



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/40/PV.54
31 October 1985

ENGLISH

Fortieth session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 30 October 1985, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. DE PINIÉS (Spain)

later: Mr. AGIUS (Vice-President) (Malta)

- Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa [35] (continued)

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

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 35 (continued)

POLICIES OF APARTHEID OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA

- (a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID (A/40/22 AND ADD.1-4)
- (b) REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE DRAFTING OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION AGAINST APARTHEID IN SPORTS (A/40/36)
- (c) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/40/780)
- (d) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/40/805)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Before calling on the first speaker, I should like to urge representatives, in accordance with Annex V, paragraph 71 of the rules of procedure, to speak in the order of their inscription on the list of speakers, on the understanding that those prevented from doing so will be moved to the end of the list for that day, unless they have arranged it to change places with other representatives.

Mr. WALTERS (United States of America): We all know the meaning of apartheid: deliberate, systematic, institutionalized racial discrimination denying South Africa's black people their God-given rights. America's view of apartheid is simple and straightforward: we believe it is wrong. We condemn it. And because we live by Lincoln's words - "No person is good enough to govern another without the other's consent" - all Americans are united in hoping for the day when apartheid will exist no more.

(Mr. Walters, United States)

The history of the United States is one of struggle against all forms of racial, cultural and political intolerance. Our Constitution resolutely forbids intolerance and our commitment to equality and freedom does not end at our borders. We oppose political and economic systems based upon the self-proclaimed right of any race, religion, tribe, clan or economic or political elite to rule over and oppress other people. Such elitist orders produce misery and refugees, many of whom bring their talents and energy to open societies, including my own.

My country can thus only reject apartheid, and we are working towards the elimination of this unjust and unjustifiable system. The question has never been whether apartheid should end - all of us recognize that it is doomed - but how to end it while realizing the democratic aspirations of South Africa's people. The policy of the United States, outlined in dozens of addresses before this and other bodies and most recently by President Reagan on 9 September, is to promote positive and peaceful change that will lead to a system in South Africa based on the consent of all those governed by it. We want to encourage change that assures rather than destroys South Africa's future.

I should also point out that the United States believes that apartheid will not be undone by demagogic posturing and sloganeering. Exhortations to bloody revolution, calls for mandatory sanctions and hypocritical talk about liberation from the leaders and representatives of some nations that deny liberty to their own people will not bring peace and justice to millions of South Africans.

Ending apartheid is a task that demands more than hot rhetoric, no matter how emotionally satisfying that may be. That is the spirit of President Reagan's Executive Order of 9 September. The measures he announced then, which will go into force by the end of this year, are aimed at specific areas: the apparatus and symbols of apartheid. They are designed to deprive the Government of South Africa of any direct or indirect United States support in maintaining its police, military

(Mr. Walters, United States)

and apartheid-enforcing structure and, equally important, they commit the United States to sustaining a strong presence in South Africa as a basis from which to exert influence for change. The United States Government is taking concrete steps to encourage United States businesses and entrepreneurs to seek an end to the discriminatory labour and employment practices of apartheid and we shall greatly increase our economic assistance for the education and training of disadvantaged South Africans and our support to peaceful opponents of apartheid through our human rights programme.

Some might argue that this is not enough, that those improvements are only economic and do not represent political gains. This reminds me of the axiom that one of the lessons of history is that we do not remember the lessons of history. One of those lessons is surely that economic and political freedoms are inextricably linked. It is exactly this hope for real improvement in their lives that has brought so many people to South Africa - black and white - and that now impels an unstoppable push for political change in that country.

Others call for destructive, punitive sanctions, arms and more violence. We want jobs, better housing and health programmes. We want freedom of association, and of movement, and all the other political rights and economic freedoms that allow the individual, rather than the Government, to choose his way of life. We take this approach because we Americans are builders, not destroyers. Our Government is actively pressing for democratic, peaceful change in South Africa. So too are our foundations, our labour unions, our universities, our corporations. We want our every link with South Africa to be dedicated to the purpose of bringing constructive influence to bear on that country. In other words, we are striving to utilize every instrument of peaceful change in South Africa to the benefit of the common cause: the ending of apartheid and the creation of a political process in which all South Africans can participate freely.

