



General Assembly

PROVIS IONAL

A/44/PV.46 13 November 1989

ENGLISH

Forty-fourth session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FORTY-61XTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 7 November 1989, at 10 a.m.

President:

Mr. GARBA

(Nigeria)

- Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa [28] (continued)
 - (a) Report of the Special Committee against hoartheid
 - (b) Report of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa
 - (c) Report of the Commission against Apartheid in Sports
 - (d) Reports of the Secretary-General
 - (e) Report of the Special Political Committee

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 28 (continued)

POLICIES OF A PARTHEID OF THE COVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA

- (a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID (A/44/22 and Corr.2)
- (b) REPORT OF THE INTERCOVERNMENTAL GROUP TO MONITOR THE SUPPLY AND SHIPPING OF OIL AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS TO SOUTH AFRICA (A/44/44)
- (c) REPORT OF THE COMM ISS ION AGAINST A PARTHEID IN SPORTS (A/44/47)
- (d) REFORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/44/533, A/44/555 and Corr.1, A/44/556, A/44/698)
- (e) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/44/709)

The PRESIDENT: I draw the attention of the General Assembly to the report of the Special Political Committee (A/44/709). May I take it that the General Assembly takes note of that report?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: First, I should like to propose that the list of speakers on the item before us this morning be closed at 5 p.m. today.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the Acting Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, Mr. Jai Pratap Rana of Nepal.

Mr. RANA (Nepal), Acting Chairman of the Special Committee Against

Apartheid: The Special Committee against Apartheid has every reason, Sir, to be
proud and satisfied at your election to the presidency of the General Assembly at
its forty-fourth session. We congratulate you most warmly on your unanimous
election. We should like to believe that it is, among other things, a recognition
of the outstanding role that you have played as Chairman of the Committee in the
struggle against apartheid and for freedom and justice.

Despite the state of emergency over the past four years, the Fretoria régime has failed to contain or crush the legitimate aspirations of the majority of people in South Africa. In fact, as the report of the Special Committee notes, there is today a resurgence of the anti-apartheid movement in South Africa. This campaign of defiance is aimed not only at making the apartheid laws ineffective but also at regaining the political momentum that would make it possible for all anti-apartheid forces to join hands to realize the goal of a united, non-racial and democratic society, with equal rights and opportunities for all people.

While, on the one hand, the majority of the population of the country reject cosmetic reforms of the <u>apartheid</u> system and continue to demand a fundamental transformation of the political and economic structure of the country, the international community shows greater readiness to continue the economic pressure on the régime to persuade it to seek a negotiated political solution to the conflict.

The question is whether the South African régime will have the courage to take bold steps to eradicate <u>apartheid</u>. Recent measures taken by

Mr. Frederik Willem De Klerk have aroused expectations concerning his desire to create - as he puts it - a new South Africa. The release of eight long-term political prisoners was a significant move on the part of Mr. De Klerk, although it fell far short of what the resistance in South Africa and the internationa?

community consider the absolute minimum for the creation of a climate conducive to negotiations.

The recent release of some political prisoners has to be viewed against the fact that thousands are still imprisoned in South Africa. At least 14 individuals are serving life sentences for their opposition to apartheid. Political trials and death sentences continue, as do the hans and restrictions on political dissent. Forced population removals have not ceased. Vigilante groups and death squads continue to carry out violent actions against opponents of the régime. The pillars of the apartheid system - such as the Group Areas Act, the Separate Amenities Act, the Land Act and the Population Registration Act - are still intact.

In September, despite overwhelming opposition, the régime conducted nation-wide elections to the racially segregated tricameral Parliament, excluding once again the African majority. The five-ear plan of action announced by Mr. De Klerk in June this year is rooted in the maintenance of racial divisions, and it entrenches the veto power of the whites. There has been no change in the effects of the régime's acts of aggression and destabilization in the southern African region. The Economic Commission for Africa has reported that South Africa's military aggression against, and destabilization of, its neighbours cost the region \$10 billion in 1988 alone. The cost over the first nine years of this decade has been 1.5 million lives and over \$60 billion.

We may ask, then, what is changing in South Africa. While not denying that Pretoria has taken some positive steps, we cannot but underline that those steps were forced upon the régime. The determined resistance of the majority people of South Africa has gradually undermined Pretoria's confidence and has contributed to the erosion of its political support. The economic measures adopted by the international community, though unco-ordinated, have caused disruption to the

economy of South Africa. It is not clear, however, that Pretoria has understood the imperative for change, nor is it clear that the régime has a new vision for the country.

On the other hand, the anti-apartheid forces do have a vision. Addressing a gathering of more than 70,000 in Soweto just a few days ago, Walter Sisulu gave a message of hope to his countrymen. He called on all South Africans - blacks and whites - to join ranks to bring peace to the country. Sisulu recalled that the African National Congress (ANC), since it was founded in 1912, has been urging the régime to negotiate. He said:

"We stood for peace in 1912 when we were formed, we stood for peace in our long struggle of resistance, we stand for peace today, and we shall stand for peace tomorrow."

It is in this political context that the Harare Declaration must be understood. That Declaration, which has been endorsed by the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Commonwealth, states:

"A conjuncture of circumstances exists which, if there is a demonstrable readiness on the part of the Pretoria régime to engage in negotiations genuinely and seriously, could create the possibility to end apartheid through negotiations. Such an eventuality would be an expression of the long-standing preference of the majority of the people of South Africa to arrive at a political settlement ... Together with the rest of the world, we believe that it is essential, before any negotiations can take place, that the necessary climate for negotiations be created."

