to collaborate with the racist régime. We appeal to them to put an end to their parochial interests in South Africa and to join the international struggle against the inhuman system of *apartheid* and racial discrimination by implementing the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations, particularly Security Council resolution 418 (1977) of 4 November 1977, on the arms embargo against South Africa, and the Declaration and the Programme of Action recently adopted at

the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, held in Geneva from 1 to 12 August 1983.⁵

178. Lastly, I wish to reaffirm the solidarity of the Government and people of Uganda with the freedom fighters of the ANC and the Pan Africanist Congress and, indeed, with the oppressed people of South Africa, who are waging a courageous and extremely arduous struggle against the determined and inflexible enemy, the racist régime of South Africa. My delegation believes that there is still time for the United Nations to make the peaceful choice of applying comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, to force South Africa to put an end to its policy of *apartheid*. As the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of Uganda warned on 11 October 1983 in this Assembly:

“the South African racist régime [is] sitting on an active volcano. That volcano is now showing everywhere signs of erupting. Mere cosmetic changes such as the so-called constitutional reforms will not prevent that eruption. The only preventive measure against total eruption and a consequent blood bath is the complete eradication of the evil system of *apartheid*. Those who continue to collaborate with the racist régime must share responsibility for the violence that is escalating in South Africa.” [27th meeting, para. 122.]

179. Mr. MACIEL (Brazil): Even though almost everything that could be said has been said about the evil nature of *apartheid* and about the degrading social and political system inspired by it, Brazil feels impelled once again to join in the world community's unanimous condemnation of the racist policies which the South African régime uses to subjugate the overwhelming majority of the people of South Africa.

180. A question that has been inscribed on the agenda of the United Nations since its very inception, the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa relates to a subject which has generated some of the longest debates and on which more resolutions have been passed than almost any other. One might well say that the persistence of the system of *apartheid* can be counted as one of the greatest failures of the United Nations.

181. Perhaps on no other international issue has there been such a wide gap between the intensity of our commonly held, deepest convictions, proclaimed in this Hall every year, and the bitter reality that confronts us. And yet we owe it to our own consciences and even more to the suffering peoples of South Africa themselves to persevere in our efforts. Sooner or later, freedom must inevitably prevail, and the struggling people of South Africa will then be able to enjoy their inalienable right to citizenship in their own country.

182. The situation obtaining in South Africa since the institutionalization of *apartheid* in 1948 cannot be described solely as a simple case of the violation of human rights. Although in essence that is exactly what it is, the persistence and brutality of the policies resorted to by the leaders in Pretoria in order to foist *apartheid* upon the people of South Africa, in defiance of the will of the rest of Africa and the world at large, have converted the situation in South Africa into what can be considered a real threat to the whole southern African region. *Apartheid* has become a major factor of instability and a source of tension which, if left unchecked, will sooner or later explode into open and unrestrained military confrontation, with predictably deleterious consequences for international peace and security.

183. The South African Government, in order to ward off what it perceives as unhealthy influences of the winds of liberalization, acts as if it were entitled to sow havoc in neighbouring independent States. Not only has South Africa continued its illegal occupation and militarization of Namibia, where it has implanted the condemnable system of homelands, but at this very moment it unabashedly occupies the southern part of the territory of Angola, in violation of the letter and the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations. It proceeds with attempts to destabilize countries like Zimbabwe, Lesotho and Mozambique, into whose territories it has stepped up its military forays. Brazil would like to reaffirm its support for the right of those friendly independent States of Africa to enjoy full sovereignty without any foreign interference or hindrance.

184. Only a few days ago, on 15 November, the General Assembly adopted resolution 38/11, condemning the so-called constitutional reforms adopted on 2 November 1983 in South Africa by a referendum in which only the white electorate participated. My delegation, together with 140 others, voted in favour of that resolution out of its distrust of the intentions behind those so-called constitutional proposals. Indeed, it would be wishful thinking to see in them what in some quarters has been described as a first positive step in an evolutionary process leading to the eventual dismantling of *apartheid*. Quite the contrary, the proposals to change the South African Constitution will entail a further entrenchment of the *apartheid* system.

