



General Assembly

PROVIS IONAL

A/44/PV.51
17 November 1989

ENGLISH

Forty-fourth session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVIS IONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTY-FIRST MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 9 November 1989, at 3 p.m.

<u>President:</u>	Mr. NAVAJAS MOCRO (Vice-President)	(Bolivia)
later:	Mr. GARBA (President)	(Nigeria)
later:	Mr. HURST (Vice-President)	(Antigua and Barbuda)

- Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa [28] (continued)
 - (a) Report of the Special Committee against Apartheid
 - (b) Report of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa
 - (c) 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.

In the absence of the President, Mr. Navajas Mogro (Bolivia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 28 (continued)

POLICIES OF APARTHEID OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA

- (a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID (A/44/22 and Corr.2)
- (b) REPORT OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL GROUP TO MONITOR THE SUPPLY AND SHIPPING OF OIL AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS TO SOUTH AFRICA (A/44/44)
- (c) REPORT OF THE COMMISSION AGAINST APARTHEID IN SPORTS (A/44/47)
- (d) REPORTS 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)

Mr. MOHAMMED (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): First, my delegation wishes to pay a tribute, on behalf of the people and leadership of Iraq, to the freedom fighters of South Africa as they step up their bitter struggle to liberate their country from the abhorrent apartheid régime. The huge demonstration in Soweto on 29 October 1989, in which some 100,000 South Africans joined, is another significant milestone in the efforts of the South African masses to rid themselves of the most heinous and inhuman system in the history of mankind.

The events in South Africa confirm two basic facts: first, that the apartheid régime will never be made to retreat except through continuing and escalating struggle and pressure; and, secondly, that the essential cause of the conflict in the area is the apartheid régime itself. Therefore what is required is not a change of faces but the complete and definitive eradication of the régime and the establishment of black majority rule. In order to achieve that goal all political prisoners, foremost among them the African leader Nelson Mandela, must be released. It is also essential to lift the state of emergency, establish the inalienable, legitimate rights of South Africa's black majority and recognize the legitimacy of the South African national movement and its militant leadership.

(Mr. Mohammed, Iraq)

On the basis of the experience gained in the struggle and of the reality of the conflict, my delegation considers all settlements achieved in the southern African region, and the positive results they have produced and can produce to be all to the good, but they can in no way be an alternative to the fundamental solution: the final eradication of the apartheid system, in accordance with adopted international resolutions.

The achievements of the people of South Africa and the victories they are continuing to achieve, in addition to the backward steps the racist régime is forced to take in retreat, do not mean that a final victory has been won and that the people of South Africa and the international community supporting them should cease to exert pressure and escalate their struggle. For any relaxation of efforts and any appeasement policies could lead to the extension of the life of the hated apartheid régime and give the rulers of Pretoria the chance to manoeuvre and circumvent the achievements of the people of South Africa.

Here we can point to many experiences in the past when the Pretoria régime has been able to exploit points of weakness and relaxation of efforts and to use them in the interest of its continued survival, and also to disavow even the false commitments it has given. There is no doubt that in their manoeuvres to impede the independence of Namibia, the rulers of South Africa have added factors which further strengthen the distrust of that régime. The pressure on and struggle against the régime must be increased in order to ensure that it carries out United Nations resolutions on South Africa and Namibia.

The attempts of the Pretoria régime to embellish its image by taking cosmetic measures, by making false commitments - the kind of commitments it has disregarded in the past - indicate that it persists in practising its hateful policy of apartheid.

(Mr. Mohammed, Iraq)

The information campaigns some countries are carrying out in favour of that régime jeopardizes the international community's efforts to rid itself of the apartheid régime.

The most salient example of co-operation with the South African régime is undoubtedly embodied in the strategic relationship between the Zionist racist régime of Tel Aviv and the Pretoria régime. That strategic co-operation is based principally on the similarity in the nature of these racist régimes and is reflected in hostile practices and expansionist policies which contravene the principles of international law and human rights. What is taking place in South Africa, the murders, displacement and suppression of the most elementary human rights, and what is taking place in occupied Palestine, the methodical use of genocide against the struggling people of Palestine and their courageous intifadah, certainly constitute one of the main proofs of the similarity in the racist nature of the two régimes. The Tel Aviv rulers, in order to subvert the United States embargo law of 1986, have alleged that they are trying gradually to reduce their co-operation with the régime in South Africa. But that allegation is refuted by the facts, which the two racist régimes cannot hide. One can point here to facts in articles on the front page, as well as on page 7, of The New York Times of 27 October 1981 and facts reported by the same newspaper on page 9 on 1 November 1989 concerning the intensive and continued co-operation by the two régimes to produce transcontinental missiles.

This new scandal regarding nuclear co-operation between the two régimes is not part of an Arab information campaign against Israel, as its representative alleged this morning in his statement before the General Assembly. These are documented facts published by United States media, both on television and in the press, and we

(Mr. Mohammed, Iraq)

continue to see them in the media. The origin of these documents is the Central Intelligence Agency - not Arab circles.

What United States establishments have released indicates clearly that there is much more behind all this. It would have been logical for the representative of Israel to take the trouble to answer the United States media, rather than attacking the Arab States in an attempt to disguise known facts.

Also, he avoided entering into the details of nuclear co-operation with South Africa, including the production of missiles. He referred to some information on trade - information of which he is the source. The co-operation between the two régimes is not only an embodiment of common interests but also an expression of the same racist nature of the two régimes and the philosophy that inspires them. As regards Judaism and its values, that philosophy is far removed from the practices of the Tel Aviv rulers. If anything has caused harm to the Jewish religion and its noble, divine values it is the racist Zionist practices of the Tel Aviv rulers, and not of any other quarter.

The similarity between the practices of the two régimes sometimes reaches the point of complete identity even in details. No doubt the world was deeply distressed by and angered at the events that took place regarding the inhabitants of the Palestinian village of Beit Sahur, who were subjected to the worst type of blockade because they refused to pay taxes to the occupiers. The occupation troops stormed their houses and factories and stole the contents. The United States journalist Joel Brinkley has described on the front page of The New York Times of 1 November what the inhabitants of Beit Sahur were subjected to. The events in the Palestinian village of Beit Sahur at the hands of the Zionist occupation forces were exactly the same as those in the village of Nkqokqweni in South Africa.

(Mr. Mohammed, Iraq)

Christopher Wren reported on page 6 of The New York Times of 31 October 1989 that forces of the Pretoria régime had in the last few weeks stormed that village and demolished dozens of homes, imprisoning 100 villagers, including their leaders, while scores had been killed and buried; 1,500 villagers had fled for their lives, leaving all their belongings behind.

(Mr. Mohammed, Iraq)

The events in the Palestinian village of Beit Sahur and Nkqokweni in South Africa in the twentieth century are examples of an aggressive racist policy against the Palestinian people and the people of South Africa at the hands of the most odious racist régimes in the history of mankind.

Iraq, in line with its consistent policy against racism and aggression, condemns the aggressive racist apartheid policy of the South African régime because it flagrantly contravenes all human principles and poses a constant threat to international peace and security. For this reason, Iraq calls for the stepping up of strict international measures against that régime until it is totally uprooted.

Iraq is also committed to the resolutions of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, in particular the final document (A/44/551) of the ninth summit conference of non-aligned countries, held in Belgrade. Iraq will maintain its total commitment to international resolutions, particularly the resolutions of the United Nations, and we have no diplomatic, economic, political or cultural relations with the South African régime. Iraq fully implements the embargoes on South Africa and does not supply it with any oil or arms. It does not allow Iraqi ships to use South African harbours. Iraq has supported all the measures adopted concerning non-co-operation with South Africa in the nuclear field.

Iraq has also co-operated and continues to co-operate by all the means available to it in United Nations efforts to end the occupation of Namibia by the racist Pretoria régime and bring about the independence of Namibia under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

Regarding Government measures, Iraq maintains no political, cultural, sports or commercial relations whatsoever with the Pretoria régime. There are no Iraqi

(Mr. Mohammed, Iraq)

investments in South Africa and no funds or agencies of any kind. Iraqi law prohibits immigration to South Africa and there is no tourist travel to South Africa from Iraq. On the other hand, Iraq maintains normal relations with the African front-line States and provides all that it can in the way of matériel and moral and political assistance. Iraq does not recognize the bantustans and has no investments therein.

My country supports all national liberation movements, including the black workers' movement, in their struggle to achieve independence and exercise their human rights in South Africa. In Iraq there are no obstacles that could prevent our trade unions from co-operating with the workers of South Africa against the occupation and apartheid policies. Iraq strongly condemns the Pretoria régime's use of mercenaries and considers those mercenaries to be criminals, who should be punished legally.

The Constitution of Iraq, the supreme legislative instrument in Iraq, contains an important principle in paragraph 1 of article 19, which stipulates as follows:

"The citizens are equal before law, without discrimination as to sex, race, language or social origin."

Therefore it is axiomatic that this principle should become the norm for all Iraqi legislation.

The Republic of Iraq has established its foreign policy in the light of the principles of its Constitution, including the principle of the equality, basic rights and duties of all citizens. That policy principle is reflected in all its foreign relations with the international community. For this reason, the Republic of Iraq has no relations whatsoever with the racist South African régime. It has legislation which endorses the conventions and agreements against the racial

(Mr. Mohammed, Iraq)

discrimination adopted by the international community. Iraq has acceded to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. It has ratified the two Covenants relating to human rights and the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid, and it has acceded to the International Convention against Apartheid in Sports.

My delegation is happy to pay a tribute from this rostrum to the militant South African people and their national movements, in particular the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC), which are struggling for the eradication of the régime and the policy of apartheid as an inevitable step towards the establishment of a democratic non-racial society based on self-determination and majority rule resulting from public elections.

On behalf of my delegation, I should like to reaffirm Iraq's support for the efforts of the Organization of African Unity to ensure Namibia's independence and South Africa's liberation from the hated apartheid régime.

I reaffirm also Iraq's support for and appreciation of the Special Committee against Apartheid and all other international bodies that participate effectively in support for the struggle of the peoples of South Africa to achieve the exercise of their inalienable rights.

Iraq firmly believes, on the basis of long and rich experience, that the policy of aggression is fruitless. The people of Iraq have defended their country for eight years, unstintingly and at great sacrifice, and have finally succeeded in overcoming aggression. That is what the peoples of South Africa and Namibia will achieve, because this is the way of right and justice and the lesson that history teaches us.

Mr. ESZT ALYOS (Hungary): Two days ago the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly began its deliberation on item 28, "Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa". The opinions expressed so far have already revealed the importance that the whole international community attaches to the struggle for the total eradication of racial discrimination and apartheid.

(Mr. Esztergalyos, Hungary)

For the United Nations, the attainment of racial equality, and freedom, are goals enshrined in the Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The abolition of racial discrimination in South Africa remains a yet-unfinished task.

Since September the situation in South Africa has basically not improved. The apartheid system remains in place, and the state of emergency is still in force. The international community has taken note of the release of a few prominent political prisoners, but Nelson Mandela and all the others are still incarcerated. The ban on the African National Congress (ANC) and other political organizations is still in force. This situation demands that urgent action be taken to hasten the end of the apartheid system.

It is an indictment of our times that an unjust, anachronistic policy such as apartheid should have been allowed to prevail for so long against world opinion. The maintenance of that abhorrent policy has exacted its toll on the security and well-being of countries and peoples outside the frontiers of South Africa as well.

The opposition of the United Nations to apartheid is unequivocal. For over four decades the United Nations has spoken clearly and loudly on the problem.

The international community is keenly aware of the new political configuration that is emerging in world politics, a configuration that is having a profound and significant impact on regional conflicts in various parts of the world. I would add that it is obvious that all these problems, having accumulated over so many years, cannot be solved overnight. In that context, it is hoped that developments in southern Africa will help establish conditions for a peaceful solution of the conflict in the region and that the promising signals that my delegation is perceiving, with cautious optimism, will be followed by fundamental changes.

(Mr. Esztergalyos, Hungary)

In this hope we fully share the evaluation of the Secretary-General, contained in his report in document A/44/1, that the positive turn of events in Namibia and a political climate conducive to the resolution of the regional problems should encourage the prospects for fundamental change within South Africa too. It is clear that a mere dilution or softening of apartheid will not be an answer to the expectations of the majority of the people of South Africa, nor to those of the world as a whole. The United Nations has indicated the steps that the Government of South Africa must take to create an appropriate atmosphere for a national dialogue with the genuine representatives of the majority in order to set in motion a democratic process aimed at shaping the political future of the country. We believe that the process of building a new society in South Africa can start only when apartheid is abolished, repression against opposition forces is lifted, and an environment is ensured in which political views can be freely expressed and the interests of the black majority are taken into consideration equally with the views of the white minority.

Here I should like to recall something from the history of the United Nations. As far back as 1953 a Special Commission, set up by the Security Council, reached the conclusion that the apartheid doctrine was extremely dangerous to international peace and suggested that a round-table conference composed of members of the various communities in South Africa would be the best means of bringing about a peaceful solution to the racial situation in that country. Dialogue between all the true political leaders of various sectors of the population is more urgently needed today than ever before. Obviously, negotiations would have to address the central questions of political power, and not how to give apartheid a more acceptable face. Since it cannot be reformed, it must be abolished. It is our belief that the assistance offered by some Governments for negotiations and

(Mr. Esztergalyos, Hungary)

mediation could also contribute to the transformation of South Africa into a united, democratic and non-racial society.

President De Klerk has created expectations, unthinkable only a year ago, that his Government could soon enter into exploratory talks with the ANC and all the other political factions in South Africa. These expectations have not yet been met. In fact many of us have doubts regarding their early fulfilment. However, let me state that it is the firm belief of my delegation that only serious and responsible negotiations with the genuine representatives of the black majority can prevent further bloodshed and turn South Africa into a democratic, non-racial society where everybody, regardless of his or her skin colour or creed, is entitled to exercise human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Next month a special session of the General Assembly on apartheid and its destructive consequences in southern Africa will be convened. That session would also give the international community a good opportunity to review the situation in southern Africa and to evaluate thoroughly the state of the Namibian independence process, and consequently the implementation of the relevant United Nations resolutions.

Mr. AL-SHAALI (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic):

Another year has gone by, and the majority of South Africa's population still languishes under the heinous apartheid régime. We cannot deny that that year has been marked by new developments. It was an eventful year. Some of those events were directly related to the situation in South Africa, while others had an indirect relationship with that situation.

From those many developments in the international arena, there has emerged a trend towards the settlement of regional problems. Southern Africa was not an exception. The election process in Namibia is a case in point.

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

In the context of those new international developments and the prevalence of policies of understanding and co-operation in international relations, we cannot conceive of any justification for the perpetuation of the white minority régime, which tramples underfoot the aspirations and interests of the black majority in South Africa in defiance of international public opinion and in violation of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions adopted over 40 years of debate.

Notwithstanding a number of positive developments which may suggest an improvement in the situation in South Africa, such as the recent elections and the release of some of the political leaders of the black majority - though we still await the release of Nelson Mandela - we are afraid that those developments are aimed at improving the appearance and not the substance of the situation and that the whole thing is geared to the perpetuation rather than the elimination of that régime. The Government of South Africa has not taken any step that would indicate a true desire to recognize the magnitude of the problem or demonstrate any serious intention to engage in political negotiations with the representatives of the black majority in South Africa.