The challenge before South Africa is clear: it must create a climate for negotiations by lifting the state of emergency and repealing all repressive

legislation; it must release, immediately and unconditionally, Nelson Mandela and all other political prisoners and detainees; it must lift all bans and restrictions on individuals and political organizations opposed to <u>apartheid</u> and repeal the restrictions on the press; and it must remove all troops from black townships and cease all political trials and executions. As the Declaration states, once such a climate has been created, the liberation movement will discuss the suspension of hostilities on both sides.

In order to induce Pretoria to take the steps necessary to lead to genuine negotiations on the elimination of <u>apartheid</u>, the pressure on the régime must be maintained and even intensified. The combination of the pressures on the <u>apartheid</u> economy arising from financial and other sanctions, disinvestment and a diminished military capability as a result of the arms embargo constituted the formidable pressure that persuaded Pretoria to reach an agreement on Namibia.

The sanctions report commissioned by the Commonwealth Committee of Foreign Ministers on Southern Africa demonstrates that sanctions have contributed to slow rates of growth, adding to the chronic structural difficulties of the South African economy. The combined effects of disinvestment, the dearth of new capital investment and the denial of long-term credit have undermined South Africa's ability to impose its designs both within and beyond its borders. The mandatory arms embargo has prevented South Africa from obtaining modern weapon systems, particularly aircraft, a situation that contributed to Pretoria's retreat from Namibia. The oil embargo has cost Pretoria \$25 hillion over the past years. A sports and cultural boycott has increased the sense of isolation of South Africa.

Financial sanctions in particular have been the most effective form of pressure because they have reduced the régime's access to international capital markets and increased the economic difficulties created by the more than \$1.2 billion losses. The report (A/44/555) prepared by the Centre against Apartheid on the subject underlines the fact that the difficulties and constraints in the South African economy are structural and have been exacerbated by sanctions. In the light of this vulnerability, the Special Committee considers that the rescheduling of South Africa's foreign debt hailed out the régime at a time when sanctions were affecting the economy deeply. In a press release (GA/AP/1947) the Special Committee expressed its condemnation of both the generous

terms and the timing of the rescheduling. The continued provision of short-term credit has eased and continues to ease South Africa's foreign exchange constraints.

Considering the vulnerabilities of the South African economy, the Special Committee regrets that the measures adopted by States against South Africa have fallen far short of what would be necessary and sufficient to exert pressure and thereby induce political changes in South Africa. As indicated in the report of the Special Committee, paragraphs 151 to 192, in the last 12 months Governments and intergovernmental organizations have adopted few significant measures, despite proposals to impose further sanctions and to strengthen current measures.

Non-governmental sources have maintained a steady pressure on South Africa.

Acting as voters, consumers, trade unionists, students and shareholders.

Individuals continue to carry out campaigns to persuade their Governments, corporations and local authorities to sever economic ties with South Africa. In undertaking such actions they are fostering a climate of public opinion in which it is no longer morally acceptable to deal with apartheid South Africa.

The Special Committee welcomes the Commonwealth's decision to establish an independent agency to review and report on South Africa's international financial links on a regular basis, and the initiative taken by the International Labour Organisation's Committee on <u>Apartheid</u> in establishing a group of three independent experts to evaluate the implementation of sanctions and other measures. We have already met with the experts and discussed ways to co-ordinate our activities.

The Special Committee believes that, unless legal mechanisms are adopted to monitor and enforce sanctions, violations will continue. I should like to point out that South Africa's ability to purchase oil and petroleum products, albeit at a premium price, is evidence that the oil embargo is being openly violated. In this

respect the Committee draws attention to annex III of the annual report (A/44/44) of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa. The Special Committee is concerned at the many reported violations of the arms embargo, which have allowed Pretoria to expand parts of its armaments production and to increase its export of armaments through third-party States. It regrets, in particular, that the Governments of Chile and Turkey permitted the participation of South Africa in armaments fairs in their respective countries, in breach of Security Council resolutions on the arms embargo. The Special Committee also regrets that the investigation conducted by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany into the delivery to South Africa by two corporations hased in the Federal Republic of Germany of microfilms of the blueprints of the U-209 submarine has not reached a successful conclusion and that the violators have not been prosecuted. In this connection I draw attention to paragraphs 132 to 145 of the Special Committee's report.

Likewise, South Africa's external trade continues to thrive as a result of the unco-ordinated sanctions, the loopholes within the sanctions and the eagerness of some smaller countries to expand their trade with South Africa and take advantage of restrictions imposed by other States. It is a matter of regret that, while the Nordic States are in the forefront of those that have curtailed trade with South Africa, the Federal Republic of Germany has become the first trading partner of South Africa, surpassing Japan. The United Kingdom and the United States continue to be major trading partners of South Africa although the volume of United States trade has declined. The Special Committee draws attention to the disturbing shift in regional trade which is taking place. Some Far Eastern and Western European States are increasing trade with Pretoria, thus undermining the positive action

undertaken by other States. In this connection I draw attention to paragraphs 109, 110 and 112 of the Special Committee's report.

While the disinvestment campaign has cut off new investment capital for South Africa, the retention of non-equity links by more than half the disinvesting companies is allowing a flow of licensing and franchise fees to transnational corporations, as well as technology, managerial know-how and foreign markets to domestic South African companies. Non-racial trade unions in South Africa have counteracted this form of disinvestment by developing guidelines for a fair disinvestment procedure, which provides for negotiations between transnational corporations and the relevant trade union on the terms of disinvestment.