185. By luring people of mixed race and Asian descent into the political life of the country, those measures will contribute only to alienating even further the black majority, who will continue to enjoy no political rights, to be confined to those demarcated areas specifically allotted to them and to endure the severity of the unacceptable pass laws. The so-called constitutional reforms will have no effect whatsoever on the institutional structure of South Africa, for only the white minority will continue to wield political power. We are heartened to note that many leaders of mixed race and Asian communities have refused to be deceived by this devious attempt to goad them into becoming accomplices of the system of *apartheid*.

186. Although at this moment there seem to be no grounds for optimism, my Government, consistent with the principles that inspire its foreign policy, still hopes that the present unjust state of affairs in South Africa will be superseded peacefully by a new order in which all men and women, irrespective of race or political affiliation, will be able to live together as equals. We cherish the belief that the United Nations, by resorting to all peaceful mechanisms available to it, will bring the South African leaders to realize that no one stands to gain from the perpetuation of the present tense situation. The escalation of acts of violence in the region is a harbinger of a large military confrontation, the effects of which could spill over beyond the confines of the southern African region and invite interference from outside. We should all act decisively before it is too late to prevent this from happening.

187. I could not conclude this brief statement without expressing my delegation's appreciation to the Special Committee against *Apartheid* for the work it has done in behalf of the noble cause of freedom and dignity.

188. Mr. URBINA ORTEGA (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): More than 30 years have elapsed since the United Nations dealt for the first time with the policy of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa; more than 30 years of tireless effort by the international

community to reclaim the rights of the majority; more than 30 years of effort by the United Nations to have the principle of equality of all men respected; and, lastly, more than 30 years in which the conscience of our present-day world has been shaken by the shameless violation of the principles on which coexistence among peoples is based.

189. My delegation has followed this struggle closely. Costa Rica follows with interest the work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. We deplore that not all the resources in the hands of the international community are placed at the service of the cause of the struggle against *apartheid*. We regret that the wealth of South African soil is irresistible to the greed of transnational capital. Also, we deplore the fact that the commercial flows between South Africa and other countries give the racist régime of Pretoria the oxygen it needs to continue perpetrating its crime against humanity. My delegation deplores the fact that international financial bodies continue to feed the South African régime, alleging the technical nature of that assistance and resisting what they call "politicization" of their criteria.

190. International investments, trade and financing conspire daily against the struggle of the United Nations to eradicate the institutionalized forms of racism that prevail in southern Africa.

191. In this context, the weight of the struggle against *apartheid* falls on third-world countries. This weight is heaviest for the African countries and the confrontation, even more ominous. We developing countries of other latitudes have been and continue to be consistent in our struggle against *apartheid*, but we do not benefit in this struggle from the decided support of those who bear the greatest responsibilities. The struggle against *apartheid* today is the struggle of third-world countries to secure the support of the powerful in a struggle that is ours but is also the struggle of mankind. It is not sufficient for those bearing the greatest responsibilities to intercede in vain for the lives of the freedom fighters of the great South African nation. It is necessary for them to decide to use their immense resources to put an end to the South African night. We are convinced that, when the international community acts decisively, the Pretoria minority will have to abandon its retrograde policy and open its doors to the proper representation of the South African nation.

192. We Latin Americans struggled against colonialism in our own continent and, early in our history, demanded equality for all Americans. We have noted with very great satisfaction that, as part of the bicentenary celebration in 1983 of the birth of the Liberator, Simón Bolívar, the Simón Bolívar Award has been given to Nelson Mandela, who is both an apostle and a symbol of the struggle for liberation of the South African people.

193. Our participation in this debate testifies to the determination of the democratic people of Costa Rica to lend their support to the struggle against *apartheid*. We dream of an authentically democratic régime for South Africa based on the freedom and equality of all South Africans, as a reflection of the political will of the majority.

194. Our South African brothers can count on the decisive support of our people and the unswerving backing of our Government.

195. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I now call on the representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I remind them that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to

10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

196. Mr. FAFOWORA (Nigeria): Last Thursday, 17 November, the representative of Israel made a statement [61st meeting] on the question of *apartheid*, and in the course of his statement he chose to attack the Special Committee against *Apartheid* as well as the Centre against *Apartheid*.

