



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 10th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea)

CONTENTS

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS

AGENDA ITEM 104: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA; REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.4/39/SR.10  
30 October 1984

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS

1. The CHAIRMAN said that he had received some communications containing requests for hearings relating to agenda item 18. He suggested that the communications should be circulated as Committee documents (A/C.4/39/8/Add.1 and 2) and considered at a subsequent meeting.

2. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 104: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued) (A/39/23 (Part III), A/39/133, 478, 560; A/C.4/39/L.2; A/AC.109/766, 778, 779, 781, 782, 786, 787).

3. Mr. NENGRAHARY (Afghanistan) said that South Africa's continuing policy of building up its military power in Namibia, its introduction of compulsory military service for Namibians and its recruitment of mercenaries had caused much suffering to the heroic Namibian people and to the freedom-loving neighbouring peoples. It was only because of the support of Western countries, particularly the United States and Israel, that the Pretoria régime was able to maintain its colonial domination of Namibia and destabilize the countries of the region. His delegation condemned South Africa's occupation of part of Angola and demanded the unconditional withdrawal of South Africa's troops from that country.

4. Referring to General Assembly resolution 38/36 A, he said that it was high time to save the Namibian people and the oppressed South African people suffering under inhuman colonial rule and the shameful apartheid system. His country was in favour of the complete isolation of the apartheid régime, which would become possible only through the strict implementation of a comprehensive and mandatory embargo, including an arms embargo, against the South African régime in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter.

5. Other colonial Territories besides Namibia were exposed to the dangers inherent in the presence of military bases and installations and the pursuit of military activities. In Micronesia, military installations and manoeuvres, as well as tests of various types of weapons, including nuclear weapons, had caused serious damage and endangered peace and security in the region. In Puerto Rico, the colonial Power had consolidated its military presence in order to crush the people's legitimate aspiration to independence and had, moreover, used the Territory as a springboard for the invasion of independent Grenada. His delegation condemned that invasion by the interventionist United States Army and appealed to the international community to take all necessary steps to prevent any recurrence.

(Mr. Nengrahary, Afghanistan)

6. As could be seen from document A/AC.109/766, military activities in Guam were increasing from day to day. Urgent measures should be taken to ensure the immediate withdrawal of United States bases from Guam in order to enable the indigenous population freely to exercise its right to self-determination and independence, and in order to eliminate the threat of aggression against independent States and other colonial Territories in the region. That threat had become more marked since the utilization of Guam as a springboard for aggression against the heroic people of Viet Nam and, more recently, since the invasion of Grenada from Puerto Rico. The continuing presence of military bases and installations and the pursuit of military activities in Guam, Bermuda, the British Virgin Islands, the Turks and Caicos Islands and other Territories under colonial domination were in defiance of the international community, which had repeatedly called for the unconditional withdrawal of all such bases. In that connection, he referred to paragraph 10 of resolution 38/54.

7. He reaffirmed his delegation's support for the Special Committee's recent decision on military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers (A/39/23 (Part III), chap. VI, para. 13). The consideration of that question as a separate agenda item would help in the elimination of impediments to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

8. Mr. BORODULIN (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that military activities by colonial and imperialist Powers in Territories under their administration or trusteeship constituted one of the most serious impediments to the implementation of the Declaration and posed a very real threat to neighbouring independent States and to international peace and security in general. The explosive situation in southern Africa and, more particularly, in and around Namibia was a striking example.

9. In its efforts to maintain its presence in Namibia and to exercise full control over the country's natural resources, the racist Pretoria régime was increasingly relying on armed force and military terror and was steadily building up its military potential within the Territory under its illegal occupation. Meanwhile, the United States and other NATO members, stubbornly resisting all United Nations efforts to restrain the racists and offering every kind of assistance to the South African régime, preached "constructive engagement" with that régime and discoursed on the "peaceful changes" allegedly taking place in the region.

10. It was clear from the information contained in document A/AC.109/781 that the Western countries had completely ignored the United Nations appeal for a voluntary arms embargo against South Africa and had taken good care to ensure that their co-operation with the racist régime was not disturbed by the mandatory embargo.