The export of South African capital is also of grave concern and reflects to some extent the weakness of the present sanctions. Not only are South African transnational corporations involved in helping Pretoria evade sanctions, but they are also becoming parts of other transnational corporations, thereby avoiding the stigma attached to South African firms. In this connection, I draw members' attention to paragraph 131 of the Special Committee's report.

The Special Committee considers that in order to achieve maximum effectiveness sanctions should be mandatory and comprehensive. Pending appropriate action by the Security Council, further sanctions should target explicitly the main areas of dependence and vulnerability of the South African economy. Sanctions should be adopted in unison and should be strictly monitored and enforced. Measures should also be adopted to prevent States from benefiting from the vacuum created by other States that have imposed sanctions. Information on sanctions violations and economic links with South Africa should be widely publicized, particularly concerning the arms and oil embargoes. In this respect, I draw attention to the recommendations made by the Special Committee in paragraph 275 of its report to the General Assembly. These recommendations are, indeed, the basis of the draft resolutions to be considered later during this debate.

The world is witnessing a growing relaxation in political relations between the major Powers, which is improving the climate of international co-operation and is leading to an active search for peaceful settlements to regional conflicts, notably in Namibia. As we meet today, the people of that country, with the support of the international community, are exercising, for the first time ever, their right to vote. The international community remains vigilant and will exercise effective pressure to ensure that Pretoria honours its commitment to the process in Namibia.

The liberation struggle and international pressure have opened up possibilities for a peaceful end to <u>apartheid</u>. Intensified and co-ordinated pressure from the international community can induce Pretoria to take the steps conducive to a climate for negotiations, as spelled out by the General Assembly at its forty-third session, the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Commonwealth.

The Special Committee will, in the coming year, continue its activities designed to influence both decision-makers and opinion-makers in order to strengthen the international campaign against the régime. In 1990, it plans to consult in New York with South African opponents of apartheid; to hold, next January, a seminar on East Asian actions against apartheid in Tokyo; to hold a conference, in co-operation with the International Parliamentary Union, with members of Parliament; and to organize meetings with the media and labour leaders. Acting as a focal point for the international campaign against apartheid, and with the support services of the Centre against Apartheid, the Special Committee will continue to monitor closely the situation in South Africa and the action by the international community regarding sanctions and other restrictive measures and will continue to mobilize international action against apartheid, inter alia through the analysis and dissemination of information, liaison with non-governmental organizations and other individuals and groups, as well as through hearings, conferences, consultations, missions, publicity and other relevant activities.

The present situation in South Africa poses two stark options: the international community can take no further action and adopt no new sanctions, thus maintaining a lifeline to apartheid and allowing Mr. De Klerk to proceed with paced

reforms"; or it can step up the pressure either by adopting comprehensive and mandatory sanctions or by imposing concerted and strictly monitored sanctions on the vulnerable areas of the South African economy until Pretoria resists no further the need for genuine negotiations. The first option would undoubtedly lead to a deepening of the conflict, further bloodshed and suffering for South Africans and ominous consequences for the region. The second option would lead to a peaceful end to apartheid. If Mr. De Klerk is as committed as he says to the process of creating a new South Africa, let him respond, not vaguely but directly, to the demands of the majority in South Africa for full political rights in the country of their birth.

Allow me to conclude with the thoughts of Thomas Faine, who, in 1776, said:
"Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph."

The majority in South Africa value their freedom so highly that they are ready to give their lives for it. The international community can do no less than support their quest, so that in the near future an independent and democratic South African Government may at last take its rightful and proud place in the community of nations.

The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Virendra Gupta of India, to introduce the report of the Special Committee.

Mr. GUPTA (India), Rapporteur of the Special Committee against

Apartheid: I have been privileged to work under your guidance in the Special

Committee against Apartheid, and it gives me great pleasure to see you presiding

over the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly. At the same time, I wish to

express special appreciation for your dedication, commitment and important

contribution to the struggle against apartheid.

(Mr. Gupta, Rapporteur, Special Committee against Apartheid)

I have been assigned the task of presenting the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid. The report is contained in document A/44/22, and consists of two parts: part I is the annual report of the Special Committee and part II is the report on recent developments concerning relations between Israel and South Africa. Before I proceed to give a brief outline of the report, I should like to put on record the Special Committee's appreciation of the invaluable assistance rendered by the Centre against Apartheid in its preparation and finalization.

The annual report covers developments in <u>apartheid</u> South Africa from August 1988 to August 1989. Paragraphs 5 to 94 of the report contain detailed accounts of general political conditions and the growing resistance to <u>apartheid</u> in an environment of increasing repression by the racist régime as well as South Africa's policy of destabilization and State terrorism.

Inside South Africa, despite the state of emergency, internal resistance to the régime was able to regroup and adapt to conditions and, in doing so, is experiencing a resurgence.

(Mr. Gupta, Rapporteur, Special Committee against Apartheid)

Opponents of <u>apartheid</u> undertook a co-ordinated campaign of defiance of repressive laws, which showed the failure of the state of emergency and of attempts to crush the growing Mass Democratic Movement. Furthermore, the growing participation of whites in the opposition is adding an important dimension to the struggle and is a reflection of the gradual erosion of the National Party monolith.