197. I have decided to exercise the right of reply for two reasons. The first reason is that the statement by the Israeli representative was one more example of the cynicism and distortion to which the Israeli Government has repeatedly resorted in diverting attention from its collaboration with the *apartheid* régime. We are now only too familiar with these tactics. The second reason is that Nigeria is the current Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, which organized the International Conference on the Alliance between South Africa and Israel, held in Vienna from 11 to 13 July 1983, and I had the honour to preside over that Conference.

198. The representative of Israel was conveniently absent last Tuesday, 15 November, when the General Assembly adopted resolution 38/11, condemning the new racist Constitution of South Africa, but last Thursday he ventured to speak to attack the Special Committee against *Apartheid*.

199. The main concern of the Special Committee is to bring about the total elimination, from the African continent, of *apartheid* and other vestiges of racism. In order to discharge this responsibility fully, the Committee has a duty to inform the international community of the activities of Governments that are seeking to strengthen the military capability of the *apartheid* régime and to undermine international efforts to ensure the elimination of *apartheid*. As the records of the Assembly show, the Israeli Government is one such Government. It has steadily developed an alliance with the racist régime of South Africa, an alliance that has grown more intimate, despite the numerous cynical denials which emanate from Tel Aviv.

200. The representative of Israel has not tried to refute any of the evidence of growing collaboration with the South African racist régime, nor has he provided any undertaking that his Government will cease such collaboration. Instead, he has tried to insinuate that the complaint is against what he described as the minor trade of Israel with South Africa. The figures he used regarding Israel's trade relations with South Africa are totally misleading as they do not include the arms trade, the diamond trade and many other economic relations.

201. The issue, however, is not merely one of trade relations with the *apartheid* régime, but the much more serious evidence of collusion by Israel with the racist régime of South Africa, which is engaged in a brutal war against the African majority in South Africa, against the people of Namibia and against the front-line States. I will mention only a few facts, and I challenge the representative of Israel to deny them.

202. In 1976, the Prime Minister of South Africa, Mr. Vorster, led a high-level delegation to Israel. Israeli propaganda told the world that he was only visiting the Holy Places, but he had discussions with the Israeli Prime Minister, the Foreign Minister and the Defence Minister and visited military installations and armaments factories. The two régimes signed a series of agreements establishing a virtual alliance and agreed on periodic joint meetings of finance, defence and other ministers. No other country in the world has similar co-operation agreements with

the racist régime of South Africa. Does the representative of Israel deny that?

203. Israeli Defence Ministers and military officers have often visited South Africa and even lectured at South African military schools. Mr. Ariel Sharon, then Defence Minister, even went to the war front on the Namibia-Angola border in December 1981 and then tried to persuade some Western Powers to provide South Africa with more sophisticated military equipment. That information came from a press report in *The New York Times*. Does the representative of Israel deny its veracity?

204. Can he explain how Israeli patrol boats and Gabriel missiles find their way to the South African Navy in flagrant violation of the mandatory arms embargo instituted by the Security Council? Can he explain how Israeli pilotless aeroplanes violated the sovereignty of Mozambique last May?

205. The General Assembly has unanimously denounced the so-called independence of the bantustans in South Africa and called on all Governments to have no relations with them. How is it that the authorities of the bantustans are frequent visitors to Israel and that Israel has become the main source of investment in and technical co-operation with the bantustans?

206. One of the favourite guests of Israel is Chief Lennox Sebe of the bantustan of Ciskei, who has become notorious for killing and torturing his people for their opposition to *apartheid*. Will the representative of Israel deny that he has received military and other assistance from Israel?

207. According to the *Sowetan* of Johannesburg, on 10 March 1983 Chief Lennox Sebe told the press on his return from a visit to Israel that Israel had agreed to have closer co-operation with Ciskei "in all spheres". As an example, he stated that Israel had given, as a gift to the Ciskei security forces, a special police dog which had seen action in Beirut. Israel also presented a presidential aircraft to the so-called Government of Ciskei. How much more intimate can relations be?