11. The international community and, above all, the African States were particularly alarmed by the South African racists' nuclear ambitions, pursued with the assistance of Western countries led by the United States and Israel.

(Mr. Borodulin, Byelorussian SSR)

12. Israel's military assistance to South Africa was not confined to the nuclear field. Up to 70 per cent of Israel's war technology exports went to South Africa, and Israeli military experts were participating in the elaboration of South Africa's military strategy. Such co-operation was carried out on the basis of long-term agreements and by joint intergovernmental bodies. There was ample evidence that the criminal apartheid régime would not be able to continue to defy the international community without the support of Western countries, particularly the United States and other NATO members anxious to preserve the régime as an outpost against national liberation movements on the African continent. In order to force the Pretoria racists to respect United Nations decisions, the Security Council should, without delay, impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter.

13. The continuance of colonial exploitation of small Territories by imperialist monopolies and the use of those Territories as military bases by the administering Powers constituted the principal impediment to the attainment of the goals of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Far from being intended to provide employment opportunities to the local population, the military bases in Puerto Rico, Guam, Micronesia, Diego Garcia, Bermuda, the Turks and Caicos Islands and other colonial and dependent Territories served the purpose of suppressing national liberation movements and maintaining the colonial Powers' military presence, contrary to the interests of international peace and security. The indigenous inhabitants of Diego Garcia, forcibly evicted from the island by the United Kingdom, were undergoing incalculable suffering, while the island itself had been transformed by the United States into a so-called "unsinkable aircraft-carrier". Another example was Puerto Rico, which the United States had transformed into an outpost of aggression in the Caribbean and had used for its invasion of Grenada.

14. In Micronesia, recent actions by the United States were depriving the people of their right to independence, and constituted a serious threat to the security of the people of Micronesia and neighbouring countries. Another characteristic illustration of the fact that the presence of military bases invariably stood in the way of the independence of the peoples concerned was Guam, which the United States had virtually annexed, using it in the recent past as a military base against Viet Nam. The expansion of United States military bases in Non-Self-Governing Territories clearly occupied a special place in the aggressive hegemonistic plans of the United States and NATO.

15. The war fought by the United Kingdom to preserve the colonial status of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) had demonstrated the danger to peace inherent in the continued existence of even small colonial possessions. The serious concern felt by Latin American States over the United Kingdom's actions aimed at further militarization of the Islands was readily understandable.

16. The Fourth Committee should resolutely demand the cessation of military activities by colonial and racist régimes in Non-Self-Governing Territories and the immediate withdrawal of all military bases and installations.



17. Mr. PIMENTEL (Dominican Republic) said that the question of Namibia was a matter of great concern to the Dominican Republic, which gave its unqualified support to the people of Namibia and to the struggle of their legitimate representative, SWAPO, to liberate the Territory from the inhuman system of apartheid and establish an independent State.

18. His Government welcomed the award of the 1984 Nobel Prize for Peace to Bishop Desmond Tutu of South Africa, a recognition that was particularly gratifying to the Dominican Republic because dialogue had always been its credo in foreign policy as the only way to resolve conflicts endangering world peace.

19. It also welcomed the settlement, through the good offices of the Pope, of the long-standing territorial dispute between Argentina and Chile. The accord strengthened the principles of the Charter and would benefit the entire region.

20. His Government hoped that the legitimate claim of Argentina over the Malvinas Islands would also cease to be a source of tension. To that end, it urged the Argentine and United Kingdom Governments to resume negotiations.

21. Mr. BRAVO (Angola) said that the sombre scene in southern Africa, where questions regarding the self-determination of peoples, the apartheid system, and peace and security remained unresolved, required every Member State to act with determination to honour its obligations under the Charter.

22. The instinctive pragmatism of some States which were violating accepted norms of international law, and the economic rapacity of the transnational corporations had given rise to a new form of international crime which could be called transnational crime. The report on the adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights of political, military, economic and other assistance given to colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa (E/CN.4/Sub.2/1984/8/Add.1) gave ample confirmation of the identity of those still collaborating with the apartheid régime in illegally exploiting the people and resources of Namibia.