The report shows that the defiance campaign organized by the Mass Democratic Movement against not only apartheid laws but also the racially segregated elections of 6 September suffered the brunt of the repression. The deaths of more than 20 protestors, among them children and elderly women, the high number of injuries and the more than 1,000 arrests all constitute evidence that repression continues.

Thus, while Mr. De Klerk makes pronouncements about his intention to bring about reconciliation with all South Africans and peace in the region, the security forces and the arsenal of security laws continue to be used to suppress the anti-apartheid opposition in South Africa and the policy of destabilization, aggression and terrorism, particularly regarding Mozambique, remains in place.

In its section on the external relations of South Africa - that is paragraphs 95 to 150 - the report underscores the continuing economic and financial fragility of the South African economy. On the basis of a detailed assessment the report concludes that the sanctions have had an impact. The effects on trade, new loans and the transfer of technology, the shortage of capital for productive investment and the impact of the withdrawal of transnational corporations all continue to cause strains on the economy. However, the report underlines several disturbing trends, such as the increase in trade in 1988 between South Africa and many of its trading partners, including some major ones. A shift in regional trade

is also taking place. Some Far Eastern and Western European States are increasing trade with Pretoria, thus undermining the positive actions undertaken by other States.

In addition, although transnational corporations continue to disinvest, the mode of disinvestment is allowing such corporations to maintain non-equity links with South Africa that are potentially profitable to the corporations and valuable to South Africa for the development of its industries. Similar conclusions were reached by the Panel of Eminent Persons which held hearings on transnational corporations in South Africa and Mamibia two months ago in Geneva. The report of the panel includes very significant observations and recommendations regarding investments, trade and financial relationships with South Africa.

The report argues that the increase in trade between South Africa and some of its trading partners in recent years underscores the need to examine trade sanctions in order to devise mechanisms that may tighten and strengthen them and thereby increase their effectiveness. In that connection it points to the increasing vulnerability of the economy with regard to such internationally traded commodities and services as petroleum and petroleum products, coal, gold and transport facilities.

In the section on military and nuclear relations - that is paragraphs 132 to 145 - the report highlights the fact that South Africa continues to build up its military strength and to trade in armaments in spite of the mandatory arms embargo. Loopholes in the existing arms embargo allow South Africa to circumvent it. The absence of laws and regulations banning all forms of military collaboration with South Africa, the non-enforcement of current laws by specific States which have adopted legislation on the embargo, the thriving international market in weapons amd military technology and the lack of firm international action

(Mr. Gupta, Rapporteur, Special Committee against Apartheid)

to deter certain States and individuals from violating the embargo all enhance the apartheid régime's ability to circumvent it. The report provides particular instances of violations of the arms embargo and points to the dangers involved in South Africa's nuclear ability, in particular concerning the development of a ballistic missile.

Another part of the report deals with international action against <u>apartheid</u> and the thrust of initiatives undertaken by the Special Committee. It indicates that although proposals were made to impose further sanctions against South Africa Governments and intergovernmental organizations have adopted few significant new measures.

I should particularly like to draw attention to section IV of the report, since that section contains a detailed review of the activities undertaken by the Special Committee. This section also underscores the shortcomings in the implementation of current sanctions and the inherent limitations in the monitoring and enforcement of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.

With regard to the report on recent developments concerning relations between Israel and South Africa, I wish to emphasize that the report focuses mainly on the field of military collaboration between the two countries, although attention was also given to certain aspects of economic collaboration. It is the view of the Special Committee that, despite the repeated statements by the Government of Israel that its relations with South Africa have been curtailed, collaboration continues unabated, particularly in the military field. Israel appears to be continuing to supply military technology to South Africa and from this point of view Israel's case is rather unique.

(Mr. Gupta, Rapporteur, Special Committee against Apartheid)

The foregoing brings me to the last chapter of the annual report entitled "Conclusions and Recommendations". This section contains a detailed assessment of the situation in South Africa and urges the international community to intensify and co-ordinate pressure against Pretoria in order to induce it to take the steps necessary for the creation of a climate conducive to negotiations.

In this respect, the Special Committee considers that in order to achieve maximum effectiveness sanctions should be mandatory and comprehensive. Pending appropriate action by the Security Council, further sanctions must target explicitly the main areas of dependence and vulnerability of the South African economy, adopted in unison and strictly monitored and enforced. Targeted measures should include a prohibition by all States on new loans and investment of any sort to South Africa; a ban on the importation of all South African agricultural products and coal, gold and other non-stratetgic minerals; a restriction on trade credits for sales to South Africa; a ban on the transfer of technology particularly in the areas of arms, oil and computers; and the extension of the ban on air links to all States other than those in the Southern African Development Co-ordinated Conference (SADCC) region.

I wish to draw particular attention to the recommendations contained in paragraph 275, since those recommendations are the basis of the draft resolutions the General Assembly will be considering later.

In August 1963, at the height of the struggle of African-Americans for their civil rights, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. said: "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice anywhere". The relevance of these words in today's South Africa is all too evident. The Special Committee trusts that all members will consider its recommendations positively in order to enable the General Assembly and the Security Council to take appropriate action to secure the speedy eradication of apartheid.

Mr. BADAWI (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): The challenges facing southern Africa today are numerous and have significant implications for its destiny. The fraternal African peoples have one option: to face those challenges with the resolute and steadfast will that has characterized the continent's recent history. Foremost among those challenges - and the most provocative - is the deteriorating situation in the region, as a result of the policies of racial discrimination practised by South Africa. We believe that those policies are the root cause of all the problems in the region. Their total elimination represents the real point of departure to overcome all the challenges.