We have always been and continue to be of the opinion that the apartheid régime is an aberration that runs counter to all the norms, concepts and ideals which have motivated mankind's historical quest for a better life.

(Mr. Al-Shazli,
United Arab Emirates)

Hence this régime cannot be reformed, it should be eradicated. This is the unanimous conviction of all the countries of the world: apartheid must be eradicated. We have not heard a single voice raised to the contrary. Even the régime's staunchest supporters and collaborators do not disagree. The area of disagreement here is not whether or not apartheid should be eradicated, but how to rid the world of this system of racism and its institutions.

Throughout the last 40 years many ways and means have been tried. There have been those who claim that racism can be overcome although the positive approach of dealing constructively with South Africa, in the hope of persuading the régime to desist from its policies and practices. However, this has not been the case. The Pretoria régime exploited that approach in strengthening its racist institutions and pursuing with impunity its oppressive policies and draconian measures against the black majority regardless of the intentions of the authors of that positive approach.

It is no secret that foreign interests have propped up that régime, especially through impeding the attempts of the Security Council to adopt a direct and clear-cut resolution to impose sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter. This was done out of the desire to protect the narrow selfish interests of certain States that wished to continue to benefit from that régime until its last gasp.

Proceeding from that premise, we call upon those States, once again, to reconsider their position and urge them to help the international community to take the necessary measures unanimously to stop the tragedy and put an end to the continued exacerbation of the situation in South Africa.

In this respect, we welcome the efforts of the Centre against Apartheid, especially its programme of action in the follow-up to the implementation of

(Mr. Al-Shaali,
United Arab Emirates)

United Nations resolutions concerning apartheid. We also support the work of the Special Committee against Apartheid, which plays a pioneering and major role in formulating the position of the United Nations against that régime.

We also welcome the forthcoming special session of the General Assembly to consider the destructive impact of the apartheid régime in southern Africa.

Numerous lives have been lost, thousands of black citizens have been subjected to imprisonment, torture and persecution only because they defended their right to exist and their right to freedom in their own country. That is a right the United Nations was founded to uphold and guarantee.

The States of the world should work in concert in order to restore peace and security to southern Africa. This cannot be realized while oppression, inequality and the flouting of human rights continue unabated.

Political and civil rights are closely linked to economic, social and cultural rights. The intransigence of the apartheid régime in dealing with international resolutions and instruments concerning those rights reflects an unabashed disdain for those instruments and, consequently, for all international principles and norms.

Peace will be established in southern Africa only through the emergence of a society devoid of discrimination, a society where equality and justice are the modus vivendi in which all races may thrive in tranquillity and harmony. Recent developments are evidence that the apartheid régime is defending its last positions. We are confident that the sun of freedom will soon shine on our brethren who for so long have suffered oppression in South Africa.

Mr. MARDOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): For more than a quarter of a century the United Nations has been

(Mr. Mardovich,
Byelorussian SSR)

making organized efforts to eliminate the racist régime in South Africa, a régime based on the policy of apartheid which has been recognized by the United Nations as a crime against humanity and a threat to international peace and security. That inhuman system has aroused particular indignation now when in international affairs there has been a change for the better and the forces of commonsense have been gaining ground at a time when in politics priority is being given to universal human values and when violence and oppression are being eliminated from the arsenal of political means, having been recognized as unsuitable for conducting international affairs.

By means of the new political thinking, we have managed to resolve or move very close to resolving a number of formerly insuperable problems. What is particularly noteworthy now is the ongoing process, in keeping with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), of decolonization and the granting of independence to Namibia. This clearly demonstrates that violence, terror and repression in whatever form they may appear are not able to break or stifle the aspirations of peoples or States to freedom and independence, and that even the most complicated conflicts and problems can and should be resolved by peaceful political means, through negotiation.

This fully applies to the problem of eliminating apartheid in South Africa. Apartheid cannot be reformed; it must be eradicated. That is the view of the international community enshrined in United Nations documents that are gaining increasing recognition in South Africa itself. Many institutions of South African

(Mr. Mardovich,
Byelorussian SSR)

nationalism that traditionally were considered to be the ideological bulwark of apartheid are speaking out in favour of the elimination of apartheid. The Dutch Reformed Church, initiator of building a society on the principles of racial discrimination, now recognizes apartheid to be a mistake and racial discrimination to be a sin.

The situation in South Africa is now characterized by a complex welter of many contradictory factors, among which are attempts by the ruling circles to bring about a political settlement of the conflict, on the one hand, and actions which seek to continue the old policy based on racial oppression, on the other hand.

Like all peoples of good will, we welcomed the recent decision taken by the South African Government to release the former General Secretary of the African National Congress (ANC), Mr. Sisulu, as well as a number of other members of that organization, and the President of the United Democratic Front, Mr. Mpetha. How could one not welcome it, since they released people who had been sentenced for political reasons? At the same time, we cannot be complacent about something else: many hundreds of political detainees are still languishing in South African gaols, including the staunch anti-apartheid fighter, one of the leaders of the ANC, Nelson Mandela.

(Mr. Mardovich, Byelorussian SSR)

The state of emergency has been extended despite the mass protests and official appeals for clemency from thousands of organizations and scores of Governments. Despite the appeal of this session of the General Assembly, death sentences against those who oppose the régime are now being handed down and implemented. Police repression and blackmail continue against the democratic anti-racist forces in the country. The number of political refugees is growing. Many leaders and activists in the anti-apartheid struggle are becoming victims of terror. The system of repressive laws continues to operate, and this is a mockery of the traditional democratic institutions and norms of society. This is all spelt out in detail in the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid (A/44/22 and Corr. 2).

As the Assembly can see, the big talk, the "peace-loving phrases," the promises by Pretoria to write a new chapter in the history of South Africa are certainly not matched by the practical steps that I have just mentioned. This is worrying; it impels people of good will to take action and not to slacken their efforts in the struggle against racism and its most odious manifestation apartheid; it warns those who fight against apartheid to remain resolute. In this context, we noted with concern the passage in the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid in which reference is made to the expansion by certain States of commercial and financial links with Pretoria and the rescheduling of South Africa's credits from a group of banks in Western Europe and North America.

Actions of this kind, of course, made the struggle even harder for those fighting for freedom and independence. What is needed now, in our view, is more decisive concerted action by the international community in the anti-apartheid struggle. We associate ourselves fully with the appeal to the international

(Mr. Mardovich, Byelorussian SSR)

community contained in the Declaration adopted by the Ninth Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, in Belgrade, that those countries will

"increase, widen, intensify and tighten the sanctions aimed at isolating the abhorrent apartheid régime, and eradicating the apartheid system."

(A/44/551, p. 12)

My country, on the basis of its position of principle on the policies of apartheid of the Pretoria régime, has constantly advocated the elimination of the apartheid system and the scrupulous implementation of United Nations resolutions, including General Assembly resolution 43/50 K on concerted international action for the elimination of apartheid, adopted at the last regular session.

In our Republic there is widespread observance of the special days and weeks to commemorate the struggle against racial discrimination and to express solidarity with the struggling people of South Africa. These commemorative events mobilize public opinion in support of the just struggle of the peoples of southern Africa, and the whole of progressive mankind against apartheid, for the complete elimination of colonialism and neo-colonialism, and against any manifestation of racial discrimination.

My delegation is a sponsor of six of the draft resolutions on this item at this session.

The situation in southern Africa demands that all Members of the United Nations which cherish the purposes of the Organization take co-ordinated, active measures to defend the righteous cause of the people of South Africa and speak out for the elimination of the hateful system of apartheid. A significant role in this important work will be played by the special session of the General Assembly scheduled for December of this year. Our delegation is prepared to make a positive contribution to the attainment of a just, lasting settlement in southern Africa.

Mr. OKEYO (Kenya): The ugly and haunting visage of apartheid remains a blemish on the landscape of national and international relations. Racism, racial discrimination and their most flagrant, abhorrent manifestation, apartheid, continue to flaunt their inhuman dimensions despite the innumerable efforts of the international community to destroy apartheid. Again, we are confronted with the Nazi face of apartheid and again we have to strike it.

A former British Minister once warned that white South Africa would face an African "tempest of revolution" if it did not end apartheid. Apartheid, he said, had been:

"institutionalized, enshrined in law and even sanctified by religious doctrine."

The threat of this tempest coupled with the obvious effectiveness of sanctions has only now begun to force Pretoria to mend its evil ways. We say that the pressure that produced results must continue. Attempts by some world leaders to provide Pretoria with more "carrot" than "stick", or to provide a breathing space to enable the South African leadership to enact reforms, must be rejected wholesale. The snake's head of apartheid has changed, but its body remains and its lifeblood still courses strongly.

The reforms in South Africa have been derided as cosmetic. Even as we speak, thousands of Africans suffer daily brutal treatment as the inimical, but now crumbling edifice of apartheid is shored up. The rhetoric has changed but the essential features of apartheid are still the same. Some action has, however, been taken and we acknowledge this. On 28 September 1989 Kenya's Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Co-operation, Mr. Robert Ouko, expressed the hope that the new white South African leadership would take

"positive and progressive steps towards a humane society in which all peoples, regardless of race, can live in harmony." (A/44/PV.10, p. 68-70)

(Mr. Okeyo, Kenya)

The recently concluded Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, welcomed developments which showed that

"the régime had accepted a degree of peaceful political activity by the black majority",

and again that there was a

"possibility that significant changes in approach on the part of the South African régime ... may yet prove to be within reach." (A/44/672, para.2)

However, like the Commonwealth Heads of Government we also stressed again that the recent positive steps in South Africa only came about because of the increasing pressure on the South African economy caused by sanctions and that this pressure would continue until Pretoria showed evidence of clear and irreversible change.

Kenya is concerned and deeply saddened by the vociferous and disdainful opposition to that segment of the Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting's communiqué which dealt with apartheid. Unfortunately, this opposition has again left a gnawing, nagging, but increasingly accurate, impression that some are defending the racist régime. We are confident that the Commonwealth of nations is completely opposed to this position.

This unseemly disregarding of world opinion was magnified and made worse by the earlier rescheduling on 13 October 1989 of Pretoria's \$8 billion short-term debt, which was frozen when South Africa was in turmoil in 1985. This will greatly relieve the immediate debt pressure on South Africa, and it is a set-back for us in our continuous battle to force South Africa to abandon its Nazi policies of apartheid. In other deliberations of this forty-fourth session of the General Assembly we urged that:

(Mr. Okeyo, Kenya)

"As South Africa reschedules its debt in 1990 the international banking community must help in translating our total moral indignation into a tangible stick to beat the remnants of apartheid out of South Africa."

Our call and those of other nations in our continent went unheeded. This rescheduling is the result of a deal between South Africa and its creditor banks in this our host city, New York, and in Washington and Zurich. At the time the world deplored this action, Pretoria's Finance Minister said the rescheduling was

"certainly one of the most important international events for South Africa this year, especially as far as the economy is concerned."

The results of this rescheduling back our ardent belief that moral indignation must be backed by financial muscle.

My delegation is also angered and saddened that these actions are indirect projections and manifestations of racism that are uglier and more pervasive than the overt direct enforcement of apartheid policies.

Witness the cries for help from the developing world for a just reorientation of the asymmetric balance of the global economy. The casual snubbing of these pleas is in marked and discriminative contrast to the total support that some Members of this Organization generously provided to a Europe almost completely devastated in the Second World War.

Witness the united and total consensus of Western moral, material and financial support towards some countries in Europe struggling out of the quagmire of unworkable economic policies. Compare this with the equally meek attempts to infuse resources into the ailing economies of the developing world.

Witness the quibbling, the equivocation and the downright refusal of some Western nations even to contemplate sanctions as an instrument to correct the errant political, social and economic policies of apartheid in South Africa, and

(Mr. Okeyo, Kenya)

the reflex alacrity with which the same sanctions and embargoes are designed and imposed on some developing countries in this hemisphere.

Witness still the accusing finger quickly pointed at recent social and political maladjustments in the largest nation in the orient and the reluctant and half-hearted criticism and equivocation directed at worse maladjustments in apartheid South Africa. This hypocrisy must stop.

All is not lost. There is a ray of light at the end of the tunnel. We could take some recent developments and from them forge a sword that the world could use to tear at the heart of apartheid. That sword is economic sanctions. A recent heartening development in Washington that could be used to forge such a sword occurred on Tuesday, 2 October 1989, during a United States of America Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing on United States policy towards South Africa. During this hearing United States Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Ambassador Herman Cohen, stated that the United States Government intended to work with the Congress in order

"to be able to send a clear signal of broad bipartisan support for a policy premised on unequivocal abhorrence of apartheid."

The most significant aspects of Ambassador Cohen's statement included: first, his recognition that "sanctions have played a role in stimulating new thinking within the white power structure" within South Africa - sanctions work; secondly, stressing once more the United States Government's commitment to enforce the United States Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986; and, thirdly, outlining a negotiation scenario that included the initiation of a dialogue among all parties.

Unfortunately, on the one side, in Washington, a super-Power recommitts itself in unambiguous terms to wage unrestricted war against apartheid, while, on the other side, in Kuala Lumpur, a communiqué that commits the Commonwealth to maintain

(Mr. Okeyo, Kenya)

the course on anti-apartheid policy, and where necessary to apply more pressure, is not unanimously adopted.

Kenya strongly believes that effective economic pressure - applied particularly by those major economic Powers that are South Africa's principal trading partners and to which it looks for major financial flows - that demands change while there is still time to bring it about by peaceful means is an essential part of the negotiating process.

(Mr. Okeyo, Kenya)

Sanctions and peaceful change in South Africa are synonymous. Although sanctions have been effective, their impact has been essentially limited because their application has been limited. To press for more change, a significant widening and increase of sanctions pressure must be designed and put in place. My delegation further recognizes that the two open windows of opportunity available to the international community are political and economic, interlinked for this purpose.

The political window of opportunity comes about as the climate for negotiations begins to look slightly positive because of statements made and actions taken by the white leadership in South Africa. On 21 October 1989, for example, Mr. De Klerk promised to phase out the state of emergency that has been in effect since June 1986. There was no specific indication when this would take place. He also promised to allow the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) to join other African representatives in negotiating South Africa's future with the minority Government. These are promises. They need to be kept. Specifics are needed. The response of the ANC, through the recently released Walter Sisulu, aided this climate. It said:

"We are peace-loving people. The people do not want a state of emergency. The people want to live normal lives."

The act of releasing eight freedom fighters from the shackles of apartheid bondage was a positive step in the process towards change. Some would like us to join in applauding and celebrating this long overdue act by the racist régime. We cannot. There are still several thousand detainees languishing in white South African gaols. The state of emergency is still in force. South Africa's apparatus of terror still brutally ill-treats Africans in their homes. The ANC and other mass political movements are still banned and Nelson Mandela is still in detention. It is certainly much too early to celebrate.