(Mr. Walters, United States)

This we do because another lesson of history is that we cannot retreat from all the difficult and complex moral choices in the world. We Americans have accepted the hard reality that our passionate commitment to moral principles can be no substitute for a sound foreign policy. The choice for us, however, is not between moral principles and the national interest but between moral principles divorced from political reality and moral principles anchored in political reality. Part of that reality is that progress towards democracy and greater freedom around the world may be slower than we would like. If we use our power to push non-democratic States too far and too fast we may destroy the hopes for greater freedom.

What we see in South Africa is the beginning of a process of change. The changes in official policy are plainly inadequate but, ironically, they have been enough to raise expectations and impel demands for fundamental reforms such as we all desire. This fundamental change will occur - there can be no doubt about that. All Americans are disturbed by the trend of events in South Africa. The violence and official repression will not lead to serious negotiations over a new political future for that country.

A cause of hope is that South Africa is not a totalitarian society. Every day we see examples of outspoken protest and access to the international media that would not be possible in some countries represented in this hall today. This degree of openness in South African society and our willingness to engage with that society for constructive purposes are the sources of our influence. The United States will continue to take advantage of this opportunity to do what it can as a responsible nation to end apartheid. Our policy is aimed at seeking engagement with all sides in South Africa for the purpose of encouraging negotiations that will produce fundamental reforms and we regard such a course as in the best traditions of the United Nations.

(Mr. Walters, United States)

I urge that the United Nations use its prestige to work constructively to help the South African people achieve a democratic State under which they would all enjoy the rights enumerated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. I also urge the United Nations to increase its efforts to work effectively for the elimination of all forms of racism and racial discrimination.

Mr. DINKA (Ethiopia): At the very outset I should like to express to the Special Committee against Apartheid the Ethiopian delegation's deep appreciation of and full support for its untiring efforts to lay bare the evil nature of the policy and system of apartheid. The various activities of the Committee in mobilizing the forces of peace and democracy against the racist régime and in support of the oppressed masses of South Africa deserve the approbation of the international community.

Much has been said, much has been written and numerous resolutions have been passed on the racist system of apartheid and the need to eliminate it once and for all. All of this, of course, has not been in vain. As a result of those efforts, apartheid is today universally condemned as an unjust and morally bankrupt system constituting a crime against humanity. The régime is shunned and is considered a pariah by all nations, except for a few Western States. Much of the world has severed all relations and contacts with that outcast régime. The just cause and the legitimate struggle of the oppressed masses of South Africa are supported and upheld by the preponderant majority of the international community.

Regrettably, however, there are still those in the West that support institutionalized racism in various ways. Despite repeated calls by the United Nations for the total isolation of the apartheid régime, they maintain political and diplomatic, as well as cultural, ties with South Africa. Their transnational corporations invest heavily in the economy of South Africa, mercilessly exploiting the human and natural resources of that country and reaping super-profits in the process. The military and technological collaboration of those in certain circles in the West with the racist régime has enabled the latter to build a military and security machine, including a nuclear capability, unmatched anywhere in Africa.

I submit that, if it were not for that political, economic, technological and military collaboration extended so generously to South Africa, the régime would

(Mr. Dinka, Ethiopia)

long since have crumbled. But, thanks to the support and sustenance it gets from certain Western States, the régime has survived this long and has been the cause of the continuing denial of fundamental human rights to our brothers and sisters in South Africa.

However, today, as yesterday, the oppressed refuse to accept the denial of their rights. In the past they had organized themselves and staged peaceful demonstrations and other acts of resistance to assert their rights. But that course of action proved costly as the result of the brutality and violence perpetrated against them by the fascist régime. Undeterred by the heavy sacrifices they have had to pay so far and are bound to pay in future in the course of their struggle, the oppressed have none the less escalated their popular resistance. The mindless racist régime has unleashed the full force of its repression and terrorism by declaring a state of emergency. Legitimate resistance is being countered by increased violence and repression, resulting in death and destruction, including the murder and assassination of innocent women and schoolchildren and the elderly.

We believe that it is the primary and special responsibility of the international community to arrest and reverse that trend. In this regard, we are encouraged by the unprecedented popular support for the just cause of the masses of South Africa. But we cannot conceal our disappointment at the response of certain Western Governments, particularly those of the United States and the United Kingdom, to the popular demand of their own public. People in the West are demanding the isolation of the South African régime, but the United States Administration and a few others are responding with the so-called constructive engagement with racism. People are demanding meaningful and forceful measures, but those Governments are attempting to placate their own people with token gestures. Demands for justice are thus being silenced by calculations of greed and profit.