Apartheid is an appalling human tragedy. It is an inhuman system based on oppression and the degradation of humanity. The United Nations and the international community with all its segments from all walks of life have decided to condemn it as a crime against humanity. To deny fundamental human rights to the majority of the population totally contravenes the letter and the spirit of revealed religions: indeed, it is an abominable disregard of the principles of the United Nations Charter.

Egypt takes a principled and constant stand against all forms of racial discrimination and all aspects of <u>apartheid</u>, which are incompatible with the principles of justice and equality as contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination.

We believe that the policy of racial discrimination is primarily responsible for the vicious circle of the outbreak of bloody conflicts and the escalation of acts of violence, not only in South Africa but throughout the region. This situation has inevitably led the oppressed majority to resist that policy steadfastly and with all its might.

The eagerness of earlier Governments of South Africa to protect and prop up apartheid led them to pursue aggressive policies and strategies. They did not confine themselves to internal acts of ruthless oppression and suppression but extended their iron fist of wanton aggression, wreaking havoc and leading to political instability and insecurity in the whole region, which thus became embroiled in a chain of escalating violence that posed a threat to international peace and security.

However, our African peoples did not yield to oppression or aggression. The struggle of the brother peoples in South Africa is a heroic epic, the stuff of legend, an indelible and most glorious chapter in the history of mankind. It is an example of adherence to principles, steadfastness and belief in the justice of the cause, despite the hardships and difficulties and the absence of a balance of power.

There have been encouraging signs of change and reform from the new leadership in Pretoria, manifested in the release of certain militant leaders and the granting of permission to hold large political meetings despite the continuance of the state of emergency, which has been in effect for more than three years. Perhaps those positive changes on the South African scene hold a glimmer of hope for the

approach of an end to the crisis and a redressing of the injustice. Therefore, we call on the new leadership in Pretoria to take a courageous stand that would go down in the annals of history, to treat the core of the conflict with seriousness and decisiveness, and to take advantage of the favourable international developments in order to reach a just and peaceful settlement that preserves the rights of all the parties to the conflict and fulfils their aspirations to a better future and a decent life for coming generations.

However, these reforms would still fall short of meeting the just demands of the oppressed majority and the international community. They should not remain mere cosmetic changes or palliatives; rather, they should be a point of departure towards the total elimination of the policies of <u>apartheid</u> and racial discrimination, thereby enabling the oppressed majority of the population to attain their legitimate, natural right to participate in all aspects of life and contribute to the forging of their own future.

It is incumbent on the new leadership in Pretoria not to confine itself to slogans or be satisfied with the image that characterizes its emergence as a development encouraging the hope of arriving at radical solutions to the problems that have become chronic in southern Africa. It should work sincerely to translate declared intentions into reality. It should take measures promptly to bring about the climate necessary for a democratic dialogue with the majority, which has too long been denied its right, for true morality lies not in verbal statements and good intentions but in deeds.

We believe that the new leadership can, if it learns from the lessons of the past, take advantage of the present opportunity, so that South Africa may regain its international and regional position. All depends on the courageous decision that we hope will be taken promptly by Pretoria.

A democratic dialogue on a basis of equality between all parties is still possible; it is still the best option in seeking a peaceful solution to the racial conflict in South Africa. Peace is not possible in South Africa unless all participate in taking the decision and forging the future. Pretoria must prove to the international community that its intentions regarding peace are genuine. It must release political prisoners and renounce all ruthless measures against the peaceful opposition without delay. These are two indispensable steps towards ending the conflict in South Africa by peaceful means.

The principles contained in the Harare Declaration define the elements of a sound plan for the preparation of a favourable climate for the initiation of dialogue and negotiations on a new constitution in South Africa.

We wish here to sound a note of caution for the new leadership in Pretoria: procrastination, equivocation or hesitation would leave no option but that of more violence, which we believe would have serious consequences; more destruction and loss would then be the lot of all parties. We are not alone in thinking this. Pretoria's friends are now calling upon it more urgently than ever to make a courageous change, for its policies of arrogance and obduracy have had serious implications for the credibility of these friends, which are now less able to defend it.

In conclusion, I wish to pay a tribute to the Special Committee against

Apartheid and to you, Mr. President, as its Chairman. Your presidency of the

present session of the General Assembly is an honour and a privilege for Africa. I

express my appreciation of the Committee's pioneering efforts and great dedication

it has shown in discharging its important responsibilities in the fight against

racism. We expect the Special Committee to make further efforts to strengthen the

commitment of the international community to the oppressed majority in South Africa and co-ordinate international efforts against apartheid especially during the coming crucial period.

Mr. PEJIC (Yugoslavia): The recent general debate reflected almost unanimous consent that international political relations are passing through a period of important changes characterized by the relaxation of tension, reduced confrontation and the opening of a process of dialogue and co-operation. At the same time, however, the vast majority of delegations singled out the crisis in southern Africa as a warning instance that testifies that a number of burning problems continue to exist, an urgent solution of which is indispensable if one may say that the international community is indeed at the threshold of a new era.

Contrary to all these changes that have transformed the picture of the world since the creation of the United Nations, apartheid continues to persist and represents a constant threat to international security and stability. On behalf of Yugoslavia, as a Member State as well as in its capacity as Chairman of the Movement of Non-aligned Countries, I should like to point out once again the position of principle which the non-aligned have maintained for decades, that the core of the crisis in southern Africa is the policy of apartheid and racial discrimination carried out by South Africa and that, naturally, a solution can be found only on the basis of its full and unconditional elimination, for which resolute involvement and pressure on the part of the entire international community are needed.