208. On 23 June 1983, Chief Sebe announced the establishment of an arms factory and said it was the result of negotiations held during his visit to the Federal Republic of Germany and Israel. An informed source was quoted by the South African press as disclosing that the equipment had been purchased in Israel. On 8 September 1983, the so-called Deputy Minister of Defence of the so-called independent State of Ciskei disclosed that Ciskei was purchasing aircraft from Israel for its air force and that Israel would train the pilots. I know that the representative of Israel is very allergic to press reports—even from Israel and South Africa—about its collaboration with the South African racists, but the Special Committee against *Apartheid* will not fail to acquaint the General Assembly with all available information.

209. I would like to state for the record that all the members of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* appreciate and indeed commend the work of the Centre against *Apartheid* in assisting the Special Committee in its work and publicizing its activities and documentation. In fact, we have requested the Centre to undertake wider dissemination of the documentation of the International Conference on the Alliance between South Africa and Israel, held in Vienna from 11 to 13 July 1983, and other information on the relations between Israel and South Africa. We have full confidence in the integrity of the Centre against *Apartheid*.

210. The Special Committee against *Apartheid* will not be deterred by the vicious propaganda of the Israeli

Government, and we are confident that the Secretary-General and the Secretariat will not be influenced by the improper pressures of Israel in discharging their responsibilities under the resolutions of the General Assembly.

211. Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): In his statement two days ago [64th meeting], the head of the Pakistan delegation referred to my Government as a régime which was installed and is being sustained by alien forces. His fallacious version of the facts notwithstanding, we regret the fact that not all delegations abide by the elementary rules of ethics in this Assembly or in their inter-State relations. We therefore abstain from calling his Government the "Islamabad Military Régime" which is being sustained by bullets and the bayonet.

212. Our Government has come to power as a result of the popular revolution and armed uprising of our heroic armed forces under the leadership of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, which was immediately recognized by virtually all the countries of the world, including Pakistan. That Government is based on the interests and represents the aspirations of our people, and Babrak Karmal, its Head of State, who was elected as Vice-President of the Revolutionary Council and Deputy Prime Minister right after the April 1978 Revolution, has a long and proud history and record of struggle and has consistently served the cause of his people, for which he has spent many years of his life in gaol. He was twice elected by the people to the Parliament before the Revolution. No malicious lie or slander will be able to cast any shadow of doubt on his revolutionary and patriotic personality.

213. In reference to the bloodshed in Afghanistan, we would like to state clearly that it is the natural outcome of the armed aggression and terroristic and subversive operations financed and authorized by the forces of imperialism, hegemonism and reaction. We have dealt in some detail with the root cause of the problem around Afghanistan in our statement yesterday [66th meeting]. That cause, which is the undeclared war against Afghanistan, has been responsible for the tension in the area. The United States, Pakistan and some other countries have elevated their interference in Afghanistan to the level of their State policy. Revelations to that effect have come from none other than the Heads of some of those States. Pakistan's thirst for heavy militarization and the United States plans for turning that country into a base for its Central Command force have added to the instability and insecurity in our neighbourhood and in the region of the Indian Ocean as a whole.

214. A very detailed and completely distorted version of the proceedings of the negotiations between Afghanistan and Pakistan through the intermediary of the Secretary-General's personal representative was also incorporated in the text of Pakistan's statement. We can only voice strong disappointment at this irresponsible and hypocritical attitude towards the contents of highly serious negotiations which we had all agreed to hold in strict confidentiality.

215. Merely to clarify some points, we would like to make the following comments. Negotiations did not start at the initiative of Pakistan. It was precisely the proposals of 15 May 1980¹ and 24 August 1981² of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan which, for the first time, advanced the idea of negotiations as the only correct and viable path for finding acceptable solutions to the problems in South-West Asia. The purpose of these negotiations is to put an end, once and for all, to the armed aggression against Afghanistan and thus pave the way for the solution of other related problems.

216. The representative of Pakistan also made a reference to the consultations with the so-called refugees. This presumably is a reference to the dissemination of information to the *bona fide* refugees about the declaration of general amnesty proclaimed by the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and to the various statements made on the matter by the Government and by the National Fatherland Front of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. We have already proposed four different alternatives on the manner in which this process of informing the *bona fide* refugees should be carried out. We are still awaiting a positive response from the Pakistani side.