(Mr. Okeyo, Kenya)

The recent anti-apartheid rally held in Johannesburg, in which up to 70,000 people participated, and the meeting that Archbishop Desmond Tutu, the Reverend Allan Boesak and the Reverend Frank Chikane had with De Klerk on 11 October 1989 to talk about negotiations opened further the political window of opportunity. The list of steps they urged the minority Government to take were those outlined by ANC. These included: lifting the state of emergency, lifting the restrictions on political activity, releasing detainees held without trial, legalization of political organizations, clemency for those sentenced to death and releasing political prisoners. Negotiations on South Africa's future must begin in earnest.

The economic window of opportunity is closely interlinked with the political window. This opportunity is found in sanctions of a commercial, technological and financial nature. My delegation is firm in its belief that only sanctions can provide the catalyst and necessary impetus for negotiations on South Africa's future. These sanctions must be widely, rapidly and strictly applied.

To this end, therefore, my delegation, in keeping with suggestions presented elsewhere, proposes the following action: first, convert the moral indignation against apartheid into the political will to reduce trade and financial dealings if no progress is made in the negotiation process; secondly, ban the importation of all non-strategic minerals from South Africa; thirdly, prohibit the importation of all South African manufactured goods; fourthly, prohibit the production and sale of all platinum bars and coins for investors, and ban loans and restrict investments in South Africa; fifthly, phase out the trade credit of buyers and suppliers, which, it is hoped, will discourage trade with South Africa; and, sixthly, include in the United Nations mandatory arms embargo any goods or technology that could be used for arms production to intensify repression and extend very vigorously into the nuclear technology co-operation area.

(Mr. Okeyo, Kenya)

We were recently alarmed to learn definitively that, despite international concern and efforts to diminish nuclear co-operation, some nations have been supplying nuclear technology to South Africa in exchange for enriched uranium. A nuclear missile with a 900-mile range has also been tested by the racist régime. We urge those nations to stop sharing the same bed with racist South Africa and disdainfully ignoring our requests and pleas. A reappraisal of the status of present relations is possible and in some cases is already in process.

With this in mind, therefore, Kenya suggests the following negotiation scenario. First, the state of emergency should be ended. Secondly, all political prisoners and detainees, including Nelson Mandela, should be released. Thirdly, the proscription of political organizations and anti-apartheid groups, including the African National Congress and the Pan African Congress, should be rescinded.

There may be a trend in this direction. On 23 October 1989 Mbeki, Sisulu, Mlongeni, Mhlaba, Kathrada, Motsaoleli, Mkwazi and Mpetha held a meeting with other anti-apartheid leaders in Soweto to forge a strategy for the next phase of the struggle. Kenya's appeal to our brothers is to unite. When the opposition is divided while the enemy is united and strong, no struggle can be won. We are confident that that meeting is one of many that will unite the anti-apartheid movement and fashion a response to the racist Government to which the international community can relate.

Fourthly, a roundtable conference of all parties to the internal turmoil should be convened, with a view to setting a definitive agenda for negotiations. We suggest that the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity (OAU) maintain observer and advisory status at such conference and negotiations.

In analysing and recommending action against the policies of apartheid, an important dimension must include assistance to and recognition of the special status and situation of the Southern African Development Co-ordinating Conference (SADCC) and especially the BIS States - namely, Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland. Since 1980 1.3 million people have died in SADCC States because of South African destabilization activities. The cost of that destabilization has been more than \$60 billion. Despite the obvious pain that South Africa is causing, the leaders of that region are resolute in their support of the efficacy of sanctions. President Robert Mugabe of Zimbabwe once said,

"We are already suffering. How much more can we suffer? We support sanctions because it will shorten the time we must suffer".

On the part of the international community we must continue providing assistance to the SADCC and other nations concerned. The world must help them in their hour of need.

Also worthy of note, especially by the doomsayers who forecast the massacre of, and loss of rights by, whites in free South Africa, one need only look at Kenya and Zimbabwe for more recent examples. Kenya's colonial experience was bitter and ridden with racial intolerance from the insecure white colonialists towards the colonized Africans. Our independence saw the enactment of laws and "promulgation" of attitudes that were conciliatory and accommodative and re-emphasized that a man can live harmoniously with another man of different pigmentation. We know that the same thing can happen in South Africa. The fear of the whites in South Africa is unfounded. There is enough evidence to prove that they are wrong.

(Mr. Okeyo, Kenya)

In conclusion, I would like to commend the Secretary-General for his commitment to the struggle against apartheid, as reflected in his report on the work of the Organization. We are encouraged by his position

"that a mere dilution or softening of apartheid will not answer the expectations of the majority of the people of South Africa nor of the world as a whole". (A/44/1, p. 7)

My delegation knows that the United Nations is ready to do battle because our Secretary-General is eager to

"combat against the causes of conflict, the struggle against economic inequities, and social evils and the degradation of the environment that must evoke all the courage and determination of battle". (ibid., p. 28)

We take this opportunity to salute our gallant brothers and sisters in South Africa who have paid with their lives in the struggle to liberate South Africa so that future generations in that troubled land may see and enjoy sweet freedom. Those who have taken up the struggle from their fallen colleagues, and those who will join the struggle tomorrow, have our prayers and support. The English poet Lord Byron once wrote, "Know ye not that who would be free, themselves must strike the blow?". The struggle must be won from within.

In times of adversity, strong and good men have always fashioned appropriate and lasting responses. In 1941, during the darkest hours of a terrible war, the Atlantic Charter was signed, enabling the world to see what form peace would take. In 1961 the Commonwealth expelled South Africa from its ranks. South Africa could not be tolerated. The winds of change were indeed blowing in our continent, freeing us from the shackles of colonial bondage. In 1971, with the financial arrangements under Bretton Woods collapsing, the gold standard was abandoned and gold was demonetized. As the 1990s creep upon us, we must help direct the course

(Mr. Okeyo, Kenya)

of history. We are trying to do it with Namibia. We must also do it with South Africa.

The road is tortuous, the task enormous. Apartheid must be crushed and the journey must come to an end sooner or later.

Mr. AHMED (Pakistan): The persistence of the hated system of apartheid continues to mar our vision of a world free from injustice, oppression and intolerance. While we witness the dawn of a new era of hope, symbolized by a perceptible improvement in the global political climate, apartheid stands out as a major impediment in our efforts to create a more just and peaceful world. The black population of South Africa continues to be in the clutches of one of the most pernicious doctrines ever practised by man. The international community cannot rest easy until it succeeds in securing for the majority population of South Africa the rights and freedoms it so anxiously cherishes for itself.

The system of apartheid in South Africa has been sustained over the years by a brutal régime of terror and oppression. The origins of that repression can be traced to the banning of the liberation movements in 1960, which negated the possibility of peaceful struggle and encouraged violence by compelling the liberation movements to go underground.

(Mr. Ahmed, Pakistan)

The second stage was the banning of 17 organizations of the people in 1977. That action was condemned in Security Council resolution 418 (1977). On 23 February 1988 the forces of freedom in South Africa were further decimated with the imposition of a de facto ban on 17 peaceful anti-apartheid organizations.

It is being claimed that the new Government in Pretoria has ushered in an era of hope and reform and that the end of apartheid may well be in sight. The proponents of this claim seek to derive legitimacy for their view in the recent events in South Africa, including the release of Mr. Walter Sisulu and seven other prominent political prisoners from South African gaols, the holding of massive anti-apartheid demonstrations and statements by spokesmen of the régime that the De Klerk leadership is committed to reform.

The real significance of these measures needs to be evaluated in the overall perspective of the situation prevailing in South Africa. This perspective is available in the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid, which states categorically that, while the apartheid régime has made pronouncements about the proposed changes in the political structure of the country, its reform plan fails to fulfil the demands of the black majority for full political rights. The report further states that:

"With an arsenal of repressive legislation already in place, the renewal of the state of emergency for the fourth consecutive year marked Pretoria's intention to continue suppressing the apartheid opposition." (A/44/22, p. 9)

It goes on to underscore the régime's unwillingness to establish the conditions that would create the necessary climate for negotiations.

During the period under review Pretoria undertook additional repressive measures in its attempts to eliminate even peaceful opposition to its rule.

(Mr. Ahmed, Pakistan)

Repression against opponents of apartheid escalated. The objective was to curb the activities of anti-apartheid organizations and individuals and to re-establish the régime's control in black communities. With the renewal of the emergency, police violence increased, as did attacks by death squads against opponents of apartheid. The courts were made an instrument to quash dissent. All this was carried out behind tight press censorship, in an effort to conceal from world scrutiny the massive human-rights violations being practised by the racist régime.

The central pillars of apartheid also remain in place. The 1960 laws banning the African National Congress and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania, the Final Security Act of 1962, the Public Safety Act of 1953, the legislation on trespass and on housing, and work permits continue to institutionalize the odious doctrine of apartheid. In fact, these laws have been strengthened in some respects. The Disclosure of Foreign Funding Act of 1989, the Alteration of Boundaries of Self-Government in Free Settlement Areas Act and the Prevention of Illegal Squatting Amendment Bill expand further the scope of legal provisions to perpetuate the dominance of the white minority over the black majority population of South Africa.

These developments lead to a simple but sobering conclusion: there is, as yet, no indication to justify the claim that South Africa is heading towards becoming a free and multi-racial society. There is not a shred of evidence to lead us to believe that the end of apartheid is in sight. There is no tangible proof to sustain the view that the régime in Pretoria is sincerely committed to ending white-minority rule and relinquishing its stranglehold over the country.

Under these circumstances it would be unwise of the international community to lower its guard. International pressure against South Africa should be fully

(Mr. Ahmed, Pakistan)

maintained. The sanctions already imposed by the United Nations should be respected in totality by all Member States, and steps taken to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa until it complies with the well-known demands of the international community. These demands include the lifting of the state of emergency, the unconditional release of all political prisoners, particularly Nelson Mandela, the lifting of the ban on all political organizations opposing apartheid, the repeal of the Draconian press law, and the cessation of all political trials and executions.

The Government and the people of Pakistan have stood unwaveringly by the oppressed majority people of South Africa in their struggle to regain their fundamental rights and freedoms. We are also proud to have contributed to international efforts to extend practical and material assistance to the victims of apartheid. Pakistan has maintained a stringent and comprehensive boycott of the racist régime for the past 42 years and has scrupulously avoided any links with the Pretoria régime in the diplomatic, political, economic, commercial, cultural, shipping and sports fields.

In a message issued on the Day of Solidarity with South African Political Prisoners - 11 October 1989 - the Prime Minister of Pakistan, Mohtarama Benazir Bhutto, said:

"The Government of Pakistan has consistently condemned the policy of apartheid followed by the racist minority régime in Pretoria. We regard it as a crime against humanity and a serious threat to regional peace. In accordance with the United Nations resolutions, Pakistan has also maintained a total and comprehensive embargo on any form of contact with the racist Pretoria régime. We are confident that the supreme sacrifices of the freedom fighters

(Mr. Ahmed, Pakistan)

of South Africa will ultimately result in the eradication of apartheid and the restoration of the fundamental freedoms and human rights of the people of South Africa."

It has been stated repeatedly in all international forums that apartheid is a vicious system which is not amenable to reform and that the only way to dismantle it is to destroy it. The régime in Pretoria must know that the march of civilization towards universal brotherhood and equality cannot be impeded by that régime's foredoomed efforts to keep alive a despicable creature of a cruel colonial age. There is still time for the régime to retrace its steps from the fatal course on which it is bent.

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

"O mankind! Lo! we have created you male and female, and have made nations and tribes that ye may know one another.

"Lo! the noblest of you, in the sight of Allah, is the best in conduct."

(The Holy Koran, XLIX:13)

The apartheid policies of South Africa and ways of putting an end to that affront to humanity have been under active consideration in several United Nations bodies for the larger part of the second half of the twentieth century. The Islamic Republic of Iran has, since its inception, voiced its strong opposition to South Africa's apartheid policies and has frequently reaffirmed its commitment to the total elimination of the racial-separation policies in South Africa.

As we approach the 1990s the special session on apartheid will provide a good opportunity to usher in a world without apartheid in the new decade. Recognizing the importance of that issue the Islamic Republic of Iran will participate in those deliberations at the highest possible level.

We have expressed our deep concern over the disparity between the international community's overwhelming support for actions against apartheid and the policy of a few countries that continue to maintain technical, economic and nuclear co-operation with South Africa. The end result of that disparity has been the perpetuation of apartheid. It is indeed ironic that even those that have close relations with and extend support to the apartheid régime usually do not hesitate to condemn apartheid. That is further proof that the policies of apartheid and racism are the worst forms of violations and crimes against humanity, and because of the universal recognition of that fact the outlook of all the Members of the Organization regarding apartheid is more or less similar.

(Mr. Kharazi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

Co-operation in nuclear technology between the United States, the Zionist régime and South Africa and the economic activities of the United States and certain Western European countries in South Africa have helped to perpetuate the racial and repressive policies of South Africa. According to the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid (A/44/22 and Corr.2), the Pretoria régime recently conducted a successful test of a modified version of a missile belonging to the Zionist régime that could be used to launch nuclear warheads over a distance of 1000 kilometres. In addition, close co-operation between the Zionist régime and the racist régime has resulted in an increase in Pretoria's capability of placing a low-level satellite in orbit. Such collaboration with and assistance to the racist apartheid régime have contributed to the survival of that régime, in spite of the fact that that system has frequently been condemned by every Member State. Each year, for decades, eloquent speeches have been made in the Assembly in condemnation of the nature and the heinous deeds of apartheid, and many resolutions have been adopted in that regard. Those resolutions could have been implemented more effectively if the ardent supporters of the apartheid régime had respected them.

The same fact applies to the Zionist régime as well - a régime that receives vast economic, financial, military and technological support from the United States and certain other countries. The Zionist régime, also encouraged by such support, has persisted in its continued occupation of Palestine and its suppression of the Palestinian struggle for more than four decades. That atrocity has intensified since the inception of the intifadah. Zionism and racism are the ugly manifestations of the same crime against humanity. All anti-apartheid countries should therefore treat those two régimes - in South Africa and occupied Palestine - identically.

(Mr. Kharazi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

The ninth summit conference of the Non-Aligned Movement, held at Belgrade in September 1989, also noted the similarity of repressive measures, such as the "iron-fist" and "hot-pursuit" policies practised by the two régimes against the peoples of South Africa, Namibia and the front-line States and against the peoples of Palestine, southern Lebanon and the other Arab lands occupied by the Zionist régime.

Since the last session of the General Assembly the international community has witnessed some developments in the process of the independence of Namibia. While we seriously hope that the people of Namibia, who have suffered tremendously, will soon be able to embrace freedom and independence, we warn the international community not to disregard the policies of apartheid in South Africa until that system is totally eradicated. The policies of apartheid cannot and will not be reformed. That is why we have always insisted that support for the just struggle of the South African people and that of the Namibian people, led by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), combined with effective pressure by the international community on the Pretoria régime and its supporters, constitutes the sole means of ridding the world of the roots of that problem, which pounds on the mind and the soul of every human being.