That position has been borne out by the very dynamic political developments in the region which have dominated the international scene in the past year. The process of the decolonization of Namibia has entered the final stage. Elections that are starting today should enable the people of Namibia to express their will freely and independently and to elect representatives that will lay foundations for a new independent State and for ever free the country from the bonds of <u>apartheid</u>. Similarly, important actions have been initiated and are under way with the object of removing the tragic consequences of South Africa's many years of destabilization

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

of, and aggression against, Angola and Mozambique. Obviously, the ever more profound isolation of South Africa and its worsening internal problems have taken their toll and compelled the régime in Pretoria to retreat.

Unfortunately, there are no signs as yet from South Africa itself that the system of apartheid, which has rightfully been proclaimed a crime against humanity, can soon be finally eliminated. Change has been effected at the helm in Pretoria, many promises have been made, and certain steps have been taken, designed to convince the international public that important changes are imminent. Yet these steps so far have had no significant bearing on the generally difficult situation in the country. Emergency laws and the ban on the activities of anti-apartheid organizations are still in force, first and foremost affecting the African National Congress and the Pan-Africanist Congress. All free-thinking individuals and progressive groups continue to be persecuted, and strict censorship is imposed upon the information media. Last September yet another racially-based election was held that prevented the vast majority of the population from exercising its will. In essence the régime continues to rule by oppression, on the one hand, while, on the other, it is trying to create an impression that it is ready to embark upon a genuine transformation of society.

These manoeuvres, however, cannot hoodwink the oppressed population of South Africa, whose resistance and struggle for the realization of its legitimate right to live in freedom continue unabated despite the ruthless repression of the régime. The international community has never been in a dilemma either: the only alternative is the total elimination of apartheid.

The problem of <u>apartheid</u> is one of the priority preoccupations of world opinion. This is particularly true of the non-aligned countries, which have been the staunchest advocates of the eradication of <u>apartheid</u> on the international scene, particularly in the United Nations. The recent Ninth Summit Conference of

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

Non-aligned Countries supported and accepted in its entirety the Declaration of the Organization of African Unity Ad Hoc Committee on Southern Africa on the question of South Africa, adopted in Harare last August. This exceptionally important document established the principles and guidelines for the opening of the process of negotiations between the representatives of the majority population and the régime in Pretoria. In effect a comprehensive platform has been formulated for a political solution that will enable South Africa to become a united democratic State in which all segments of the population will enjoy equal civil and political rights, irrespective of skin colour and race.

The liberation movements of South Africa, the whole of Africa and the Movement of Non-aligned Countries have offered this constructive basis for the solution of this long-standing crisis. The régime in Pretoria must now respond with concrete measures and provide firm evidence that it is prepared to address the profound internal conflict that has ripped the very fabric of South African society. The Declaration defines clear measures that the régime in Pretoria must take immediately. First and foremost, it must unconditionally release all political prisoners, including Nelson Mandela, imprisoned for decades now, and lift restrictions on their future activities; it must also lift the ban on the activities of all anti-apartheid organizations, primarily the liberation movements; it must remove all troops from townships and discontinue all political trials and executions.

Only on that basis is it possible to create conditions for the initiation of a political process for the removal of the burdensome legacy of apartheid. However, until the régime in Pretoria embarks upon negotiations, the international community will have to continue to bring pressure to bear on the régime and to implement all necessary measures for its even greater isolation, including the comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. Experience

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

has shown that is the only way to force South Africa to abandon its intransigent policy of violence and repression.

Such action, initiated by African and all other non-aligned countries, is, in our opinion, the only constructive way to ensure a peaceful, lasting and comprehensive resolution of the crisis in that region and to open up the process of South Africa's integration in the world community of peoples. In order to secure such a solution, however, universal support will be necessary.

The responsibility and obligations of the United Nations in rendering that support are exceptional. The world Organization has thus far made a great contribution to general efforts in the elimination of <u>apartheid</u>. Numerous resolutions and declarations have been adopted under its auspices, and many international conventions to combat racial discrimination concluded. Particular recognition is due to the Special Committee against <u>Apartheid</u>, which has been in the forefront of those activities. At this moment, however, a new impetus and additional efforts are needed in support of the legitimate struggle of the people of South Africa for the creation of a democratic society in a united South Africa. A special session of the General Assembly on <u>apartheid</u> will be held in a month's time. It will provide an opportunity to initiate a broad international campaign for the final eradication of the obnoxious system of <u>apartheid</u>. The programme of the non-aligned countries agreed upon at Harare and Belgrade is a good basis to achieve that end.

The non-aligned countries, Yugoslavia included, will continue to render selfless political and material support and assistance to the victims of the inhuman system of apartheid in southern Africa. The mechanism created within the AFRICA Fund for such purposes continues to function and has been generally acclaimed.

(Mr. Pejic; Yugoslavia)

The system of <u>apartheid</u> in South Africa is a relic from the darkest pages of human history. The ideals on which the world Organization rests, that all people, irrespective of race and the colour of their skin, have the right to decide on their destiny and to build a human society in which they will enjoy equal rights to life in dignity, freedom and peace, make it incumbent upon us to act urgently. The United Nations and the entire international community must, therefore, exercise decisive pressure to eliminate <u>apartheid</u> from the face of the Earth once and for all.

Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic): Peoples throughout the world feel encouraged that, despite the difficulties and contradictions that still exist, the process of positive changes in international relations is continuing. Those changes conduce to strengthening international security, making further progress in the field of disarmament, and promoting the transition of mankind to a new stage of development under conditions of peace and co-operation. In this context, the peaceful settlement of regional conflicts has great importance. The German Democratic Republic is convinced that, with good will, readiness for compromise and due regard for the interests of all parties involved in conflicts, sensible solutions can be found even to complex issues.

The German Democratic Republic consistently advocates the settlement of conflicts exclusively by peaceful means. It holds the same position towards the problems in southern Africa. It is following with attention the moves and initiatives to defuse those problems and, wherever possible, it actively supports those moves and initiatives. This applies equally to the settlement of the conflict in south-west Africa, a settlement arranged under the auspices of the United Nations.

On many occasions the German Democratic Republic has reaffirmed its stand and has taken practical action with regard to support for the process of Namibia's independence through the consistent implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). My country's assignment of a contingent of police monitors and of a group of election supervisors to the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) is a case in point. The people and Government of the German Democratic Republic are confident that Namibia's independence will be heneficial for the peoples of that region, enabling them to develop under conditions of peace, security and sovereign equality. The unrestricted implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia will also enhance trust among the

(Mr. Zachmann, German Democratic Republic)

peoples and States in that region and add new elements to efforts in the search for a political solution to other conflicts in that region, or will at least improve the conditions for first steps towards their settlement.

This applies particularly to the eradication of <u>apartheid</u>. It is not only the changes around South Africa which give rise to fresh hope. Hope is nourished, in the first place, by the growing dynamism of events in South Africa itself and the ever-more-effective anti-<u>apartheid</u> movement, led by the African National Congress (ANC). The general public in the German Democratic Republic was deeply pleased to learn that, prompted by insistent world-wide efforts, Walter Sisulu and other leading representatives of South Africa's anti-<u>apartheid</u> movement had finally been set free. This is truly a victory for justice. It is also proof of what international solidarity can actually do. South Africa's new Government should not let things rest at this first commendable measure. It must eventually meet the world-wide demand for the release of Nelson Mandela and all the other political prisoners, and henceforth it should not carry out any more death sentences.

If apartheid is not abandoned in South Africa, that country at the southern tip of the African continent will have no future, despite its wealth of natural resources. Apartheid cannot be reformed; it must be eradicated. That is the common view of international public opinion; it is a view that is also gaining more and more ground in South Africa itself. Those vested with governmental authority in that country can no longer close their minds to this and act accordingly. South Africa's rulers cannot evade negotiations with the people's opposition. The call for such negotiations cannot go unheeded any longer. The creation of a climate that would allow for a constructive dialogue is therefore urgently needed. This would include: lifting the state of emergency; unconditionally releasing Nelson Mandela and all the other political prisoners and those detained illegally; lifting

(Mr. Zachmann, German Democratic Republic)

the ban on political organizations opposing <u>apartheid</u>; withdrawing troops from black townships; and stopping all legal proceedings instituted for political reasons, as well as capital punishment with regard to political prisoners.

Apartheid is standing out more and more in sharp contrast to the positive changes throughout the world. It is the breeding ground of tension and violence in the region and is an increasing burden to international relations. A recent study by the Economic Commission for Africa illustrates that over the past nine years South Africa's military aggression and its policy of destabilization have meant death for 1.5 million people in the front-line States. Material losses have amounted to \$60 billion; 6 million people have been driven from their homes.

What the peoples in southern Africa now need most is peace. They have a right to advance the development of their countries in their own interests. Peace requires conditions worthy of the human beings inside those countries, and stable relations with the outside world, marked by good-neighbourliness and co-operation. But that will not be possible if the policy of <u>apartheid</u>, which the progressive world considers a crime against humanity, endures.

Those are strong reasons for us not to relent in our efforts to overcome institutionalized racism in South Africa. Yet those forces desiring to perpetuate apartheid are still very influential and powerful, and they continue to receive assistance and rearguard support from outside. Let me recall here the collusion, in particular in the economic and military fields, which goes on unabatedly against the will of the majority of States and peoples and of international public opinion. It is precisely that collaboration which unduly lengthens the road towards democracy and unrestricted respect for human rights in South Africa.

Therefore, support for the self-sacrificing struggle waged by the oppressed people of South Africa in pursuit of their legitimate rights is a matter of priority. We

(Mr. Zachmann, German Democratic Republic)

fully share the demand expressed in the Declaration of the Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries adopted at their Ninth Conference in Belgrade to

"increase, widen, intensify and tighten the sanctions aimed at isolating the abhorrent régime, and eradicating the <u>apartheid</u> system". (<u>A/44/551</u>, annex, Declaration, para. 13)

It is particularly important for the United Nations to promote measures that are suited to creating the necessary framework for the eradication of <u>apartheid</u>. Likewise, it can contribute to setting in motion and supporting the much-needed dialogue within the country itself. We have no doubt that sooner or later peace, security, stability and fruitful co-operation will become an irrevocable reality in southern Africa also.