217. With that brief clarification, we refrain from any other comment on the proceedings of the negotiations, in the belief that it will be against the spirit of mutual understanding reached on their secrecy.

218. We also heard a reference to the consultations in New York through the Secretary-General. Here, again, we have to put the record straight. The main purpose behind the trip of the Foreign Minister of Afghanistan to New York was to make himself available for the Secretary-General's consultations on preparing the grounds for the trip to the region of the Secretary-General's personal representative, and that was on the basis of the understandings reached in October of this year. The Foreign Minister is not only available for such consultations, but he has already had very detailed discussions with the personal representative of the Secretary-General and with the Secretary-General himself.

219. In Pakistan's statement, a strong emphasis was also put on the present format of the negotiations. The false pretext on the basis of which Pakistan has been preventing the commencement of direct negotiations with Afghanistan is that they do not recognize the Government of Afghanistan. Let me make it abundantly clear that Afghanistan shall live, with or without recognition of imperialists, hegemonists and their lackey reactionaries. We have never asked Pakistan to recognize our Government. What we consider to be of great importance to us is the feelings of the Pakistani people and those of their true representatives. Suffice it to mention that virtually all political parties in Pakistan have officially included in their political programmes the full recognition of and normalization of relations with the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. Having said that, there are historical examples where two countries have engaged in political negotiations without having recognized each other. Negotiations between China and the United States and between the United States and Viet Nam are but two examples of such cases. Pakistan's pretext is therefore only for the purpose of prolonging the present situation.

220. To the slanderous accusations that Afghanistan air forces have violated Pakistan's airspace, we have already given categorical rejections in our communications addressed to the Secretary-General and do not wish to dwell on them in this Assembly. The fact that such baseless allegations are made on the eve of every session of the General Assembly reveals the true intentions and nature of these Pakistani allegations.

221. With regard to the nature and composition of the so-called refugees in Pakistan, we have already referred the Assembly to some new revelations made by United Nations sources in the statement we made yesterday. With regard to their number, I should like to quote from a UNHCR publication. In its issue No. 22 of October 1983, the journal *Refugees* states that

"The *Powindas*, most of whom are nomadic Pathans but include other tribes, cut across the main tribal and linguistic groupings. These herdsmen, traders

and itinerant labourers have traditionally gone south in winter, often travelling as far as the Punjab and Sind provinces, before returning to Afghanistan during the hot summer months. The *Powindas*, or *Kuchi* as they are also known, have long been a familiar sight in Pakistan. Now their migratory pattern has been upset, and many thousands of them swell the ranks of the refugees."

222. A study conducted by the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development and entitled *Sustaining Afghan Refugees in Pakistan*, which was issued in 1983, reveals that

"A certain amount of double registration might have taken place . . . either in different villages or even in the same village. The actual village population appeared much less than the registered population. Also, a proportion of the refugees presumably belongs to the semi-nomadic category of the Afghan people who . . . used to shift their habitation according to season. Hence some refugees may be registered in two villages at different altitudes. . . .

"From the [refugees'] point of view, the best way to handle shortages [of food] would be . . . to obtain as much as possible when supplies arrive. Over-registration would in this sense be an efficient means of coping with uncontrolled, irregular food deliveries . . .

"Many refugees reported that the village staff had registered the actual size of the resident households incorrectly . . .

"Other issues were apparent. Visits to the villages revealed that the size of the refugee population may be much smaller than indicated by the official population figures. Assistance programmes may thus be"—

223. The PRESIDENT: I would remind the representative of Afghanistan that his 10 minutes have expired, and I must ask him to conclude his statement.

224. Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): "Assistance programmes may thus be geared to unrealistic numbers of refugees."

225. The representative of China, a country which has been one of the prime instigators of and partners in the dirty undeclared war on the people and revolution of Afghanistan, also made some fallacious remarks about my country. Nothing more could be expected from the hegemonistic circles who maintain territorial claims against practically all of their neighbours, who have forcefully occupied and later annexed vast territories of other countries, who, relying on their might, have launched treacherous armed aggression against some of their neighbours and who are still manipulating minorities of Chinese origin in other countries for the purpose of economic blackmail, subversion and destabilization of those countries.