23. The situation prevailing in South Africa, where approximately 5 million whites had decided to relegate 26 million blacks to utter degradation, remained explosive. As the General Assembly had recently pointed out in its resolution 39/2, the oppressed people of South Africa had resisted the imposition of the so-called "new constitution", whose only objective had been to divide and conquer. The wave of new arbitrary arrests and detention of leaders and activists of mass organizations, as well as the closure of several schools and universities gave additional evidence of the fact that the régime was hard pressed.

24. South Africa's obstinacy and arrogance were made possible by the activities of economic and military interests which conspired to support the régime and bolstered its capacity to destabilize and attack neighbouring States, including Angola. His Government joined in the virtually universal condemnation of the activities of foreign economic and other interests which were impeding the implementation of the Declaration on decolonization, and it attached great importance to the liberation struggle in Namibia.

(Mr. Bravo, Angola)

25. Angola had been an active participant in efforts to ensure peace and stability in southern Africa and had a stake in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and other United Nations resolutions on Namibia, whose territory was being used by South Africa to commit acts of armed aggression against the people of Angola.

26. The independence of Namibia, a Territory under direct United Nations jurisdiction, depended solely on the full application of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and was not linked to any factors extraneous to that resolution. Regarding the presence of Cuban troops in Angola, the joint declaration of 19 March 1984 of the Governments of Cuba and Angola (A/39/138-S/16427) was unequivocal: the two Governments would, by their own decision and in exercise of their sovereignty, reinstate the gradual withdrawal of the Cuban internationalist military contingent as soon as the following requirements were met: (a) unilateral withdrawal of the racist troops of South Africa from Angolan territory; (b) strict implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the accession of Namibia to true independence and the total withdrawal of the South African troops which were illegally occupying that Territory; (c) the cessation of any act of direct aggression or threat of aggression against Angola by South Africa, the United States and their allies; and (d) the cessation of all aid to the counter-revolutionary organization UNITA and any other puppet group.

27. Mr. AKHTAR (Bangladesh) said that, in order to avert armed conflicts such as those which had recently been threatening international peace and security, efforts should be made at both the regional and international levels for an amicable settlement of the question of the political status of Non-Self-Governing Territories.

28. The ugliest manifestation of colonialism and exploitation was to be found in South Africa and Namibia. The people of Namibia had been deprived of their right to life and liberty and were being subjugated by force and ruthlessly brutalized. The racist minority régime in South Africa continued to practise its hated policy of apartheid, in total disregard of the United Nations Charter, the established principles of international law and justice, and all standards of civilized behaviour. South Africa also continued to maintain with impunity its machinery of terror, repression and intimidation in Namibia, extending its abhorrent policy of institutionalized racism to the people of Namibia as well.

29. His delegation viewed the situation in Namibia with deep concern and sympathy, since Bangladesh had won its independence through a war of liberation and was committed to supporting oppressed peoples throughout the world who were waging the just struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racism. Bangladesh also condemned the policy of "bantustanization" and the imposition of the so-called "new constitution" in South Africa, and reiterated its support for the oppressed people of South Africa in their struggle against minority rule.

30. Bangladesh deplored the obstinate refusal of the Pretoria régime to recognize the legitimate demands of the Namibian people for immediate and unconditional cessation of its illegal occupation. It was his Government's position that

/...

(Mr. Akhtar, Bangladesh)

Security Council resolution 435 (1978) constituted the only basis for the peaceful transition of the Territory from colonial subjugation to independence, and that the resolution should be fully implemented without any preconditions and without attempts to link the independence of Namibia with extraneous issues.

31. The working paper on Namibia (A/AC.109/782) gave an overview of the Namibian economy and of the exploitative activities of the foreign economic interests which were collaborating with South Africa in plundering the natural resources of Namibia. Some interested quarters had argued that investments by the transnational corporations helped build the economy of Namibia. That was not borne out by the evidence.