(Mr. Zachmann, German Democratic Republic)

In that spirit, the German Democratic Republic will continue actively to contribute to the important work of the Special Committee against <u>Apartheid</u>, guided by your wisdom and profound diplomatic experience, Sir. We will also continue to co-operate closely with the Centre against <u>Apartheid</u> under the skilled leadership of the Assistant Secretary-General, Mr. Mousouris.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the German Democratic Republic for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. AL-MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): The General Assembly is considering the item on apartheid at a time when the eyes of the world are turned to Namibia as it completes the final stages of its long struggle for freedom and independence. Indeed, after a struggle of several score years against the racist occupation of their country, and as a result of great sacrifices, the militant people of Namibia have been able to liberate their country, exercise their full right to self-determination and accede to independence. There is no doubt that the independence of the people of Namibia will consolidate and enhance the just struggle of their brothers in South Africa against the hateful réqime of apartheid - a struggle that has won them world-wide support which has been reflected in the numerous United Nations resolutions condemning apartheid and racism, and recognizing the right of the people of South Africa to freedom and independence. As the General Assembly has repeatedly affirmed, South Africa's policy of apartheid is not only a gross violation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international legal instruments; but a crime against humanity.

Proceeding from its firm, principled stance that <u>apartheid</u> constitutes the most odious form of evil that has ever bedeviled mankind, Syria affirms its staunch

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

support of all measures likely to contribute to the liberation of all peoples that are victims of this most heinous form of evil.

We reaffirm our full solidarity with the South African people in its struggle against apartheid because we believe in the joint Arab/African struggle against a common enemy. Just as our African brethren are suffering under the racist white minority régime in South Africa, our Arab people in the occupied Arab territories are staggering under the yoke of the apartheid régime of racist zionism in occupied Palestine and the other occupied Arab territories.

For their part, at their ninth conference, the Heads of State or Government of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries strongly denounced the increasing co-operation between the racist régimes in South Africa and occupied Palestine. The conferees noted the great similarity between the repressive measures - such as the policies of "the iron-fist" and "hot pursuit" - practised against the peoples of South Africa, the front-line States, Palestine, southern Lebanon and the other occupied Arab territories. They callled on all States to abstain from nuclear co-operation with the Pretoria and Tel Aviv régimes because of the threat posed by such co-operation to international peace and security.

Recalling the resolutions adopted by the United Nations General Assembly reaffirming its condemnation of the continuing collaboration between Israel and South Africa in the field of nuclear arms and systems of delivery, the conferees cited the serious implications of that collaboration for international peace and security.

In that regard, according to the report of the Special Committee against

Apartheid, ballistic missiles constitute one of the most serious threats posed by

South Africa's nuclear capabilities: South Africa has successfully tested a

modified version of the Israeli Jericho II missile, which may be used to launch

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

nuclear warheads of a 1,000-kilometre range. Furthermore, Pretoria now has the capacity, through its co-operation with Israel, to launch satellites into low orbit. News agencies have recently reported the nuclear co-operation scandal involving the two régimes. Indeed, on 25 October 1989, NBC revealed that the racist régime in occupied Palestine was helping Pretoria to produce a long-range nuclear missile in exchange for the supply of enriched uranium, enabling Israel to produce nuclear warheads. This is information that Pretoria and Tel Aviv can no longer deny, despite their resort to all sorts of allegations and misinformation to conceal the true nature of the danger posed by such co-operation to the peace and security not only of the Arab and African countries but of the world at large.

In its report, the Special Committee against Apartheid concluded that the numerous reported violations of the mandatory arms embargo have made it possible for Pretoria to continue to produce weapons and to increase its weapon exports through third-States. In that regard, thanks to Israel's continuing collaboration, South Africa now has the technology to develop a capability in delivery systems.

The <u>apartheid</u> régimes of Tel Aviv and Pretoria will not willingly renounce their racist practices and policies: they must be forced to do so. Hence, effective action is required.

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

If we are to accelerate the liberation of the people of South Africa and the occupied Arab territories, and to spare them of further suffering as a result of the repressive policies applied against them, comprehensive, mandatory sanctions must be imposed on the South African and Israeli régimes, under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. In resolution 43/50 C the General Assembly decided once again

"that the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations would be the most ... effective ... and peaceful means to bring apartheid to an end".

(resolution 43/50 C, para. 4)

That would be the best means of enabling the United Nations to discharge its duty to maintain international peace and security, both of which are seriously threatened by the policy of apartheid.

We endorse the efforts of the Organization of African Unity to convene a meeting of the Security Council, with a view to reaching agreement on the adoption of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the <u>apartheid</u> régime of South Africa, to consider the measures of intimidation that have been adopted by South Africa and the policy of State terrorism that has been practised by that régime in South Africa and the whole region. Even though, for well-known reasons, the Security Council has not been able to adopt such mandatory sanctions, most Member States have agreed on the adoption of comprehensive or voluntary sanctions against South Africa. In this context, my country, which is struggling against racist Zionism in our part of the Arab region, has always been in the forefront of States that support the struggle of the South African people against the racist and oppressive régime. We have always implemented all United Nations resolutions

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

calling for a boycott and for nations to abstain from establishing any ties with the régime.

We vehemently condemn the policy of <u>apartheid</u> practised by Pretoria: it constitutes the worst form of racial discrimination. We likewise oppose the policy of destabilization that has been practised by Pretoria against neighbouring States for the purpose of perpetuating its policy and ensuring its own survival. Syria subscribes entirely to General Assembly resolution 43/50, of 5 December 1988, which calls for the convening of a special session of the General Assembly on <u>apartheid</u> and on its devastating effects on southern Africa when the peoples of Palestine and of South Africa regain their human dignity and enjoy unimpeded rights. Humanity is duty-bound to support the international community's contribution to the efforts to free southern Africa from racial persecution and establish a democratic State in South Africa.

The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.