The dangerous situation in South Africa requires that the international community enhance its credibility by imposing comprehensive economic and military sanctions, under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, against the apartheid régime, and design an effective mechanism for their implementation, thereby putting an end to the obstructionist policies of some Western countries. It is our conviction that strict observance of mandatory and comprehensive sanctions against South Africa is an indispensable element for extirpating apartheid from South Africa.

(Mr. Kharazi, Islamic Republic
of Iran)

The Islamic Republic of Iran, in practical expression of its opposition to the shameful, anti-human apartheid régime of South Africa, and in conformity with General Assembly resolutions on an oil embargo against South Africa, has, ever since the victory of the Islamic revolution, banned the supply of oil and petroleum products to South Africa. In this context the Islamic Republic of Iran has co-operated closely with the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa, so as to strengthen the mechanism for enforcing the embargo against South Africa. The result of our co-operation with the Intergovernmental Group is reflected in the report of the Group, contained in document A/44/44, which has been circulated here and was presented yesterday by the Acting Chairman of the Group.

Another effort in this regard was the ratification by the Parliament of the Islamic Republic of Iran of the International Convention against Apartheid in Sports. The instrument of ratification was deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 12 January 1988.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to reiterate that all those engaged in revolutionary struggle, including the Muslim combatants against the policies of apartheid, can be assured of the full support of the Islamic Republic of Iran. The Islamic Republic of Iran places at the disposal of the front-line States and the people of southern Africa its full capacities and the experience drawn from eight years of sacred defence against foreign aggression.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): This year again the General Assembly is called on to discuss the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa. It will do so twice: at its regular session, where we are discussing them now; and at the special session, which is to take place from 12 to 14 December and will be devoted exclusively to this issue.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

At the special session, the Twelve States members of the European Community - on whose behalf I am now speaking - will set out in detail their condemnation of apartheid, and the actions which the Community and its Member States have taken to contribute to the elimination of this discriminatory system. Now, however, I would recall some of the guiding principles of our policy in this respect.

The Twelve have on many occasions expressed their total abhorrence of the immoral and despicable system of apartheid. They have constantly reaffirmed their condemnation of apartheid in all its forms and manifestations, and have spoken out resolutely in favour of its total and immediate abolition.

What is apartheid if not a form of an institutionalised system of State racism which has spawned hatred and violence and deprived the majority of the South African population of its civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights? It is a flagrant violation of the fundamental human rights set out in the United Nations Charter and promulgated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Apartheid currently survives in South Africa only because of the maintenance of the discriminatory measures taken by the Pretoria Government against the great majority of the population.

The position of the Twelve in this connection is well known. I shall briefly recall some of its main points.

The Twelve call upon South Africa to lift the state of emergency and put an end to its policy of repression. They again call for all political prisoners, particularly Nelson Mandela, to be released immediately and unconditionally. The Twelve also call for the lifting of the ban on the anti-apartheid organizations, specifically, the African National Congress and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

The Community and its member States have noted with concern the entry into force, on 18 August 1989, of the Disclosure of Foreign Funding Act. The Twelve are, in fact, committed to a policy of encouraging change in South Africa and making it possible for apartheid to be abolished by peaceful means. This policy has been reflected in the implementation of Community and also bilateral programmes of positive measures to assist the populations which are victims of the system of apartheid.

The Twelve note that the Pretoria authorities have not yet taken the necessary steps to promote a real national dialogue. The reforms implemented so far by the South African Government do not in fact go far enough. Only negotiations in which the genuine representatives of all the segments of the South African population participate can achieve peace and prosperity in a free, democratic and united South Africa without racial discrimination.

At the same time, the Twelve have closely followed the recent initiatives of the new South African Government, and note with interest its intention to undertake reforms. They have thus taken note with satisfaction of the release of eight political prisoners, including Walter Sisulu. Their release makes the fact that other political detainees, Nelson Mandela in particular, are being kept in prison even more of an anachronism.

At a time when significant changes in South Africa are becoming apparent, the Twelve consider that it is more necessary than ever before to keep up the pressure on the South African Government to commit itself firmly to dialogue with the representatives of the black majority. To achieve this objective, we have adopted an active policy. During the special session on apartheid I shall revert in greater detail to the efforts the Community and its member States have made in this connection. Here I should like to express the interest felt by the Twelve in the

(Mr. Blanc, France)

special session, which they expect will make a positive contribution to seeking, in a spirit of consensus, solutions designed to put an end to apartheid.

Our objective, one shared by the entire community of nations, is to achieve the elimination of this intolerable system and to help ensure that freedom and justice are granted to all South Africans.

Mr. OCAMPO (Philippines): In the annals of mankind apartheid has emerged as the most abhorrent institutionalized system, standing as an obstacle to man's unending struggle for dignity and freedom.

The President of the Philippines, Her Excellency Mrs. Corazon C. Aquino, in her address to the Assembly three years ago, referred to the issue of apartheid in South Africa as the great moral issue confronting the Organization.

The United Nations stands for people - for peace, freedom, dignity and the brotherhood of mankind. On the other hand, apartheid is the antithesis of what the United Nations stands for. The preparation of the political and social environment which would facilitate the abolition of this inhuman system may well serve as the litmus test for the will and competence of this international body to achieve the main objective of its existence.

The winds of change are blowing everywhere. In the statements made during the general debate at the start of the session speakers did not fail to mention that the international political situation and relations are entering a period characterized by relaxation of tension and emphasis on dialogue, conciliation and co-operation. We see the dawning of possible solutions of seemingly irreconcilable differences and conflicts which have brought suffering to millions of people in different regions.

In South Africa the positive turn of events, especially in Namibia, has led to understandable expectations of positive developments within South Africa. Peaceful demonstrations and rallies have been allowed, political prisoners have been released, and the city of Johannesburg has opened its recreation areas to all and abandoned segregation on local buses. The Philippines has taken note of these recent happenings and considers them steps in the right direction.

(Mr. Ocampo Philippines)

But the Philippines and many other countries have also taken cognizance of the more important fact that apartheid and all its major manifestations remain basically intact. There is still no authentic exercise of political rights by the black majority. They were excluded from the elections to the racially segregated tricameral Parliament. Their place is still in the bantustans, the concentration camps shamelessly declared by the racist régime to be independent States. The state of emergency is still in force, and trials and executions of political opponents continue. The African National Congress, the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania and other anti-apartheid organizations are still banned. Black South African children continue to receive inferior education.

The new leadership in Pretoria has promised reforms - new grand designs for the people of South Africa. However, we are yet to hear a sincere declaration that apartheid and all its evil manifestations will soon be abolished. There are no actions to indicate that the oppressed people of South Africa will soon be given the chance to enjoy freedom, equality and the right to determine their own destiny.

In his inaugural address, on 20 September 1989, Mr. F.W. De Klerk, newly elected President of South Africa, while calling for support and understanding, stated:

"for years, progress was hampered by, among other things, lack of co-operation, suspicion and mistrust."

To this we say that the lack of co-operation, the suspicion and the mistrust - on the part not only of black South Africans but also of members of the international community - were brought about by the perpetrators of apartheid themselves.

(Mr. Ocampo Philippines)

I need not dwell on the many aberrations of apartheid to prove our point. We have heard more than enough during the more than four decades of discussions on this issue in the Assembly.

South Africa has perfected the dubious art of making big promises, especially when it is under pressure, as it is today. Have we forgotten that the much publicized - by South African authorities, of course - termination of the pass laws turned out not to apply to residents of the bantustans, or that the state of emergency was lifted when South Africa was negotiating with international banks in 1986, only to be reimposed a few months later?

If we are to believe that the winds of change have finally reached South Africa as its drum-beaters and supporters are loudly announcing, the leaders of that country should give as evidence of concrete actions and deeds - not words, not promises. Cosmetic reforms are not acceptable, for the simple reason that apartheid cannot be reformed. Nothing less than its complete obliteration is necessary.

(Mr. Ocampo, Philippines)

As long as Pretoria clings to apartheid and is unwilling to create a climate conducive to genuine negotiations with the authentic leaders of the oppressed black people, the international community must not relax existing sanctions.

The Philippines, as a member of the Special Committee against Apartheid, urges all other States to support the Committee's recommendations, outlined in its report, in particular the imposition by the Security Council of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions.

The argument has been advanced that comprehensive sanctions would hurt the victims of apartheid more than its practitioners. That is the voice of false humanitarianism, which places comfort and convenience above human dignity and human rights. The victims of apartheid have themselves accepted long ago that sanctions are bitter pills they have to take to put an end to the unceasing pain that the system of apartheid brings them.

The sanctions report prepared for the Commonwealth Committee of Foreign Ministers on Southern Africa said that had sanctions been imposed in 1960 after the Sharpeville massacre apartheid would have been overthrown by now. If sanctions had been imposed in 1976 after the Soweto massacre, destabilization would have been over.

In this regard the Philippines notes with serious concern the report of the increasing trade of some countries with South Africa which undermines the effectiveness of the sanctions imposed against the Pretoria régime. Definitely that practice slows down the international effort to bring South Africa to the negotiating table. There is an urgent need for all of us to muster the strong political will to match our words with action.*

* The President took the Chair.

(Mr. Ocampo, Philippines)

As an original member of the Special Committee against Apartheid the Philippines has stood firmly with the international community in its strong opposition to apartheid. It maintains no relations with Pretoria, supports all initiatives against South Africa's policy and imposes sanctions against that country.

Today I reaffirm the unwavering support of the Government and people of the Philippines for the struggle of the South African people - the blacks, the Coloureds, the enlightened whites - for peace, justice and equality in their homeland.

Let me end by quoting Archbishop Desmond Tutu, whose words thus capture the essence of our common humanity:

"Africans believe in something that is difficult to render in English. We call it obuntu, botho. It means the essence of being human. You know when it is there and when it is absent. It speaks about humaneness, gentleness, hospitality, putting yourself out on behalf of others, being vulnerable. It embraces compassion and toughness. It recognizes that their humanity is bound up in yours, for we can only be human together."

Mr. NYAKYI (United Republic of Tanzania): The ongoing Namibian independence process and the euphoria which has accompanied the ascendancy to the presidency of South Africa by Mr. F. W. De Klerk make the debate on the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa at this time particularly timely. The régime and some of its friends in the West have been at pains to persuade the international community to believe that those two developments represent a fundamental change of policy on the part of the régime. They want the world to believe that the advent of Namibian independence is an indication of South Africa's willingness to terminate the era of colonialism in that Territory. Similarly, the

(Mr. Nyakyi, United Republic
of Tanzania)

change of guard at Pretoria from P.W. Botha to F.W. De Klerk is being represented as a new era which heralds the beginning of the end of apartheid.

They argue that the régime should therefore be rewarded by the easing of sanctions and other pressures, or at least by refraining from strengthening sanctions or imposing new ones.

Pretoria's friends ignore the régime's persistent violations of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and the settlement plan, not to mention the 10 years of prevarication and stonewalling. They also pay little attention to the pressures exerted by the international community, particularly the United Nations, to compel South Africa to grant independence to Namibia. They ignore Cuito Cuanavale.

True, F.W. De Klerk has - as did his predecessors whenever they felt under pressure - made some noises about the need for change, but he has so far said nothing which could be presented as an indication of a genuine desire to initiate fundamental change. He has said nothing about abolishing the Population Registration Act, the Land Act, the Group Areas Act, the Bantu Education Act, the Tricameral Parliament and the bantustans, all of which constitute the pillars of the system of apartheid. Indeed, many people interpret what he has said so far about group rights and power sharing to mean a desire to renovate and modernize apartheid. None of this surprises those who remember him as Pretoria's man responsible for Bantu education. They see his new image as being inconsistent with the reputation of the man who so ruthlessly put down the students' boycott of apartheid education at the time of the Soweto uprisings in 1976 and maintained their oppression until last year.

(Mr. Nyakyi, United Republic
of Tanzania)

Apartheid's friends also ignore the régime's internal crisis brought about by internal pressures. Over the past year we have witnessed concerted opposition and organized defiance of the apartheid system by the majority of the people of South Africa. Through their national liberation movements, trade union federations, anti-apartheid mass organizations and the churches, the people of South Africa, in different forms and actions, have registered their abhorrence of the apartheid system. Mass demonstrations have been organized in various South African cities. Workers have gone on strike, detainees have gone without food for several days, and even children have kept away from schools. The overwhelming majority of South Africans boycotted the municipal elections organized by the Pretoria régime because they were racist in nature.

Tanzania wishes to pay a tribute to the people of South Africa who are engaged in the heroic resistance of all unjust laws under apartheid. It is this internal resistance by the oppressed people of South Africa and the various pressures exerted by the international community that have compelled the South African régime to show some tolerance in recent months. That some demonstrations by black South Africans have been tolerated without their leaders and participants being whipped or gassed by the racist police and that Walter Sisulu and seven of his colleagues have been released unconditionally is not due to the humanity and magnanimity of the régime.

In any case, these are mere cosmetic embellishments. They do not constitute the fundamental change demanded by the majority of the South African people and the entire international community, namely, the eradication of the apartheid system and movement towards a democratic, non-racial, united South Africa. Walter Sisulu and his colleagues have been unjustly incarcerated in racist goals for their opposition to apartheid. The fanfare that has accompanied their release 26 years later ignores the fact that apartheid is not only still in existence but has grown to

(Mr. Nyakyi, United Republic
of Tanzania)

be even more oppressive. Whether in gaol or out of it, these heroic sons of South Africa remain prisoners of apartheid. And even the so-called releases are done at the pleasure of the South African leadership. It is outrageous that Nelson Mandela, that celebrated prisoner and universally acknowledged leader of the South African people, should have his freedom held hostage of the "security" of the apartheid system. We reiterate our call for the immediate and unconditional release of Nelson Mandela and all other political prisoners from racist gaols.

The Pretoria régime must take serious and deliberate steps to bring about a negotiated settlement in South Africa. The Organization of African Unity (OAU) in its Harare Declaration adopted by its Ad Hoc Committee in August 1989, which was endorsed by the Ninth Summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement in Belgrade in September, has set forth the prerequisites for such negotiations. The objective should be for the Pretoria régime to initiate a genuine dialogue with the authentic leaders of the people of South Africa. To prepare for such negotiations, the Pretoria régime must take steps to create the atmosphere conducive to negotiations. These must of necessity include the lifting of the state of emergency; the unconditional release of Nelson Mandela and all other political prisoners and detainees; the unbanning of the African National Congress (ANC), the Pan-Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) and all other political parties and mass anti-apartheid organizations; the ending of all "judicial murders"; and permitting the unconditional return, without impediments, of all political exiles and refugees. Tanzania wishes to emphasize that these measures are within the power of the Pretoria régime to undertake, and movement towards their fulfilment will be an indicator of the régime's genuine desire for change.

Pretoria's allies claim that since the régime was compelled to end its invasion and occupation of Angola last year the region has been spared its direct

(Mr. Nyakvi, United Republic
of Tanzania)

acts of aggression against, and destabilization of, the front-line and other neighbouring States. There is no evidence, however, that it has given up its hegemonic ambitions over the region. It is still waging proxy wars in Mozambique and Angola through its support of the bandit organizations of MNR and UNITA. And as the Commonwealth Observer Group on Namibia ominously warned, there are signs of similar designs for Namibia, as it emerges into independence. Thus Pretoria has not abandoned its so-called policy of total strategy through which it seeks to weaken and ultimately destroy the economic, political, military, cultural and social fabric of the neighbouring countries so that they continue to remain dependent on South Africa.