32. Bangladesh shared the international community's concern over South Africa's militarization of Namibia aimed at crushing the liberation struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative. The militaristic policy of South Africa, which was expanding its nuclear capacity and collaborating militarily with countries such as Israel, posed a serious threat not only to the region but to the world at large.

33. The international community must secure implementation of the United Nations decisions pertaining to South Africa and Namibia, in order to achieve the ultimate objectives of the universal realization of the right to self-determination, the elimination of colonialism and racial discrimination, and the effective observance of human rights.

34. Mr. GARVALOV (Bulgaria) said the report of the Special Committee (A/39/23 (Part III)) showed that in pursuit of their selfish global strategic interests, disguised as "security interests", the imperialist forces had expanded their unprecedented programme of overarmament, which gave priority to establishing a world-wide network of military bases and installations. The vast majority of Member States were opposed to the maintenance of military bases and installations in colonial Territories and had repeatedly called upon the colonial Powers to withdraw such bases and installations immediately and unconditionally. Instead, those Powers had continued to strengthen and enlarge that military network. Namibia, for example, continued to be occupied by a 100,000-strong South African force. Existing military bases of the United States and other colonial Powers in the Territories were being expanded and new ones established. In Guam, such bases took up a third of the land. At the same time, the colonial Powers were seeking by every means to prolong their control over those Territories in order to further their geo-military strategy of world domination.

35. Military activities and arrangements by colonial and occupying Powers had, in General Assembly resolution 35/118, been declared an impediment to the implementation of the Declaration on decolonization. The military presence of the colonial Powers in Namibia, Micronesia, Guam, Diego Garcia, Bermuda, Puerto Rico, the Turks and Caicos Islands, the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) and other Territories were not designed to give employment to the local populations, as the colonial Powers maintained, but rather to serve as a springboard for interference in the internal affairs of neighbouring countries and for the suppression of the legitimate aspiration of peoples for independence and freedom.

/...

(Mr. Garvalov, Bulgaria)

36. It was common knowledge that Puerto Rico served conveniently for quick deployment of military forces, as had been the case during the armed intervention in Grenada. Also disconcerting was the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (Micronesia), which, in pursuit of its strategic goals, the United States had been dismembering into "commonwealths" and "free associations" that it could keep under colonial domination. One of the long-term aims of the administering Power was to obtain exclusive rights under military agreements binding on the separate parts of the Trust Territory. Such agreements contained provisions giving the United States the right to maintain and expand missile-testing grounds, naval bases, strategic air bases and stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction.

37. Military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers posed a direct threat to international peace and security. Bulgaria gave its whole-hearted support to the latest call by the General Assembly for immediate and unconditional withdrawal of military bases in the colonial Territories.

38. Mr. GVIR (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representatives of Democratic Yemen, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had referred to his country in a manner which did not comply with the rules and procedures of the Fourth Committee; they had mentioned subjects which bore no relevance to the items on the agenda. He would refrain from responding to those extraneous matters as they were being dealt with elsewhere.

39. In reply to allegations by the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic that Israel had co-operated widely with South Africa, he pointed out that trade between Israel and South Africa during the previous year had accounted for 0.63 per cent of South Africa's total trade. If such a figure represented wide co-operation, it would be interesting to learn the terms in which those two representatives would describe the remaining 99.37 per cent of South Africa's foreign trade, which involved other countries represented on the Committee.

40. In reply to statements, in particular by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, concerning nuclear co-operation between Israel and South Africa, he drew attention to paragraph 13 of the Secretary-General's report on Israel's nuclear armament (A/36/431), which, in referring to certain anti-Israeli rumours on that matter, had dismissed them as unsubstantiated speculation. The repetition of such lies did not transform them into truth.

41. The representative of Iraq had accused Israel of supporting the policy of apartheid. In that connection, the representative of Iraq might do well to set his own house in order first; Iraq's infamous brand of bloody suppression of human liberties had been fully documented through the courtesy of Amnesty International. Israel's position on apartheid was quite clear. Israel opposed bigotry and racial prejudice totally and unreservedly, wherever and whenever they emerged. His Government had made that position known to the Government of South Africa on numerous occasions and had repeatedly stated it publicly in the United Nations.