226. Mr. Riaz KHAN (Pakistan): The previous speaker exercised his right of reply, even though the General Assembly had concluded its discussion of the item. Since he has done so and, in so doing, has made baseless allegations against my country, I too would like to exercise the right of reply.

227. I shall address myself to two separate questions or aspects: first, the reality of the situation inside Afghanistan and, secondly, the question of the diplomatic process. I shall do so because these are the two things with regard to which the previous speaker has made allegations against my country.

228. The reality of foreign military intervention in Afghanistan and the resistance to it by the Afghan people can neither be denied nor obscured by misleading propaganda such as we have heard from the speaker. This

propaganda is resoundingly refuted by the facts of the situation inside Afghanistan and the international reaction to it.

229. First, the United Nations, in previous years and again today, has expressed its deep concern over the foreign military intervention that is continuing in Afghanistan, and it has again called firmly for the withdrawal of foreign troops from that country and for respect for the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and non-aligned status of that country. The international verdict that the Afghanistan crisis is a case of foreign military intervention is thus unequivocal and leaves no room for misinterpretation.

230. Secondly, the Afghan people, whether within their own country or outside it, have clearly demonstrated their opposition to the foreign military intervention. Within the country they are resisting it. Outside the country they have declared their solidarity with the resistance and have, without exception, voiced their rejection of the foreign military intervention and the régime in Kabul.

231. Thirdly, the accounts of armed resistance which have been extensively reported in international media over the last four years clearly illustrate the magnitude and intensity of the resistance and the fact that it is spread throughout the length and breadth of that country and also covers areas closer to Afghanistan's northern periphery. The reports of the past year indicate that most of the fighting was concentrated near the city of Herat and the Panjshir valley, which lie north of Kabul and are far removed from the Pakistan-Afghanistan border.

232. Fourthly, the presence in Iran and Pakistan of over 4 million Afghan refugees, who constitute nearly one fourth of the population of Afghanistan, is the most telling indicator of the gravity of the crisis afflicting Afghanistan and of its real nature. It is a travesty of common sense and logic to suggest that such a massive exodus of population could be the result of the so-called counter-revolutionary activities of a handful of bandit groups encouraged from outside.

233. The representative of the Kabul régime has also said that Pakistan is trying to obstruct the diplomatic process. In this connection, the statement made by the Pakistan Foreign Minister two days ago [64th meeting] is clear proof of the sincerity with which we have pursued the course towards a negotiated settlement and of the positive and constructive approach that we have demonstrated in co-operating with the Secretary-General and in the initiatives he has taken. I do not need to go into the details because the Foreign Minister has already given them and has given the stages and described how Pakistan has at every stage sincerely tried to advance the diplomatic process initiated by the Secretary-General.

234. With regard to the question of refugees, the representative of the Kabul régime has tried to confuse the statistics, but, briefly, I should like to state for the record that the number of Powindas has never been more than 100,000. The refugees, whose number in Pakistan alone exceeds 2.5 million—indeed it is nearly 3 million—are registered as such. As far as the Powindas are concerned, they are registered separately, and since 1979 even those Powindas have not gone back to Afghanistan, as was the traditional pattern in the old days. But their number never exceeded 100,000.

235. I have stated these facts in exercise of the right of reply in order to expose the falseness of the allegations made by the representative of the Kabul régime.

236. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Afghanistan, who wishes to exercise the right of reply

a second time. I remind him that such statements are limited to five minutes.

237. Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): For lack of time I was unable to complete my first intervention, but with your permission, Mr. President, I shall give the full text of that statement to the Secretariat for distribution as an official document of the General Assembly.⁶

238. However, I should like to respond to some of the new issues raised by the representative of Pakistan. I shall not, of course, repeat what we have already said in our statement in the Assembly this year, or during the previous sessions, but I would like to show how Pakistan is falsifying the number of so-called refugees in their country.