Tanzania salutes both Angola and Mozambique in their struggle to preserve their independence and maintain their sovereignty and territorial integrity. We support their efforts towards peace and reconciliation. We urge the international community to support, in all forms, the front-line and other neighbouring States in their efforts to consolidate their economies and achieve self-reliance so as to lessen their dependence on South Africa. We believe that the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC) provides the appropriate vehicle for the attainment of these objectives.

It is now self-evident to all but the allies of apartheid that sanctions have had an impact on South Africa, and especially on its economy. The economy has shown its vulnerability to sanctions, which is what all the pressure on the régime for fundamental political change and its own reactions are all about. The Secretary-General, in his report contained in document A/44/555 of 11 October 1989, makes very pertinent observations in this regard, as revealed in the following excerpt:

(Mr. Nyakvi, United Republic
of Tanzania)

"The South African economy is highly dependent on the outside world. The country's foreign trade has represented, on average, over 50 per cent of South Africa's gross domestic product (GDP) in the 1980s, while inflows of foreign capital, in the form of investment or loans, have been essential to the country's economic growth. The potential of externally applied pressures on the South African economy is therefore great. A number of restrictive measures against South Africa affecting both the country's foreign trade and the inflow of foreign capital have been adopted and have had discernible impact on the economy." (A/44/555 para. 3)

The Secretary-General goes on to state that owing to scarcity of foreign capital and "internal disinvestment" the economic situation in South Africa has been further aggravated by the régime's allocating an increasing amount of the country's financial resources to defence and law and order matters. Sanctions were also biting in other fields, according to the report. It also quotes the régime's President as acknowledging, in 1986, that the oil embargo had obliged the Government to spend R22 billion more on oil imports in the period 1974-1984 than would otherwise have been necessary. The same report reveals that the Shipping Research Bureau estimates the annual cost to South Africa of the oil embargo at around \$2 billion.

(Mr. Nyakyi, United Republic
of Tanzania)

Sanctions work. All the cosmetic changes which the Pretoria régime has initiated have been forced on it by the sanctions imposed and observed by many nations represented in the Assembly. In their different forms these sanctions have had the same objective, namely, to exert pressure on Pretoria to abolish apartheid and work towards democracy. They were never intended to be punitive. Many nations have made great sacrifices in imposing sanctions, and Tanzania wishes to pay a tribute to all of them for these sacrifices and for their expression of solidarity with the oppressed people of South Africa.

We are distressed, however, that a few countries continue to support the South African economy in defiance of the international calls for sanctions. As the Secretary-General points out:

"The three leading countries in volume of investments in South Africa are the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. For capital goods and technology, these three countries and Japan are the four major suppliers to South Africa, accounting for over 70 per cent of all South Africa's intermediate and capital goods imports and close to 80 per cent of the various technology transfer agreements in 1984." (A/44/555, para. 20)

The report further points out that the Federal Republic of Germany, France and the United Kingdom together account for over 90 per cent of officially insured credits, which amounted to over \$8 billion in 1987. That is the sum which was involved in the rescheduling announced a few weeks ago, which has been condemned by many Governments, including Commonwealth Governments at their recent summit meeting in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

(Mr. Nyakyi, United Republic
of Tanzania)

The most important sanction so far imposed by the United Nations against the Pretoria régime remains the arms embargo. Although that is mandatory, we are concerned that arms and military technology continue to reach South Africa and the Committee established under Security Council resolution 421 (1977) has not been enabled to close the loopholes. The greatest offender remains Israel, which, to compound the violation, has continued to collaborate with Pretoria in the nuclear field. Chile has also become a major partner with South Africa in the arms trade.

Tanzania continues to believe that for the attainment of a non-violent solution in South Africa, the international community should impose on that country comprehensive and mandatory sanctions. Pending such action, the existing sanctions against South Africa should be widened, tightened and intensified.

We wish to express our appreciation to the Special Committee against Apartheid for its comprehensive report contained in document A/44/22 of 25 October 1989. We pay a special tribute to its Chairman, Major-General Joseph Garba, for his indefatigable efforts in steering the work of the Committee.

As we approach the last decade of this century - a decade dedicated by the General Assembly to the eradication of colonialism - let us also resolve that this crime against humanity, this modern form of slavery, must be eradicated immediately. The international community abolished institutionalized slavery 150 years ago. Fifty years ago it fought and defeated nazism. Apartheid, the modern form of nazism, must be fought with the same vigour and determination. That is the objective of the draft resolutions before the Assembly under this agenda item. My delegation will therefore vote in favour of all of them.

Mr. MORTENSEN (Denmark): I have the honour to speak in the general debate on agenda item 28, concerning South Africa's policies of apartheid, on behalf of the five Nordic countries: Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Denmark.

The Nordic countries have repeatedly, here at the United Nations and elsewhere, individually as well as collectively, expressed their strong condemnation of South Africa's abhorrent policies of apartheid. Apartheid must be eradicated. All the efforts of the international community should be directed towards that goal.

It is in furtherance of that goal that the Nordic countries together with other Member States, again this year have submitted a draft resolution on concerted international action for the elimination of apartheid. We count on the Assembly's continued and widespread support for this draft resolution as a means of sending a clear and unequivocal message to South Africa that apartheid is intolerable to the international community.

The many repulsive aspects of apartheid are well known to the Assembly: the institutionalized discrimination against the majority population, the imposition of minority rule, the stifling of freedom of political expression by the majority and the denial of their basic political rights. The apartheid system based on racial segregation, discrimination, exploitation and repression imposes enormous suffering on the majority of the South African population in order to ensure political and economic domination by a minority. This concept of separate development on a racial basis violates the fundamental purposes of the Charter of the Organization. It is a concept contrary to the principles of equality and justice to which the Nordic countries firmly adhere and an affront to every human being irrespective of race and colour.

(Mr. Mortensen, Denmark)

Despite recent positive developments, the situation in South Africa remains grim and serious. The extension of the nation-wide state of emergency for a third consecutive year has further diminished the chances for peaceful change by stifling the voices of opposition and by the detention and imprisonment without trial of thousands of people, including women and children. The African National Congress and the Pan-Africanist Congress of Azania, as well as other political organizations, remain proscribed. Nelson Mandela and many other political prisoners are still incarcerated. The execution of political prisoners has continued unabated. The censorship of the press and news media remains in force in violation of basic democratic principles. The reforms introduced have been too little and too late. There has up to now been no definite indication that the South African Government is really prepared to dismantle the very corner-stones of the apartheid system.

The South African Government's continued oppression has taken a heavy toll in human lives and suffering. In addition, the policies of apartheid continue to be the root cause of the violence, suffering, destabilization and economic dislocation in the southern African region. In short, apartheid is a threat to international peace and security.

The resistance to repression, culminating in the recent campaign of defiance, has, however, made it clear that the authorities are facing a formidable challenge and that the state of emergency has not succeeded in stifling extraparliamentary opposition, political dissent and protest.

(Mr. Mortensen, Denmark)

The Nordic countries welcome the recent release of eight political prisoners, including Walter Sisulu. We have also noted the relaxation of restrictions on political activities of the black majority. We hope such steps will be followed by further action conducive to a decrease in the level of tension and to peaceful change in South Africa.

We note, however, that none of these developments is irreversible and that the South African Government on many previous occasions has defaulted on its promises of change.

The Nordic countries reiterate their firm conviction that apartheid cannot be reformed but must be totally abolished by peaceful means. This can be achieved only if repression and violence are replaced by constructive dialogue across lines of colour, politics and religion. We urge the South African Government to initiate negotiations immediately and without pre-conditions with the genuine representatives of the majority of the South African population with a view to establishing a free, democratic, non-racial and united South Africa.

Dialogue and national reconciliation, however, are impossible as long as the state of emergency remains in force, black leaders are imprisoned or detained, and anti-apartheid organizations are banned. We therefore once again call on the South African Government to lift the state of emergency, to free Nelson Mandela and all other political prisoners, and to unban the ANC, the PAC and other political organizations.

The Nordic countries believe that the best way to move the South African Government in that direction and bring about peaceful change is through joint and unanimous measures taken by the international community. There is no doubt - despite occasional claims to the contrary - that existing economic sanctions have had a serious impact on the South African economy and contributed to the isolation of the white minority régime and thus to the change of attitudes in South Africa.

(Mr. Mortensen, Denmark)

It is the firm belief of the Nordic countries that such pressure must be maintained, not as a punitive measure, but as a means of abolishing apartheid by bringing the Government to the negotiating table.

There is still a need for the imposition of effective international sanctions against South Africa.

Pending the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions by the Security Council, the Nordic countries have adopted their own Programme of Action against Apartheid, most recently revised and strengthened in 1988. This Programme includes a general trade boycott and other restrictions on economic and cultural links between the Nordic countries and South Africa.

Consistent with the Programme of Action, the Nordic countries have significantly widened their co-operation with the members of the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC) in order to help the countries of the region to increase their economic strength and reduce their dependence on South Africa. The Nordic countries likewise contribute substantially to alleviating the plight of the victims of apartheid and supporting opponents of that policy.

The Nordic countries look forward to addressing themselves in greater depth and detail to the question of apartheid during the special session on apartheid next month. We attach great importance to that special session. It will be an opportunity for the international community to express itself unanimously on the effective elimination of apartheid.

The Nordic countries are convinced that the policy of apartheid is doomed to failure. The longer the Government of South Africa denies the majority of its citizens the right to participate in the governing of their own country, the more difficult it will be for changes to be achieved by peaceful means. The

(Mr. Mortensen, Denmark)

international community should continue to spare no effort to exert pressure on South Africa to put an end to the intolerable system of apartheid and to establish without further delay a society with freedom and justice for all.

Mr. MOUMIN (Comoros): Why is apartheid so abominable and offensive to mankind? Why is it so hated and condemned by the entire international community? The answer to those two questions is simple. Apartheid is the most systematic form of racial discrimination, practised by the régime in Pretoria as an official policy of legalized and institutionalized racial segregation. It is the very antithesis of all of the values of civilized humanity; it is demeaning and abhorrent. It is a system used by the minority white régime in South Africa to dominate and humiliate the black majority. It is a system that feeds on hatred, violence and brutality.

It is regrettable that after 40 years and after thousands of speeches delivered from this rostrum denouncing and condemning this inhuman system and calling for concerted international action to put an end to it, this abhorrent animal continues to survive. Consequently it is imperative that the delegation of the Federal Islamic Republic of the Comoros make its voice heard once again, to express our solidarity with those who are victims of and suffering from the evils of apartheid, and who are struggling to have it abolished.

As we are about to enter a new century, the international community cannot stand by and allow this doctrine to survive and follow us into the next century.

Despite universal condemnation, including the condemnation expressed from this rostrum year in, year out for the last four decades, the South African Government has so far refused to take meaningful or definite steps towards ending apartheid. In recent years, however, in the face of mounting internal resistance and international pressure, the South African régime has been forced to institute with greater urgency some cosmetic changes to make apartheid acceptable. Of course, those who have since birth profited from the system view those changes as

(Mr. Mounin, Comoros)

major and meaningful concessions. The changes include the abolition of the notorious pass laws and the revision of segregationist legislation concerning public places. But they are not deep or fundamental, and that is why the oppressed victims of apartheid see those reforms for what they are: mere cosmetic and tactical changes to entrench apartheid and defuse the growing political crisis in the country.

(Mr. Moumin, Comoros)

The year 1989 has brought a number of political developments in Pretoria: Frederik Willem De Klerk has replaced P.W. Botha as the President of South Africa. The régime was compelled by internal events and international pressure to release hundreds of political detainees. Some important political detainees have also been released, among them a prominent leader of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), Mr. Walter Sisulu. But South Africa still defies international pressure to release Mr. Nelson Mandela, who is still languishing in prison.

Mr. De Klerk has promised to bring in needed changes in South Africa. However, so far he seems to us to reflect more a concern with the viability of the apartheid system rather than with an essential break with the ideological-political conception of apartheid. Mr. De Klerk has reiterated, to the disappointment of many, his Party's conviction that "group right" will be protected under any political dispensation offered the black majority, which clearly means he has no intention whatsoever of eradicating apartheid.

We would advise Mr. De Klerk that, rather than continuing with the futile policies of aggression and the so-called reforms, his Government should avail itself of the new climate of change and détente in international relations that has improved international co-operation and enhanced the search for a peaceful settlement to regional conflicts and work seriously towards the full integration of blacks in the country's social and political structures.

Although racism is a common phenomenon of mankind and is practised in many parts of the globe, it is only in South Africa that race has been the basis of political rights. Apartheid betrays the most fundamental concepts of human liberty and equality; hence the system cannot be reformed, it must be abolished.

The year 1989 should, once again, be the year of zero tolerance of the system of apartheid. The time has come for the international community to exert maximum

(Mr. Moumin, Comoros)

pressure on South Africa to force it to eradicate apartheid. We can no longer tolerate the Pretoria régime's trampling upon the dignity of our brothers in South Africa.

Ms. MAIR (Jamaica): There is no item on the international political agenda with which the Government and the people of Jamaica identify more passionately than this item now before the General Assembly, namely, the policies of apartheid in South Africa. I welcome this opportunity to reaffirm our deep and continuing commitment to all efforts, national and international, which are designed to eradicate this immoral and illegal racist system.

At this time we share the sense of achievement of so many States Members of the United Nations which see some of the results of that commitment of the international community over a period of many years at last, it would appear, beginning to bear fruit. For now we see the promise of a new day of freedom and independence beginning to dawn in that region. One of the brightest images the world now sees is the movement of hundreds and thousands of Namibians to the voting booths.

But the promise of freedom and independence for Namibia will remain unfulfilled so long as that dark shadow of apartheid still hangs over the region. Until the establishment of a free, non-racial and democratic society in South Africa based on majority rule becomes a reality, both the issue of Namibia's future as a politically and economically independent State and the prospects for peace, security and development in that region remain endangered.

For the fact is that despite recent developments, the internal situation in South Africa remains profoundly treacherous. The pronouncements of the new South African President, Mr. De Klerk, have attracted much attention and interest in the international media. Some see these developments as evidence of a certain

(Ms. Mair, Jamaica)

willingness to work towards the creation of a new political atmosphere as a preliminary to peaceful change. Concern has been expressed within South Africa for it to become an acceptable member of world society and to lift itself out of the doldrums of growing international isolation, economic decline, and increasing polarization. The action taken by the Government recently in unconditionally releasing eight political prisoners, including that great anti-apartheid fighter, Walter Sisulu, and permitting a degree of peaceful political activity by the black majority has inevitably produced speculation in some quarters about the new Pretoria leadership's commitment to peaceful change.