(Mr. Dinka, Ethiopia)

Greed and profit are not, of course, being presented as the rationale for the positions of those Western Governments. Instead, seemingly reasonable and compassionate explanations are given. We are told, for example, that economic sanctions would not compel the racist régime to change its ways but would only hurt the blacks of South Africa and the peoples of southern Africa.

How do the people of South Africa and southern Africa on whose behalf those arguments are being proffered respond? Their response is clear and unequivocal. They have all said that the only way to exert pressure on Pretoria to give up its racist policies peacefully is by the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

Only last Monday, Bishop Desmond Tutu, a respected leader of the South African blacks and a Nobel laureate, addressing the Special Political Committee, called for the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa. Leaders of the front-line States have been no less clear in their support for sanctions. In his message to the fortieth session of the General Assembly, read on his behalf by Foreign Minister Mangwende, Prime Minister Robert Mugabe had the following to say:

"We do not want the international community to shirk its responsibility to the people of South Africa by hiding behind our vulnerability to South Africa's reprisals if mandatory sanctions are imposed against it. We accept that there is a price to be paid for the liberty of our brothers and sisters in South Africa and Namibia. For our part, we are prepared to play our full role." (A/40/PV.24, p. 21)

This clearly shows that the arguments against sanctions are as weak as they are self-serving. Indeed, the very talk and threat of sanctions has only recently shown how vulnerable Pretoria is to comprehensive mandatory sanctions. To defuse the pressure for sanctions, talk of reform is already in the air. But, as my own Foreign Minister and many others have said to this Assembly, apartheid cannot be

(Mr. Dinka, Ethiopia)

reformed. Only systems with basically firm and just foundations can be reformed. The foundations of apartheid are racism, exploitation and injustice. That being so, it cannot be reformed. It can only be dismantled and eliminated. A non-racial and democratic society must be built in its place.

To pave the way for the establishment of such a society and to avert a racial blood-bath in southern Africa, mandatory economic sanctions must be imposed on Pretoria forthwith. That is the call of the oppressed people of South Africa. It is also the call of all freedom-loving and peace-loving peoples the world over. Let us therefore work together to respond to that call with the courage and far-sightedness that is expected of us all.

Mr. KABANDA (Rwanda) (interpretation from French): The Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the first articles of the constitutions of most Members of the United Nations provide that all people are born equal, that all citizens are equal before the law, that they enjoy the same rights and the same duties and that all political freedoms and all civil, economic, social and cultural rights are guaranteed to all citizens.

These are the fundamental principles that govern the public and private life of citizens of the world who hold freedom dear. Respect for these principles is an essential prerequisite for order, security and progress.

(Mr. Kabanda, Rwanda)

In South Africa, however, we come up against a very strange and unique law, a law that bases the entire political, social, economic and cultural order on racial inequality. We are confronted with a philosophical concept that originated in 1913, on the eve of the First World War, and that differs from the Nazi philosophy in name only, for it is called apartheid.

Born in the same period as the Nazi philosophy, apartheid was radicalized in 1948, the very year in which the Universal Declaration on Human Rights was adopted, the very Declaration that proclaims the fundamental equality of men and that therefore bans and prohibits any discrimination based on race, colour, sex, religion or other opinion.

To describe the political system based on that philosophy and now in force in South Africa, I should like to quote from the statement made from this rostrum by the Prime Minister of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, Mr. Jacques Santer. He said:

"the policy of apartheid is a crime against the conscience and dignity of mankind and one that is particularly repugnant, since it has been built up into a system of government. It is contrary to the principles laid down in the Charter, as is any other policy of discrimination based on sex, race, religion or political opinion." (A/40/PV.47, p. 41)

The victims of this policy are legion: Steve Biko and Benjamin Moloise, to mention only two, are part of a long list of martyrs of the South African régime.

Nelson Mandela, leader of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), and his companions in the struggle have been suffering in the isolation of Government goals for many years, and further arrests are being made every day.

Sharpeville, Soweto, Crossroad, Port Elizabeth - all of those names bring to mind the horrors of the régime. Verwoerd and Vorster inherited the régime and consolidated it. Verwoerd paid for so doing. Botha inherited it in turn and

(Mr. Kabanda, Rwanda)

is now refining it. He is even attempting to extend it beyond South Africa's borders, and to that end he is employing every means available, including the use of armed force against neighbouring States: Lesotho and Swaziland are threatened with economic reprisals if they persist in their opposition to the régime. The Republic of Botswana, the Republic of Mozambique and the People's Republic of Angola have been subjected to manoeuvres designed to destabilize them. The goal of the Government of South Africa is obvious: it wants to instal its puppets in power in those countries.