(Mr. Gvir, Israel)

42. Israel's Jewish heritage and the multiracial fabric of its society were at the very root of its vigorous opposition to any policy or system which sought to humiliate others and to deprive them of their fundamental rights because of race, religion, colour or creed. For too long, the Jewish people had itself been the victim of racial discrimination, persecution and oppression. Those countries which genuinely stood against racism and racial harassment would find Israel an active ally in the common effort to eradicate those evils.

43. Mr. ADHAMI (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the United States delegation had claimed that the United States was not disregarding the provisions of Security Council resolution 418 (1977) on the arms embargo and that the admitted collaboration between the United States and South Africa was to the advantage of the African people. Despite the secrecy imposed by the United States on its collaboration in the military and nuclear fields, there was clear evidence that Israel and the United States were collaborating with the racist South African régime in those areas. The concern of the international community was inevitably aroused, since a South African nuclear capability would represent a great danger to peace in Africa and throughout the world. In recent aggressive statements, South Africa had confirmed its readiness to violate the sovereign independence of neighbouring States, regardless of the fact that that might lead to a confrontation with the whole world.

44. An article in The Washington Post had referred to a confidential study regarding the export of nuclear technology controlled by the United States Government to other countries, including Israel and South Africa, despite the fact that both refused to agree to international supervision of their nuclear installations. They had been allowed to take advantage of loopholes in the regulations and buy equipment that could be used for military purposes.

45. A recent study conducted for the Security Council Committee established by resolution 421 (1977) stated that the United States had, in the period 1981-1982, allowed the export to South Africa of items on the military equipment list to the value of about \$28.3 million.

46. Another study, on the relationship between the United States and South Africa, stated that, under the policy of so-called "constructive engagement", the current United States Administration had sought to mitigate the previous Administration's veto on the export of United States technology to the military and police forces of South Africa, through three amendments to the export regulations. According to the study, possibly the most significant violation of the arms embargo had been carried out when the United States had provided South Africa with some 60,000 155-millimetre long-range artillery shells, a large number of 155-millimetre guns and a radar-tracking instrumentation system.

47. All those reports prompted real international concern that the United States commitment to the arms embargo was no longer sincere. At the previous meeting, the United States representative had questioned the effectiveness of the proposed resolution, asking whether it would help to liberate Namibia or to mitigate the suffering of the South African people. The implication was that the United States intended to persist in its policy towards South Africa, consolidating its strategic

/...



(Mr. Adhami, Syrian Arab Republic)

interests in that country and maintaining its economic ties with it, at the expense of the freedom and dignity of peoples and the sacred right to self-determination. The whole international community was ranged against South Africa, but the United States and Israel had chosen the side of apartheid and colonialism. It was incumbent upon the United Nations to condemn their policy.

48. The representative of Israel had alleged that his country's economic collaboration and trade exchanges with South Africa were marginal and unimportant. The statistics he had quoted, however, did not reflect the actual trade in military equipment or in diamonds and uranium. The exclusion of those items was a deliberate attempt to mislead the Committee. There was also evidence that Israel aspired to act as the proxy of the United States in arms exports to sensitive areas, including Taiwan and South Africa.

49. Mr. KARTASHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that at a previous meeting the representative of Singapore had questioned a reference made by the Soviet delegation to data contained in a report of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations relating to assistance by Singaporean companies to the racist South African régime. He was glad to hear that Singaporean companies were not in fact operating in southern Africa, but wished to point out that four Singaporean companies were mentioned in the updated comprehensive list of banks, insurance companies, firms and other organizations assisting South Africa, prepared by the Special Rapporteur of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities (E/C.4/Sub.2/1984/8/Add.1).