But the hard facts of the situation should dispel any such naive assumptions that real change is in progress. For example, at the recent meeting in Kuala Lumpur of Commonwealth Heads of Government, the reality of some changes was acknowledged, but at the same time it was noted that the state of emergency still remained in force; the African National Congress (ANC), Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) and many other political organizations remained banned; and Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners remained incarcerated, while many others continued to be detained and executions for so-called political offences had not stopped. Moreover, there has been no action to indicate that the new South African Government is prepared to dismantle the pillars of apartheid, in particular the Group Areas Act, the Population Registration Act, the Bantustan "Homelands" policy, and the system of separate education.

Jamaica is therefore profoundly disturbed to observe that Pretoria has chosen to ignore the calls of the non-aligned and the Commonwealth summits and has instead enunciated further policies aimed at propping up the discredited apartheid system, notably President De Klerk's proposal for constitutionally guaranteed "group rights" defined by race, including the right of whites to veto legislation that

(Ms. Mair, Jamaica)

they may consider threatening, as well as the preservation of whites-only neighbourhoods and segregated schools. Equally alarming is the recent threat to freedom of the press, the threat to silence the New Nation, a leading organ of black majority opinion.

The advocacy of such policies makes a mockery of the highly trumpeted so-called reform plans of the South African leadership and should serve to shatter any illusions that may exist about the new régime's presumed commitment to meaningful change.

(Ms. Mair, Jamaica)

Jamaica therefore endorses the view that there should be an immediate intensification of international pressure against South Africa, including the tightening of economic, investment and financial sanctions.

This is not the time to consider any relaxation of existing sanctions and pressures. Such action would have to await evidence of clear and irreversible change. Quite frankly, we have to acknowledge that such evidence has not yet emerged.

In the absence of such evidence we would therefore wish to commend to the Assembly measures that are potentially the most effective of non-violent means capable of forcing South Africa to come to the negotiating table and agree to undertake fundamental political change. Such measures include: the exercise of financial pressure on the Pretoria régime by seeking to intensify and extend financial sanctions, such as calling on all banks and financial institutions to impose tougher conditions on day-to-day trade financing, specifically through reducing the maximum credit terms to 90 days; calling on relevant Governments to make trade credits harder to get by taking South Africa "off cover" with official government agencies; and support for the initiative developed by the Commonwealth Committee of Foreign Ministers on Southern Africa to strengthen the arms embargo, and continue to pursue it at the United Nations in the Committee established under Security Council resolution 421 (1977).

These additional measures have been proposed by the Commonwealth leaders in clear recognition of the importance of South Africa's dealings with the international financial community, the growing vulnerability of South Africa's economy, and an acknowledgement of the impact of sanctions in influencing present policies of the South African régime. It is, I think, generally agreed that such encouraging signs as one may perceive are a product of internal and external pressures on the racist régime.

(Ms. Mair, Jamaica)

It is also now being admitted that of all the pressures exerted on South Africa from abroad, perhaps the most damaging to Pretoria has been the action of Western bankers that in 1985 halted all new loans and demanded repayment of some \$14 billion in short-term debt. While South Africa has reportedly been paying back those loans, the export of so much of its capital has had a crippling effect on the country's economic growth. If evidence is needed, this represents clear testimony of the efficacy of international sanctions clearly targeted and selectively applied.

Our Government therefore is deeply disturbed to note that despite the urgings of the international community the international banking institutions have taken the precipitous step of deciding to ease the financial pressure on South Africa by negotiating a deal with the South African Reserve Bank which will allow Pretoria to repay \$1.5 billion through December 1993 and turn \$6.5 billion into long-term credits. Hence, it is the strong hope of my delegation that the forthcoming special session of the General Assembly on apartheid and its destructive consequences in southern Africa will lead to more forceful, concerted and urgent action by the international community with a view to closing the existing loopholes, and also to applying more vigorous pressure on South Africa to abandon its discredited policies.

My Government has never advocated sanctions lightly or indiscriminately, but in the case of South Africa we believe that this is the only way to apply effective international pressure to force Pretoria abolish apartheid and negotiate peaceful change in that country.

We also continue to be concerned that the persistence of apartheid in South Africa and continuation of support from many quarters for the Pretoria régime have only served to lend credence and justification to the perpetuation of attitudes of racial superiority and racial discrimination in other parts of the world. It is

(Ms. Mair, Jamaica)

therefore incumbent on the entire international community to take the necessary steps to bring an immediate end to this obnoxious system and its pernicious policies.

I should like to conclude by echoing remarks made in this debate by the distinguished African leader His Excellency the Reverend Canaan Banana, former President of Zimbabwe and co-Chairman of the Panel of Eminent Persons that conducted public hearings on the activities of transnational corporations in South Africa and Namibia. He said:

"We cannot say when apartheid will end: that is in the hands of the South African people. What we can say is that the community of nations represented here has the collective responsibility to ensure that the struggling people of South Africa receive all the support we are capable of giving. And this refers not only to the abolition of apartheid but to the challenges that lie beyond the end of that criminal system." (A/44/PV.47, p. 21)

The Jamaican delegation fully endorses those sentiments.

Ms. WILLBERG (New Zealand): We focus our attention on southern Africa at a time of major progress in efforts to rid that region of the pernicious system of apartheid. Elections now taking place should ensure the end of apartheid in Namibia. That will be a big step forward, but still only the first step on the way to the total eradication of apartheid.

New Zealand has watched carefully the political developments in South Africa this year - the change of President, the release of some leading opponents of apartheid, the efforts made by President De Klerk to engage in dialogue with leaders of neighbouring countries, and the token reforms. The release of some prisoners of course is welcome. But we want to see fundamental change. The apartheid system cannot be reformed. It is not reformable. It must be destroyed now, once and for all.

(Ms. Willberg, New Zealand)

This year's report by the Special Committee against Apartheid makes sobering reading. The evidence shows that the abuses continue. The South African Government has been trumpeting reform. But the state of emergency has been extended for the fourth consecutive year. The system of separate education, the Group Areas and Population Registration Acts remain intact and the so-called bantustan homelands continue to exist. Many South Africans remain political prisoners in gaol.

Recently we saw with horror the hand of vigilante groups and death squads at work in the assassination of anti-apartheid activist Mr. David Webster. He had, in his own writings, called attention to the escalating activities of the death squads.

The Commonwealth Secretary-General, Shridath Ramphal, notes in his introduction to the Commonwealth sanctions report on South Africa that Pretoria "has been trying to present to the world the face of reasonableness and reform" while "hiding the realities of apartheid behind an iron curtain of censorship". That censorship, which pervades the judicial system and the media, hides from world view the greater part of the apartheid iceberg, including countless human rights violations, bannings and the forced removal of population.

(Ms. Willberg, New Zealand)

The South African régime still gives the appearance of having no fundamental misgivings about the system of apartheid itself. Rather, as the Special Committee's report notes, it appears concerned with the system's continued viability in its essential form. New Zealand continues to believe that the complete destruction of apartheid is a major moral imperative of our times. Some things in the world are right and some things wrong. Apartheid is clearly utterly wrong.

A few positive things have happened but the pillars of apartheid still stand.

The effect of apartheid within South Africa is disastrous enough; but it also impacts strongly on the neighbouring States. The costs are huge and the human suffering enormous. New Zealand has continued to lend support to the Southern Africa Development Co-ordination Conference and other organizations and funds designed to alleviate the effects of regional conflict.

Around the world, and not least here, some satisfaction can be derived from the improved climate of international co-operation and the active search for a resolution to disputes. In southern Africa the benefits can be seen in the Namibia and Angola settlements. But like others more closely involved, New Zealand is very much aware of the fragile nature of the political settlements, and the fact that economic recovery still has a long way to travel.

Outside South Africa, there has been some positive progress in containing the destabilizing effects of apartheid South Africa's policies. But there is nothing in the so-called reforms within South Africa about which the international community can or should be complacent. Commonwealth Heads of Government in Kuala Lumpur last month were aware of this. This is not the time to consider any relaxation of existing sanctions and pressures on Pretoria.

Sanctions, as South African leaders have themselves acknowledged, have had important repercussions for the economy of the country. My Government considers

(Ms. Willberg, New Zealand)

considers that they are diminished in their effectiveness because of the loopholes that exist and by a less than complete application by the international community. Earlier this year, the Commonwealth Committee of Foreign Ministers on Southern Africa recommended a strengthening of the arms embargo. New Zealand was among those that endorsed this policy at the recent Kuala Lumpur meeting. New Zealand fully supports the decision of Commonwealth Heads of Government at Kuala Lumpur to tighten financial measures on South Africa, particularly in the area of trade financing. We also support the new draft resolution before the Assembly this year that gives effect to that decision.

New Zealand is happy to be a member of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa. We were pleased to see that, as a result of the hearings on the oil embargo held at the United Nations in April, the Intergovernmental Group has been able to identify certain areas to pursue that might facilitate a stricter application of the embargo. Like other sanctions, the oil embargo can be made more effective through efforts to identify and close the loopholes. But ultimately the success of all sanctions depends on the wholehearted support of the international community.

Consistent with the conviction that sanctions are required in order to bring pressure on Pretoria for fundamental political change, New Zealand has given effect to all measures recommended by the Security Council and those adopted by the Commonwealth. We do not rule out the possibility of New Zealand's taking further action should circumstances warrant it. We will be watching closely developments in South Africa in the next few months. We want to see the state of emergency lifted, remaining political prisoners released unconditionally, the African National Congress and other political organizations legally recognized and genuine

(Ms. Willberg, New Zealand)

political negotiations between the South African authorities and authentic black leaders begin. These demands are consistent with the decisions reached by the Organization of African Unity's resolutions on South Africa, endorsed at the ninth summit meeting of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at Belgrade in September. They are consistent also with Commonwealth demands, including those set out in the Eminent Persons Group's "possible negotiating concept".

The struggle against apartheid intensifies. The United Nations and other organizations have worked consistently to persuade the South African authorities to change their policies, and will continue to do so. To that end, New Zealand welcomes and supports the call of the Organization of African Unity for a negotiated, peaceful solution.

Shridath Ramphal, whom I quoted earlier, has said that "people pressure, human solidarity is the ultimate sanction against apartheid". It is that human solidarity with the victims and opponents of apartheid which will one day ensure a free and non-racial democratic society in South Africa. This debate is a tribute to that solidarity, the expression of the vast majority that apartheid must be eradicated - and will be. Let it be soon.

Mr. TANASIE (Romania): People all over the world express their great satisfaction with the process of decolonization entering its final stage in Namibia. We are waiting for Namibia to join the free nations Members of the United Nations. The independence of Namibia is not only an historical turning-point in the destiny of the Namibian people but at the same time a heavy blow to the apartheid system.

The firm condemnation of the policies and practices of the apartheid system, the militant solidarity and the many-sided support given to the liberation movements for achieving the aspiration of all peoples for a free and dignified life constitute the basic principles of our long-standing position.

(Mr. Tanasie, Romania)

The eradication of racial discrimination and the assurance of equal rights for all peoples constitute an imperative requirement of our times. The achievement of this aim is perfectly in line with the aspirations of economic and social progress, of peace and prosperity for all the peoples of the world. The elimination of apartheid policies in South Africa is also crucial for putting an end to the acts of aggression and destabilization by the Pretoria régime in the front-line States and other neighbouring countries.*

It is Romania's considered view that nowhere in the world is racism and racial discrimination so brutal and blatant as it is in South Africa. The policies promulgated by the racist régime are rooted in the systematic and illegal institutionalization of racial discrimination. It has become a system which does not lend itself to correction and, therefore, it must be eliminated.

*Mr. Hurst (Antigua and Barbuda), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Tanasie, Romania)

The legitimacy of the aspirations of the people of South Africa and their opposition to racial discrimination and apartheid - which was declared a crime against humanity - has been fully acknowledged by the United Nations. Furthermore, the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly constitute a clear reaffirmation of the special responsibility of the international community to bring about the dismantling of apartheid as soon as possible.

Condemnation of apartheid is already universal. What is needed now is not only commitment but also energetic action consistent with that condemnation.

Recent developments in South Africa appearing to mark some changes in the apartheid policy should be viewed with great caution. Those insignificant changes were made only to gain favour for the South African Government and are far short of meeting the just demands of the international community. The system of apartheid cannot be reformed; it must be dismantled in its entirety.

The minority racist régime, which excludes the overwhelming majority of the population from the political process, must be forced to initiate genuine negotiations with the true representatives of the oppressed people of South Africa, and to work towards the creation of a united, democratic and non-racial society. Romania joins in the demand for the lifting of the state of emergency; the release of all political prisoners and other activists, including Nelson Mandela; the unbanning of the African liberation organizations; and implementation of other confidence-building measures, as pre-conditions for the commencement of negotiations.

We believe that the abolition of the policies of apartheid and racial discrimination and the creation of conditions enabling people in South Africa to participate freely in shaping their own future represent an imperative that must be duly reflected in the adoption of effective measures and actions by the United Nations and the international community as a whole. An ever-increasing-number of

(Mr. Tanasie, Romania)

United Nations Member States are speaking out in favour of such effective measures and supporting the demand for the adoption of mandatory sanctions against South Africa, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter.

In its foreign policy Romania excludes any form of relations with South Africa.

It is our view that the international community should continue to give the highest priority to the programmes adopted by the United Nations for combating racism, racial discrimination and apartheid, and should act more energetically for the eradication of the apartheid system. In this respect, we are very much encouraged by the excellent work accomplished by the Special Committee against Apartheid under the leadership of the very experienced, dedicated and competent Permanent Representative of Nigeria, who is presiding over the current session of the General Assembly, Mr. Joseph Garba.

On this occasion I should like to reaffirm Romania's firm support for all the efforts made by the United Nations against apartheid, and to assure the peoples of South Africa and Namibia of our assistance and militant solidarity in their just struggle for freedom and independence.

Mr. AGUILAR (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): The system of apartheid imposed by the white minority in South Africa, apart from systematically violating the fundamental rights and freedoms of the non-white population, is the major cause of instability in southern Africa. There can no longer be even a lingering doubt about the danger that apartheid poses to international peace and security.

On this subject Venezuela has maintained a clearly defined position that is known to everyone. We reject the policies of racial discrimination, and apartheid which are contrary not only to our legal constitutional provisions but also to principles and sentiments that are deeply rooted in the minds of the Venezuelan

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

people. That is why we reiterate once again that our country does not have, nor has it had, any diplomatic, consular, commercial, cultural, sports or any other kind of relations with South Africa.

The Government of Venezuela unequivocally condemns apartheid and supports the implementation of the measures adopted by the United Nations aimed at eradicating that system once and for all. Furthermore, we have supported the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the Government of Pretoria, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter. We have stated that more than once in the Security Council, when we were members of that body, and here in the Assembly. I should add that the Government of Venezuela, in keeping with our domestic legislation, is a party to the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, and the International Convention against Apartheid in Sports.

My Government's oft-repeated, strong condemnation of the apartheid system, together with a policy aimed at a steady flow of information about the Venezuelan position on this issue, has played a major role in the education of our population about the true meaning of the system of apartheid and its dangerous consequences. The awareness aroused in my country has found expression in certain concrete facts. For instance, the Venezuelan Association of Sports Journalists - a non-governmental organization - decided not to award the prize of Best Sportsman of the Year to a very distinguished Venezuelan tennis player, even though he met the requirements, because he had taken part in a tournament in South Africa. Also, non-profit private organizations have been established to promote seminars on apartheid in various parts of the country. They make it possible to disseminate throughout the country, in addition to the capital and beyond the framework of

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

governmental institutions, information that can raise the people's consciousness against racism and racial discrimination.