239. I shall cite a United Nations source—the study entitled *Sustaining Afghan Refugees in Pakistan*, mentioned above—which states that, in the same month—that is, July 1982—the recorded population of the villages visited—they are referring to three villages—reached 16,474, 15,384 and 10,955.

240. Now, after they had visited the refugee camps later, in August, the recorded number appeared to be completely incorrect. The study reads as follows in this regard:

“By August and September 1982, visits to the villages, however, disclosed the possibility that in fact the size of the resident populations could conceivably be much lower than the official registration figures. Alternative estimates of the three village populations could fall to the level of 7,000,”—as compared to 16,000 in the past year—“8,000”—as compared to 15,000—“and 2,000”—as compared to 10,955.

241. I believe that these sources, which are prepared very carefully by United Nations officials, who are supposed to be—and I believe they are—impartial in their conduct of affairs, can be more trusted than what Pakistan claims to be the correct numbers of the refugees.

242. As far as the diplomatic process, to which he made reference, is concerned, we have already expressed our disappointment at the revelations made and at the distorted picture which the Assembly was given by the representative of Pakistan.

243. His statement also contained an accusation that the Afghan Foreign Minister did not appear in New York, or did not make himself available for the Secretary-General's consultations. But the Assembly had just heard me say that the Foreign Minister of Afghanistan was not only present in New York, but had already had some consultations with the Secretary-General and with his personal representative.

244. With regard to the root cause of the problem around Afghanistan, we would like to refer him and other delegations to the statements we have made throughout the debate on this so-called issue in the Assembly.

245. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Pakistan, who wishes to exercise his right of reply a second time, within the usual time-limit of five minutes.

246. Mr. Riaz KHAN (Pakistan): Briefly, as regards the figures of the Afghan refugees, these figures are maintained and registered by UNHCR. They are checked and rechecked again and again. In fact, the number should be larger than the figure which is indicated by us, because, on account of the ethnic affiliations in the population across the border, some of the people who live with their kith and kin there usually do not register. Therefore, the figure could be even larger. But this figure is authentic, and is so authenticated by the UNHCR and other international agencies.

247. This massive number of refugees in fact is a reflection of the conflict which is raging inside Afghanistan. As to the picture of that conflict, I will simply quote from a recent report in the 17 September 1983 issue of *The Economist*, which began as follows:

“Every week in Afghanistan there are probably as many victims of Russian-wielded or Russian-supplied arms as there were in the South Korean airliner shot down on September 1st. In a single skirmish in the city of Herat last month—news of which reached the outside world last week—some 250 Afghan guerrillas and 50 Russian soldiers are said to have been killed. The week before at least 100 people died in a street-fight in Kabul.

“Russian retaliation usually strikes at the civilian villagers who shelter the elusive guerrillas. Incidents like the mowing down last month of 50 Afghans in a tea-shop by a Soviet gunner, after somebody had taken a shot at his tank, are common. Altogether, maybe 130,000 Afghans—two thirds of them civilians—have died since Russia invaded Afghanistan on Christmas Eve, 1979. Some 4 million Afghans, a quarter of the population, have been forced into drab tent cities in exile.”

248. This is how the others, the outsiders, portray the picture inside Afghanistan. So it is not really a matter of surprise to us that there are so many Afghan refugees,

who have been forced to flee their homeland and seek shelter in Pakistan and Iran.

249. As regards the question of the availability of the Pakistan Foreign Minister, of course, as he indicated in his statement, he was available for the negotiations from 14 November. But as regards the availability of the other side for negotiations, we heard about it for the first time in the statement made only yesterday. My Foreign Minister has, of course, been waiting for these negotiations to be resumed and has been in touch constantly with the Secretary-General since 14 November. These are facts which can be verified.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.

NOTES

¹ *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1980*, document S/13951.

² *Ibid.*, *Thirty-sixth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1981*, document S/14649.

³ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-fifth year*, 2190th meeting.

⁴ See *Report of the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, Paris, 20-27 May 1981 (A/CONF.107/8)*.

⁵ See *Report of the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination* (United Nations publication, Sales No.E.83.XIV.4 and corrigendum), chap. II.

⁶ Subsequently circulated as document A/38/651.