50. Mr. PFIRTER (Argentina) said that his delegation stood by its statement on agenda item 104. It had been most careful in preparing it to make sure that each assertion or reference to the Malvinas Islands could be backed up, if necessary, by the use of official United Kingdom documents. The United Kingdom representative had, perhaps incautiously, confirmed that there was indeed a dispute with respect to sovereignty over the Malvinas and that that dispute was the recurring theme in the difficulties between Argentina and the United Kingdom. His statement also confirmed that the United Kingdom Government was unfortunately still unwilling to fulfil the obligation incumbent on all Member States to promote the peaceful settlement of international disputes through recourse to negotiations, as prescribed in Article 33 of the Charter. The statement had furthermore illustrated the contrast in style between the two Governments in that regard. The Government of Argentina had repeatedly stressed its genuine desire to restore an atmosphere that would allow for a mature, realistic and common-sense approach to the problem, in the medium and the long term, which would permit the differences between the two nations, including sovereignty over the Malvinas, to be resolved.

51. Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America) said that, in the statement prepared for him, the Syrian representative had provided a good deal of invective but few facts, relying chiefly on the standard cold-war allegations heard so often in the Committee. His own reply would be purely factual.



(Mr. Feldman, United States)

52. The United States had imposed a full embargo on arms shipments to South Africa since 1963, pre-dating the United Nations embargo by some 14 years. It reported regularly, as it was obligated to do, to the Committee established under Security Council resolution 421 (1977). Those reports, which were matters of public record, showed that the United States supplied no sensitive nuclear technology to South Africa. It was providing information for the maintenance of an IAEA-inspected nuclear facility, a civilian power plant, supplied to South Africa by another country.

53. The \$28.3 million worth of military goods referred to, a figure taken from a report of the American Friends Service Committee, did in fact refer to items on the United States munitions list. That list, however, was broader than military equipment and the transaction in question related to decoding devices for bank teller machines, with no military application.

54. The figures relating to shells and 155-mm guns were correct but the details of the transaction had been misrepresented. The goods had in fact been sold by a United States company to a company in a neighbouring country, which had in turn sold them to a third country in the Caribbean, which had sold them to South Africa. The transaction had been traced back, and the United States Government had indicted, tried and convicted the officers of the United States company who had been sentenced to a heavy fine.

55. There was an interesting division in the world, reflected in the Committee. Some countries contented themselves with hurling invective while others sought to help the blacks in South Africa. He had described at the previous meeting what the United States was doing to help. He would note, as a further instance, that during the United States fiscal year 1984 the Administration had shipped food to the value of \$171 million to the food emergency countries in southern Africa. In the new fiscal year, which was only a few weeks old, a further \$81 million in emergency food aid had already been authorized for shipment.

56. Mr. AL-SIKAB (Iraq) said that the military and nuclear collaboration between Israel and South Africa was substantiated by official documents of the United Nations. Statements had also been made in Tel Aviv, and at meetings held in Geneva and Montreal that confirmed the existence of that collaboration. Furthermore, official United Nations documents stated that Israel engaged in racist practices, both in Israel itself and in the occupied Arab territories. By his allegations about the situation in Iraq, the Israeli representative was merely seeking to distract the Committee's attention from the close co-operation between the Zionist entity and South Africa, from its aggressive racist policy in occupied Palestine and in Lebanon, and from its determinedly expansionist policy in the occupied Arab territories.

57. Mr. KESAVAPANY (Singapore) regretted that the representative of the USSR had made no reference to the report prepared by the Special Rapporteur (E/C.5/Sub.2/1984/Add.1) in his original statement. He reserved the right to reply at a later date after he had studied the document.

/...

58. Mr. ADHAMI (Syrian Arab Republic), replying to the representative of the United States, said that the information which his delegation had presented had not been invented but was fully documented and available to all members of the Committee. His reference to collaboration with South Africa was not based on hatred or envy for the United States and did not represent a cold war ploy. People in South Africa and Namibia were facing stark racist aggression and his delegation had drawn attention to the facts in the interest of freedom and dignity. By the same token, the Arab peoples did not resist the aggression and hegemonistic policies of Israel merely in order to satisfy one or other party in the cold war; they did so in defence of their rights to existence, freedom and dignity.