As has been repeatedly stated from this rostrum, the reformist policy of making small changes in the apartheid system through dialogue with the racist régime of South Africa has achieved very meagre results. Apartheid must be totally eradicated, in all its forms.

In the report of the Centre against Apartheid it is stated that while sanctions officially imposed against South Africa have so far been generally limited in scope and have not always focused on the main spheres in which South Africa depends on the rest of the world, their cumulative effect has significantly restricted that country's economy.

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

An effective oil embargo would exert powerful pressure on the racist régime of Pretoria to see reason, because oil is perhaps the only strategic commodity in which South Africa is not self-sufficient. For this reason Venezuela has promoted and sponsored resolutions on the oil embargo against South Africa and supported the work of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa. In this connection, Venezuela took part in the hearings organized by that Group in April this year.

The international community must exert constant pressure against the racist régime, while keeping the whole world informed of the majority population's just demands for freedom and independence. The meeting of South African women with the representatives of various organizations and of a number of countries held recently in Caracas, under the auspices of the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and with the full support of my Government, has made it clear to us that the domestic front in the struggle against apartheid has widened, that it is no longer composed exclusively of black Africans. Moreover, that front is consolidating further and has established parameters that take into account the future evolution of the situation, turning South Africa into a post-apartheid society.

The profound concern of the international community at the prevailing situation in South Africa is self-evident. It is important that we continue to emphasize the international community's total rejection of the system of apartheid. The meagre progress that has been achieved is not an indication of openness on the part of the racist Government of South Africa but, rather, is the result of the collective action of our countries. The international community must increase its pressure if the heinous régime of apartheid, which is a crime against humanity, is to be eradicated.

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

Venezuela will continue to give moral, material and political support for the struggle that will free the South African people from apartheid. We have always supported, and we will continue to participate in activities organized by the Special Committee against Apartheid. We contribute to the AFRICA Fund of the Non-aligned Countries, the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, the International Defence and Aid Fund for Southern Africa, the United Nations Fund for Namibia, the United Nations Fund for Publicity against Apartheid, and the Institute for Namibia Account of the United Nations Fund for Namibia.

Similarly, we strongly support the holding of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to apartheid and its destructive consequences in southern Africa.

I wish to mention, by way of support for the international struggle for liberation, the greatest symbol of South African resistance - Nelson Mandela, who received the Simón Bolívar Prize of UNESCO and an honorary doctorate of one of our main universities, the University of Carabobo.

In conclusion, I wish to reiterate our firm endorsement of the just demand of the South African people for liberation and to reaffirm our solidarity with them in their struggle against apartheid and our support for the African National Congress and the other black-majority organizations of that country.

Mr. ZUZE (Zambia): In recent years, events on the international scene have signalled better times ahead in international relations. The world has witnessed, with keen interest, clear manifestations of rapprochement between the two super-Powers. Indeed, this rapprochement, has had far-reaching ramifications the world over. Today, in these times of hope for the future of mankind, the oppressed black majority in apartheid South Africa remain a deprived people in the land of their birth. The effects of perestroika have not yet penetrated the apartheid structure.

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

We in southern Africa have, for a long time, faced enormous challenges - challenges brought about by racist South Africa. We have confronted and endured South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia; we have suffered South Africa's acts of aggression and destabilization; we have endured the evil system of apartheid in South Africa itself.

In this confrontation the apartheid régime has attempted to present a modified version of apartheid to convince the world that change is coming to South Africa. The window-dressing has been so effective that some among our friends are beginning to believe the optical illusion of reforms in South Africa. We are witnessing a replay of the events of 1983, when Mr. P.W. Botha held out similar promises. We know now, as we know then, that what has changed is the presentation of apartheid. The accent in South Africa is still on group development - and that means racism.

In the case of Namibia, we seem to be standing on the fence between life and death. As this Assembly knows only too well, a process that seems to hold promise for the attainment of independence is under way. We should know by next week which way to go. We hope and pray that this process, which the international community is observing, will proceed to its logical conclusion. To this end, we appeal to the international community to render all forms of assistance to the people of Namibia during the period following the elections to the constituent assembly, until accession to independence.

South Africa's export of aggression and destabilization in the region, either by covert actions or by proxy, continues to be a reality southern Africa has to face. Its cost keeps escalating. Recent statistics put the cost of South Africa's destabilization at \$60 billion in terms of economic losses, and almost 1.5 million people dead. So long as the apartheid system exists in that region, aggression and destabilization will continue to threaten independent southern African States.

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

The independence process now under way in Namibia has been referred to by South Africa's allies as being indicative of change in South Africa. South Africa's friends have chosen to ignore what has really forced South Africa to come to terms with the rest of the world. South Africa has never engaged in genuine negotiations; only pressure has had a decisive effect on the Pretoria régime.

I should like to reiterate what is now a well-known fact: that the international financial and economic sanctions against racist South Africa have had the desired effect. This has been admitted publicly by the South Africans themselves. Until recently, when some banks and other lending institutions came to the rescue of South Africa by rescheduling Pretoria's debt repayments, the South African economy was in crisis.

The rescheduling of South Africa's debt has given the racist régime a new lease of life to continue its apartheid policies. We believe that this action is an admission that sanctions do work, and are working in South Africa. What is more, this action is an affront against the will of the international community to end apartheid by peaceful means. It is in this context that we strongly appeal to Government and private financial institutions to reject any requests from racist South Africa for new loans. Rather than help the oppressed black majority - as some people claim they do - these loans only strengthen the military machine by which South Africa carries out its acts of internal repression and aggression against neighbouring independent States.

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

Over the years the international community has in so many words expressed its outrage and indignation at the system of apartheid. The General Assembly and the Security Council have adopted many resolutions demanding that South Africa abolish apartheid. Despite the international consensus that apartheid is a scourge that must be eradicated, South Africa has remained defiant. The situation has been aggravated by the protection given South Africa by its Western allies on the Security Council and by their abuse of the veto privilege. With that kind of protection against comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, South Africa has seen no need to engage in serious negotiations to bring about an end to apartheid.

The people of South Africa, who have for a long time sacrificed their lives to bring freedom and dignity to that country, have repeatedly called for the immediate imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against racist South Africa as a peaceful but effective way to end apartheid. We must ask: If sanctions do not work, why, in God's name, are they being opposed?

The international community should not be deceived by the recent pronouncements by the new South African leadership promising dramatic changes in that country. South Africa has been under extreme pressure as a result of the voluntary sanctions now in place. In order to ease that pressure the régime is once again resorting to the game of deception designed to buy time for itself. My delegation wishes to commend those countries that have taken measures against South Africa. We urge those States that have not yet taken such measures to consider doing so without further delay.

The liberation movements of South Africa have through many years of struggle demonstrated their readiness to negotiate for change in their country. Lest there be any misunderstanding, the liberation movements' readiness to negotiate should

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

not be construed as implying weakness. On the contrary, that readiness is due to their belief that a conjuncture of circumstances exists - one that, if there is demonstrable readiness on the part of the Pretoria régime to engage in negotiations genuinely and seriously, could create the possibility of ending apartheid through negotiations. That is a principled stand that deserves our unqualified support.

My delegation is of the view that the Declaration of the Ad Hoc Committee on Southern Africa of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), which was adopted on 21 August 1989 at Harare, Zimbabwe, and which now appears as document A/44/697, offers the best chance for peaceful change in South Africa. That document is a solemn undertaking by the liberation movements of South Africa and the OAU to work for change through negotiations if the racist régime is ready to negotiate seriously. The document is essentially a blueprint for the creation of a unitary, non-racial and democratic South Africa. It outlines the basic principles for negotiations, it defines the climate for negotiations, and it sets out guidelines for the process of negotiations. That blueprint is bold enough to recommend a programme of action to achieve the abolition of the insidious system of apartheid. Basically, what is required is moral and political courage on the part of the Pretoria régime to rise to the challenge of that blueprint.

Let me reiterate that in the long run, and for the sake of harmony in South Africa, the régime will have to demonstrate its seriousness by taking bold steps to create a climate conducive to the peaceful abolition of apartheid through negotiations. South Africa must agree to release unconditionally all political prisoners and detainees, including Nelson Mandela; it must agree to lift the ban on all political organizations so that they may participate in the political process to bring about change; it must agree to remove troops from the townships; it must

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

agree to lift the state of emergency; it must agree to repeal all Draconian laws; and, it must agree to cease all political trials and political executions.

We believe that those measures will ease tension and eliminate mistrust in South Africa and in the region as a whole. The new leadership in South Africa must seize the opportunities offered by the current desire for negotiation rather than confrontation. We await specific steps from the apartheid régime in response to the blueprint set out in document A/44/697.

Let me conclude by paying a deserved tribute to the President of the Assembly in his other capacity as Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid. We commend him and the other members of that important Committee for the report before the Assembly. That report has clearly shown that the situation in South Africa remains critical, indeed explosive. It is our hope that the recommendations made in the report will be implemented by all States and organizations.

Similarly, we wish to express our appreciation to the Special Committee against Apartheid for the draft resolutions on the situation in South Africa. Those draft resolutions - on which the Assembly will take action at a later stage - accurately reflect the situation currently obtaining in South Africa.

Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vanuatu): Were we to close our eyes and hear the word "apartheid" uttered, different images would spring to mind for different individuals.

Some of us would have an image of the heroic and dignified figure of Nelson Mandela, languishing for far too long in prison. Some of us would have an image of courageous children standing in defiance of an illegal régime that knows no decency. Some of us would have an image of dedicated youths who have left their homes and their families and returned in a clandestine fashion to fight for the

(Mr. Van Lierop, Vanuatu)

liberation of their people. Some of us would have an image of women struggling to hold their families together while at the same time defiantly challenging obscene laws that degrade and debase their very humanity.

Some of us would have an image of strong, silent men journeying each day deep into the fertile earth and, through very hard labour, extracting minerals that feed and sustain the great wealth and power of the South African régime, as well as the commercial interests of those outside Africa who, while claiming to deplore apartheid, never decline the fruits of apartheid. Some of us would have an image of students - black, white, brown and yellow - inside South Africa and all over the world coming together, joining hands and lifting their voices to say that we are all God's children and that we must all live together and work together to build a better future.

Some of us would have an image of snarling police dogs, water cannon, electric cattle prods, whips and the other devices of brutality so effectively wielded by the cruel and uncaring agents of a brutal and desperate régime against the men, the women and the children whose only crime is to say "No" to apartheid and "Yes" to equality and justice. Some of us would have an image of the barren topography of places called "bantustans" as opposed to the modern vistas of the cities of South Africa.

Some of us would have an image of the quiet and reserved dignity of Archbishop Desmond Tutu and other members of the clergy, praying for an infusion of sanity into the minds of those who govern South Africa today, praying for an infusion of compassion and understanding into the hearts of those who have it in their power to change South Africa.

No one - not a single person - could possibly close his or her eyes today, hear the word "apartheid" spoken and, through the instrument of word association,

(Mr. Jan Lierop, Vanuatu)

conjure up an image of a benevolent society in which children of all races laugh and play together and share a common dream of a future of peace and harmony. No one has such an imagination. No one is capable of such self-deception, or of such myopia.

(Mr. Van Lierop, Vanuatu)

South Africa has the potential to be a great nation. It has the material wealth, it has the economic potential, and it has the people to produce the greatness that every nation strives for. We can imagine what South Africa could be if its energies were directed to creating a better life for all of its people rather than to denying the humanity of the overwhelming majority of its people. What kind of humanity can possibly be built upon the degradation of other human beings? What kind of future can possibly be built on the disenfranchisement or the enslavement of any fellow human being?

Today, the political and social system known as apartheid is tottering on the brink of extinction. Soon it will cease to exist, in name if not, perhaps, in fact. However, we must not be so naive as to believe that the legacy of apartheid will be easily erased. Generations of privilege for some and deprivation for many have left deep and lasting scars, as well as deeply enshrined inequities. The healing of those scars and the eradication of those inequities will take considerable time and great effort. The international community, particularly States that have been most actively engaged with the apartheid régime, now owe it to the victims of apartheid to engage actively in undoing the consequences of apartheid.

Equal educational opportunities, social development and economic equality are laudable goals which must be pursued if South Africa is to evolve into a genuinely and substantively different type of society than it is today. The great challenge will be to ensure that within the lifetime of those who are today children in South Africa there will be a vehicle by means of which to achieve that which their parents dared not dream when they themselves were children.

(Mr. Van Lierop, Vanuatu)

Today, every nation in the world is preoccupied with the problem of the international debt crisis. What is often forgotten - and we say this without bitterness or recrimination - is the debt owed to the world's developing countries by those whose wealth was acquired at their expense. Let us, the international community, ensure that in the future the great debt owed to South Africa's people, the victims of apartheid, is not forgotten.

Recently, the world mourned the death of the great and renowned artist Vladimir Horowitz. Speaking of the creative genius of this giant, Isaac Stern, himself a great violinist, said:

"How many musicians can say they have created a standard against which all others will be judged? It was not only his personality that was extraordinary, but his pianistic and musical accomplishments, against which piano playing in the future will be measured."

In a completely different vein, South Africa also has created a standard. Yesterday, South Africa's apartheid régime created a standard of injustice and brutality against which others will always be judged. Tomorrow, let South Africa create an enlightened society of equality, truth and compassion against which others will in the future be measured. That is our humble prayer for South Africa's future.

Miss MONCADA BERMUDEZ (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish): In demonstrating its vital involvement in the elections under way in Namibia, the continent of Africa is experiencing the most significant moments in its history. Those elections reflect the end of a long and arduous path trodden by the international community together with the African nations, prompted and inspired always by the valiant struggle of the Namibian people for freedom and independence. For the first time the Namibians can vote and select their

(Miss Moncada Bermudez, Nicaragua)

representatives. For the United Nations and its Members, which never gave up the Namibian cause, were able to overcome all the obstacles that arose and at all times challenged those that consorted with South Africa, this is a source of pride.

This Assembly has long maintained that the apartheid régime must be eliminated, not reformed, and that the existence of that régime is the root and cause of the instability and violence in southern Africa.

However, the South African Government has not taken any practical steps to eradicate apartheid; rather, it has taken steps to hide it from the scrutiny of international public opinion. That situation has been duly reflected in the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid to the current session, which indicates that

"While the apartheid régime has made pronouncements concerning proposed changes in the political structure of the country, its reform plan fails to fulfil the demands of the black majority for full political rights and maintains the fundamental aspects of white minority rule." (A/44/22 and Corr.2, p. 9, para. 5)

The Pretoria Government continues to demonstrate by what it does that it is not prepared to destroy the foundations of apartheid. In the elections last September for the three parliamentary chambers the black majority was still excluded. Repression, as a means of keeping the black population in a state of subjugation and stopping them fighting for their legitimate rights, which are denied them in the political life of the country, continues and is increasing. The continuing state of emergency, which has been in force for four years, is another example, as are the press censorship - so complete that the world has known few precedents - and the persistence of death squads and vigilante groups.