The General Assembly, the Security Council and, indeed, the entire international community have strongly condemned such gratuitous acts of aggression and, in some cases, have called for reparations. Not only does the South African Government refuse to abide by the verdict of international public opinion, but in its arrogance it is set on pursuing its policy and perpetrating such acts as long as it feels the interests of apartheid are threatened.

Let us go back to what is happening within South Africa: it is evident that, in proclaiming a state of emergency the South African Government has in fact declared war against the black, Indian and Coloured peoples. Thus, the police have been given a free hand to engage in repression, if necessary by force of arms, against a people who have no means of defence other than their determination and their resolve to free themselves, against a people who do not even have the right to bury their dead in safety.

Apartheid advocates the separate development of the races. Yet what, from a political standpoint, can be the value of that régime that cares not a lot about reactions - of necessity negative - of the majority of the South African population, regarded as aliens in their own country. What, from an economic and social standpoint, can be the value of this system of separate development in which

(Mr. Kabanda, Rwanda)

most of the national income is devoted to the well-being of a quarter of the population, the white minority, who cannot even enjoy it in comfort because of their uncertainty about the future. How far, from a moral standpoint, must the black and Coloured peoples of South Africa bow under such an oppressive régime?

I am convinced that the régime will bring about its own demise. There are already indications of its approaching end within the white community itself, where some businessmen, tired of a false sense of material security, are beginning to react to bring about changes in the existing order. This, admittedly, is a positive sign, but it is not enough, for apartheid cannot be reformed. It must be abolished, and the sooner the better.

History, that great teacher, tells us that the end of a régime is beginning when those in power themselves create conditions that give rise to division or confrontation among citizens, when the authorities create a permanent state of war between the power and the people. Such is the case in South Africa.

Neither constitutional reforms nor the establishment of local councils or another presidential council, nor even the liberalization of policy on interracial marriage can change the system. Radical measures are needed.

If the South African Government wishes to act in the true interest of the country, if it wishes to create a happier future for its people, then, before it is too late, it must take the following steps: it must decree in clear and direct terms the total abolition of apartheid and of the laws, regulations and other measures based on it; it must proclaim racial equality in South Africa; it must abolish the bantustans and establish a single citizenship for all South Africans, whites, blacks and others of Asian origin; it must put an end to the state of emergency; it must release political prisoners, including the leader of the ANC, Nelson Mandela; it must lift the ban on political parties; it must bring the

(Mr. Kabanda, Rwanda)

leaders of various communities together so that they can study the problem of how to share power in accordance with the democratic principle of one man, one vote.

If Mr. Botha does that, he can be sure of having a united and multiracial South Africa, a South Africa in which citizens will be equal before the law in society, judged upon ability and merit.

I have simply repeated what was said on behalf of Africa by the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), His Excellency President Abdou Diouf, in this Hall. What he said is absolutely in keeping with the views of my Government, which hopes that the Security Council and the international community should the South African Government continue to turn a deaf ear to the wishes of the international community will take firm action and particularly to the legitimate complaints of the black, Indian and Coloured peoples of South Africa.

(Mr. Kabanda, Rwanda)

But since all the ways to peace have been explored without any success there would seem to be no other choice than to impose sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. Those that refuse to do this or are reluctant to envisage mandatory comprehensive economic sanctions and those who from near or far encourage the apartheid régime are thereby taking on an enormous responsibility before history.

It would seem rather strange, to say the least, that some countries are much more concerned with the negative effects for the South African people of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions on South Africa than are the South African people themselves. As President Kenneth Kaunda has said, these sentiments do not necessarily derive from philanthropic considerations.

In any event, if one has to choose between two evils, the lesser evil is always the one to choose. It is better to suffer from a passing difficulty, even a serious one, than to have to endure a chronic evil that will never end.

The international convention against apartheid in sports, which has just been submitted to the General Assembly, without doubt represents an important stage in the struggle against that system. Even if the convention does create legal problems for some Governments, it would be desirable for those Governments to ban access to their territory by South African sports clubs and at the same time to carry on a campaign to dissuade sports clubs in their countries from having sports relations with South Africa.