59. The racist Prime Minister of South Africa had shown the readiness of his régime to drag the whole world into a catastrophe which was too costly to contemplate. In that connection, the United States had a special responsibility in so far as it was a permanent member of the Security Council and a super-Power; as such it should curb the racist régime of South Africa and restrain it from dragging the whole world to destruction.

60. The representative of the United States had commented on his country's commitment to the arms embargo. He had not however said what the United States was going to do in response to the statement of the Prime Minister of Israel regarding arms sales to South Africa. His delegation would welcome an assurance from the representative of the United States which would emphasize that the United States would not permit Israel to be an intermediary in arms sales to South Africa.

61. Mr. GVIR (Israel) said that the statistics which he had mentioned in his earlier right of reply and which had been challenged by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic had been taken from the Direction of Trade Statistics for 1984 of the International Monetary Fund. He hoped that the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic would check those figures and report back to the Committee.

62. The representative of Iraq had referred to Israel as a Zionist entity. Israel did not in any way object to being called Zionist; zionism was the national liberation movement of the Jewish people and one of the earliest active decolonization efforts. Zionism was a positive movement for the constructive development of the Jewish people and was not directed against any other people, nation or State. He did, however, object to Israel or any other State being called an entity. States should be referred to as such and members of the United Nations should avoid name-calling and engage only in constructive deliberation.

63. Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America) said that the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic must surely understand that the United States could hardly be held responsible for statements made by citizens of other countries; indeed it was difficult enough for his country to be responsible for statements made by its own citizens. He reiterated that the United States had placed a full and complete military embargo on South Africa; that military embargo pre-dated and was broader in scope than the United Nations embargo. The embargo would remain in force in its full and complete form; there were no sales of military items or technology to South Africa.

64. Mr. MILES (United Kingdom) said that the representative of Argentina had implied that the United Kingdom was not prepared to embark on the peaceful settlement of disputes in accordance with its obligations. During the previous summer, the Governments of the United Kingdom and Argentina had made a very serious attempt to begin negotiations on a whole range of problems between them. Those negotiations had been most carefully prepared and an agreement had been reached in advance on a way of handling the various issues; that agreement had been acceptable to both sides. When, however, the negotiations began, it turned out that the Government of Argentina wished to discuss one single problem only, namely the transfer of sovereignty over the Falkland Islands. The question of the Falkland Islands was on the agenda of the plenary for the following week and for the moment he would merely draw attention to the fact that Argentina wished to deal with that matter without regard either to the wishes of the people of the Falkland Islands or to the principle of self-determination. The insistence of Argentina on discussing one subject only had been contrary to the agreement on which the talks had been based and, as a result, the talks had broken down.

65. He wished to repeat that the United Kingdom remained ready to tackle the whole range of problems between the two Governments by means of negotiations. He felt sure that a way forward would be found if no pre-conditions were placed in the way.

66. Mr. AL-SIKAB (Iraq) said that his delegation had referred to Israel as a Zionist entity on two grounds: first, zionism had been rejected by the United Nations itself and had been characterized in a resolution as a manifestation of racism; and, second, the representative of Israel should clarify exactly what his country was and what were its borders so that agreement could be reached on its name.

67. Mr. PFIRTER (Argentina) said that his delegation welcomed the latest statement by the representative of the United Kingdom. Even though there was a difference of opinion between the delegations regarding the reason why the first direct contact of the two Parties in the Berne meeting had not led to tangible results, the positive aspects of the situation should be highlighted; it was only by emphasizing those positive aspects that it would some day be possible to reach the desired solution to all the differences between the two countries. His delegation had noted with interest and satisfaction that the representative of the United Kingdom had stated that his country was prepared to discuss with Argentina a wide range of issues. Argentina also was prepared to consider a wide range of issues with an open mind. Argentina continued to claim sovereignty over the Malvinas; it considered it indispensable that the United Kingdom and Argentina should resume negotiations with a view to putting an end to all their differences, including the sovereignty issue. That did not however mean that Argentina in any way expected the United Kingdom to agree at the very start of the dialogue that Argentina was right. For all these reasons, his delegation welcomed the statement by the representative of the United Kingdom.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.