(Miss Moncada Bermudez, Nicaragua)

Poverty, the difficult economic situation and the inability of the régime to solve the structural problems have made the suffering of the South African people more acute. The fact that the black majority does not enjoy the economic privileges reserved for whites invalidates the arguments of those that refuse to impose economic sanctions on South Africa on the ground that they would adversely affect the black population.

Throughout all these years the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has stood by the oppressed people of South Africa and their liberation movements. At its principal meetings this year, that is, the ministerial meeting in Harare and the Belgrade summit, the Movement reaffirmed its commitment to the just cause of the South African black majority. At the Belgrade summit, the Heads of State or Government denounced, inter alia, the moral, economic, political and military support which some Western countries continue to give the Pretoria régime. They also condemned the many attacks and acts of aggression, subversion and destabilization against the front-line States and other neighbouring, independent States, including the massacres of refugees and the support given to groups engaged in terrorism in those States.

My Government is in full agreement with the positions of the Non-Aligned heads of State or Government, and with the content of the declaration adopted in August 1989 by the Ad Hoc Committee on Southern Africa of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) on the question of South Africa.

My Government expresses its gratitude to the various United Nations bodies which, through their dedicated work, are contributing to the eradication of apartheid. We wish to mention in particular the Special Committee against Apartheid and the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa.

(Miss Moncada Bermudez, Nicaragua)

We unreservedly support the recommendations of the Special Committee against Apartheid in stressing the need to intensify concerted measures to ensure that the apartheid system comes to an end soon, to the benefit of the peoples of South Africa and the region, and in giving our full support to the national liberation movements, particularly the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC).

(Miss Moncada Bermudez,
Nicaragua)

We unreservedly support the recommendations of the Special Committee against Apartheid, which stress the need to intensify concerted measures to ensure that the apartheid system is speedily ended, to the benefit of the peoples of South Africa and the region; to give full support to the national liberation movements, particularly the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC), in all the forms of struggle they employ; and to demand that Pretoria revoke the decision on the death penalty and respect the provisions of the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 and Additional Protocol I, of 1977, according to which prisoners taken should be recognized as prisoners of war. Similarly, we are convinced of the need for the Security Council to take specific measures to guarantee strict implementation of its resolutions.

We believe that the Special Committee against Apartheid should continue to monitor the situation in South Africa and the measures adopted by the international community, especially those relating to the imposition and implementation of mandatory sanctions.

The work carried out by the Intergovernmental Group charged with monitoring the supply and shipment of oil and its by-products to South Africa has been most useful. The contact maintained with Governments, the public hearings in April 1989 and the delicate work of building up its data bases are undoubtedly steps that will enable the Committee to increase its ability to ensure effective and active monitoring at the world level in respect of everything connected with the oil embargo against South Africa.

The mandate of the Intergovernmental Group is still in force. We believe that the Group should continue to establish effective strategies to enforce the embargo to make it increasingly difficult for South Africa to avoid it. Its monitoring of shipments of oil and petroleum products in violation of the embargo is equally

(Miss Moncada Bermudez,
Nicaragua)

important. It is now indispensable to impose a mandatory oil embargo against the South African régime as a contribution to the South African peoples' struggle against apartheid.

The approval and implementation of the measures proposed and the co-operation of Governments and organizations with the Intergovernmental Group will enable it to carry out its functions more effectively.

The organized forces of the people of South Africa will not cease their efforts until they have established a democratic non-racist society, in which the process of fundamental change can take place in the country, not simply gradual reforms. The defiant campaign of the democratic movement of the masses and the unceasing support of public opinion are proof of this. The Pretoria régime must adopt a radical initiative and dismantle the apartheid system. Despite the implementation of the régime's criminal policy of repression, the resistance is gathering new strength. This is clear from the increasing participation by whites in the opposition movement, and this marks a new stage in the struggle and is a clear reflection of the imminent collapse of the system.

My delegation wishes to end its statement by paying a tribute to the South African patriots who are risking their lives in the struggle against apartheid and those still languishing in South African gaols. Through their sacrifice they are making history and forging a future free of oppression. Their struggle calls for renewed efforts by the international community and all those that one day, as we are doing now in the case of Namibia, will celebrate the advent of a South Africa free and without apartheid.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I remind him that, in

(The President)

accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and five minutes for the second and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. SHAHEED (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): The representative of the Tel Aviv racist régime, because of his racist hatred of us, chose to devote part of his statement this morning to attacking us and casting doubt on our positions of principle. He indulged in a hypocritical attempt to mislead the Assembly regarding the racist, colonialist nature of Israel. As is his custom, he filled his statement with extraneous matters totally unrelated to the item under discussion. Without exceeding the time allotted to me, I shall try to expose his misleading attempt and set the record straight as far as possible. I shall follow the same order as he followed in his statement.

First, he referred to General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX), describing it as defamatory and futile. That resolution brands Zionism as a form of fascism and racial discrimination. Needless to say, the resolution did not come out of a void; it was the just and logical conclusion reached by the Organization after reviewing the sum-total of the ideological tenets and practical activities of Zionism. The theoretical foundation of Zionism was from the outset the promotion of racial discrimination and contempt for other peoples and national groups. On the ground, the practices of Israel and the Zionist movement are ample evidence that a policy of racial discrimination, fascism and terrorism is practised in word and in deed.

Resolution 3379 (XXX) was adopted after a series of other resolutions condemning Israel's expansionist policy, its flouting of all conventions and norms of international legitimacy and its pursuit in occupied Palestine of a racist policy, the victims of which were Arabs and Jews of eastern origin. Nor was it a coincidence that the Organization adopted another resolution branding Israel a

(Mr. Shaheed, Syrian Arab
Republic)

non-peace-loving State. That resolution and many others like it are proof of the awareness that exists of the true nature of Zionism and its practices, which call to mind Nazi ideology and practices.

Secondly, the representative of Israel referred to what he termed an attempt by some delegates to portray the situation in South Africa as similar to that in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. In fact, the common characteristics of the racist régimes of Tel Aviv and Pretoria and the similarity of their goals and aggressive methods combine with the very close relationship which binds them to confirm that they are the two sides of the same coin. Should I be able to continue my right of reply during this meeting I shall deal with that point at length.

Thirdly, in his statement he played the tune of anti-Semitism at least four times and defined it as "hatred of the Jews". Zionism has always played, and continues to play, the tune of anti-Semitism as a means of achieving its ideological and political objectives and its objective of securing information, but also as a means of pressure and blackmail to silence any voices raised in any part of the world against its expansionist, settler-colonialist and racist policy. Any protest is promptly branded anti-Semitism. Members will recall Hal Wyner's article in The New York Times, in which he said:

"most stories on the intifada that appear in the Western media are characterized not by exaggeration but by understatement. In spite of this, many non-Jewish correspondents have had to deal with accusations of anti-Semitism, while Jewish journalists, [myself included]" - that is, Mr. Wyner - "are censured for 'self-hatred'." (The New York Times, 8 October 1989, sect. 4, p. 21)

Zionism also uses anti-Semitism as an important means of collecting contributions and encouraging more Jewish immigration to Israel.

(Mr. Shaheed, Syrian Arab Republic)

The New York Times, in its issue of 10 February 1989, published a number of paragraphs from a circular addressed by B'Nai B'rith International, the largest Jewish organization in the world, to 14,000 of its members warning them that "the presence of Arabs in our universities poisons the minds of our young people". The circular also warned that the students "now face a new kind of anti-Semitism that differs from the anti-Semitism we experienced when we were at school". The circular urged the organization's members to "mobilize and attack Satan". Zionism plays the anti-Semitism tune whenever it feels that international public opinion is beginning to view with disfavour Israel's fascist policies against the Palestinian Arab people. It hastens then to use its domination of the mass media in Europe and America to remind the people of the world of the crimes of the Nazis, and thus uses the familiar "guilt complex" in the service of its Zionist dream of Greater Israel in the Arab homeland. In short, we can say that the playing of the anti-Semitism tune is a Zionist weapon of intellectual terrorism and political blackmail. Needless to say, all people of good faith the world over differentiate between Judaism, the religion, and Zionism, the ideology and political practice, exactly as in the past they differentiated between Nazism and the German people.

Fourthly, the representative of Israel defined Zionism as the liberation movement of the Jewish people and stated that one of the main principles of Zionism was the right of the Jewish people to return to Israel. We all know that Zionist settler-colonialism in occupied Palestine is the corner-stone of the Zionist enterprise. Zionism is intent on the creation of Greater Israel. Israel is only the nucleus of that project. Consequently, the most serious aspect of Zionism is its Greater Israel project, which envisages an Israel extending from the Nile

(Mr. Shaheed, Syrian Arab
Republic)

to the Euphrates. This is not a policy but a religious doctrine, - indeed, a divine decree to create such a State. That is why Israel has never defined its borders. But those borders were defined long ago and, until such borders are established, the interim borders will continue to be defined by military conquest.

Only in the light of this can we understand Israel's actions in 1948 and when it occupied Palestinian lands outside the partition areas established by the United Nations resolution, and understand its participation in the tripartite aggression against Egypt in 1956 and its acquisition of the lands which it continued to swallow piecemeal between 1948 and 1967.

In the same light we can understand Israel's aggression in 1967 and its occupation of the whole area of Palestine, as well as other territories in Syria and Egypt. We can also see in its true light Israel's occupation of southern Lebanon. All these are but stages in the realization of the Zionist biblical expansionist scheme. If we keep this in mind we can understand why the racist régime of Tel Aviv persists in defying the will of the international community and refuses to implement the international resolutions calling upon it to withdraw unconditionally from Arab territories. That is why the Zionists erupted in anger when, in his address to the American Israel Public Affairs Committee on 22 May 1989, Mr. Baker called upon them to renounce their dream of Greater Israel. Furthermore, it may be beneficial to note that Zionism's expansionist dreams are not limited to the Arab lands; the plateau of Anatolia, for example, is to be part of Greater Israel.

Fifthly, the representative of Israel described the régime he represents, three times at least, in his address, as "democratic". What gives the lie to the claim of Israeli democracy is the racist policy it pursues, not only towards the

(Mr. Shaheed, Syrian Arab Republic)

Arabs who are the legitimate owners of the land but also towards the oriental Jews whom the racist régime claims to represent and whom it dupes into joining its onslaught on the Arab homeland.

The PRESIDENT: I would point out to the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic that his 10-minute period is up. I therefore ask him to be kind enough to conclude his statement.

Mr. SHAHEED (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): I shall conclude my statement in one minute.

Members will all recall the emigration of the Falasha to occupied Palestine, but they may not know that they were treated there as third-class citizens, low in the racist Zionist classification, that is, beneath the oriental Sephardi Jews. They may not know that, among other things, they were asked to adopt Judaism anew, and that their presence gave rise to debate on the extent of their Jewishness, which led to a wider debate on who is a Jew and who is a pure Jew. The policy of racial discrimination against the Falasha and the oriental Jews demonstrates the reality of the racist régime of Tel Aviv and its apartheid policies.

Some of the attributes of what the Israeli representative has termed "the Israeli democracy" may be seen in the unsated greed for Arab land and the unquenched thirst for Arab blood. That democracy has uprooted and displaced millions of Arabs and occupied their lands. It now plans yet more aggression and more expansion; more killing, massacre and exile. The intifadah has shown the face of Israeli democracy for what it really is: a democracy of crushed bones and the burial of living human beings.

Sixthly, in his address, the Israeli representative played down the gravity of the relationship between his régime and the racist régime of South Africa.

The PRESIDENT: The Observer of Palestine has requested to make a statement in reply. I call upon him in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 3237 (XXIX), of 22 November 1974, and 43/177, of 15 December 1988.

Mr. TERZI (Palestine): This morning the representative of Israel converted this meeting of the General Assembly into a class in theology, with a lot of pontificating. No one questions the fact that religions and religious beliefs, be they Jewish, Christian, Muslim or other known or yet-to-be-known religions, have contributed to the present civilization. We all know about the arrival of our common Patriarch, Abraham, to settle in Palestine. We have all learned about Moses and the Ten Commandments. But we have also learned about the adventures and aggression of Joshua and the elimination of 33 kingdoms on his way to Jericho. We are all well aware of Hammurabi and his code of law - probably the first such code - a few generations before Moses.

What is being discussed here is not Judaism but the racist policies and practices of the apartheid régime in South Africa and in that context the relationship of that régime with the régime in Tel Aviv. The item does not deal either with the horrors of the Second World War, when the leaders of both régimes collaborated with the Nazis. Tragically, tens of millions of human beings were victims of Nazi atrocities, including Slavs, Jews and millions of others; all were victims of the Holocaust.

The spokesman for Israel this morning arrogated to himself the right to speak not only on behalf of his own Government and State but also on behalf of the Jewish people at large, be they citizens of South Africa, abiding by the laws and regulations imposed by that abominable régime, or citizens of any other State, irrespective of their duties and obligations as law-abiding citizens.

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine)

In a way, such an attitude is of an exclusively racist nature and may pose dangers prejudicial to those citizens.

It is ironic that the spokesman for Israel, the Jewish State, should assert that Israel supports all peoples striving for justice

"regardless of their stand as to our own struggle for national survival".

(A/44/PV.50, p. 71)

Does he really expect us to accept that stand even if it is at the cost of denying the national survival of another people and nation. Let us face it: are not the Palestinian people, almost 5 million of us, the price of the realization of the Zionist aims?

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine)

F expressed his fervent hope:

"... that no one will be allowed to weaken and stain the noble cause of the struggle against apartheid ..." (A/44/PV.50, p. 73)

But then how can he explain Israel's concrete contribution to the survival of the racist Pretoria régime by its facilitating and marketing South African products, be they diamonds, coal, steel and other such products, under "made in Israel" labels. And Israel is still the back door to the United States and Western Europe.

He lectures us on Zionism. He asserts that a salient symbol of Zionism is the right of the Jewish people to return to the land of Israel, but he does not say that this is done through acts of State terrorism, either "to spirit the Palestinians across", as Herzl proposed, or "to transfer" them.

He speaks of the right of return, an inalienable right, as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights proclaims, but at the same time Israel denies almost 3 million Palestinians the right to return to their homes, to return to the orange groves and olive trees some of us have planted with our own hands and to which we yearn to return.

He speaks of another symbol of Zionism:

"... the very concept of democracy - genuine, true democracy" - as if there were other kinds of democracies - "as the corner-stone of freedom and social progress." (ibid., pp. 74-75)

Was the seige of Beit Sahur a sign of freedom and social progress? Are 40,000 Palestinian detainees enjoying freedom? Is military occupation of the territory of the Palestinians and the denial of all their rights, including the right to life, not to mention political rights, the Zionist and Israeli interpretation or concept of democracy?

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine)

Finally, concerning the military co-operation between the two régimes, especially in the field of nuclear weaponry, I am sure the world is now cognizant of the facts and is expecting the United Nations, particularly the Special Committee, to furnish us with a report as soon as possible on those facts, for such co-operation is a threat to international peace and security.

The meeting rose at 7.35 p.m.