We cannot accept the view that there is no link between political activities and sports activities. If the South African blacks, Indians and Coloureds were not segregated in sports in South Africa itself, we could perhaps believe that there was some sense in such a statement. But that is not the case. Apartheid is a totalitarian system, and it has to be fought by all means available until it is completely abolished.

(Mr. Kabanda, Rwanda)

We welcomed, with I must say a modest sense of satisfaction, the decision of some Governments to impose selective unilateral sanctions. Going further, some have even set a deadline for the South African Government officially to abolish the apartheid régime. Once the time-limit has expired without any positive results, those Governments will take harsh measures against South Africa.

It has taken time for us to reach this stage, which my country feels is an important one, even though it is not enough given the nature of the sickness that has to be cured. We therefore congratulate the members of the Commonwealth on the agreement on South Africa they adopted at their recent meeting in Nassau.

We also welcome the clear position taken by the Nordic countries, which have always demonstrated their understanding and sympathy on matters concerning Africa, particularly those relating to southern Africa.

It is perhaps superfluous to say that time is against the South African régime. But it is not too late to remedy the situation. Several delegations, or rather all delegations, have tried to show those holding power in that régime, which seems to have been overtaken by events, the path they should take to correct the situation. That is the reasonable approach. If the authorities now in power continue obstinately to lend a deaf ear to the advice and the wishes of the United Nations, I fear they will realize too late the necessity of change.

Here I should like to quote the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Mulroney, who said:

"It is our hope - and it must surely be the hope of all - that the Republic of South Africa will come to its senses before it is completely engulfed by the shock waves of violence". (A/40/PV.47, p. 26)

I can see a danger, a great danger, threatening the peoples of South Africa - white, black, Indian and Coloured. Already, the parents and the schools of the whites are teaching young people contempt and hatred of black, Indian and Coloured

(Mr. Kabanda, Rwanda)

people. Today, the black and Coloured people are simply demanding their legitimate rights, but what would happen in the South Africa of the future if the black people were also to teach their children contempt and hatred of the whites?

If there is violence, destructive violence, it is not the black, Indian and Coloured people that wanted it, but those who hold power, power based on unjust and therefore unacceptable foundations.

Let us all work to save South Africa before it is too late.

Mr. MAHBUBANI (Singapore): The clock is ticking in South Africa. It is five minutes to midnight, perhaps four. From 1966 to 1980, the black population rose by 90 per cent, compared with a rise of only 30 per cent in the number of whites, whose share in the total of about 32 million has thus dipped from 18 per cent to 15 per cent. If present trends continue, 40 years from now the black population could reach 55 million and the white population would then amount to only 10 per cent of the total population. Against such trends, how long can the whites hope to retain total and absolute monopoly of power?

The doctrine of white supremacy was a creation of the nineteenth century, or perhaps an even earlier time. Early in this century, however, subject peoples in all the colonies began to question the fundamental premise of colonialism. They asked, can a few white men have the right to rule over millions of non-whites? Writing in 1953, Nelson Mandela said that in China, India, Indonesia and Indo-China, American, British, Dutch and French imperialism based on the concept of the supremacy of Europeans over Asians had been completely and perfectly exploded. Today, with a whole variety of ethnic groups thriving and prospering all over the world, it is preposterous that there continues to be one relic of the nineteenth century doctrine of white supremacy still surviving as we stand on the threshold of the twenty-first century. That relic, I submit, will not be allowed to enter the twenty-first century.

(Mr. Mahbubani, Singapore)

I come from a multiracial country, one that has seen its own history of racial conflict. Very early on in our history we learned that the only solution to racial conflicts is the creation of a society where all human beings, regardless of race or religion, are given a completely equal status. Only that has given Singapore racial harmony, and only that, we believe, will ever solve the problem of racial conflict in South Africa.

We believe change is inevitable. The timing and the form that such change will take in South Africa, however, remains uncertain. It may take the form of a major explosion. Speaking in this Hall so eloquently a few days ago, Bishop Desmond Tutu expressed the hope that such violence could be avoided.

(Mr. Mahbubani, Singapore)

Yet such a violent denouement will only become inevitable if the régime in South Africa and its friends overseas continue to resist the forces of change. The longer such change is postponed the more painful it will be for all South Africans.

The central point I wish to make today is that those who oppose sanctions are not doing the South African, blacks or whites, any favours. Every effort must be made to promote change in South Africa as soon as possible. The longer such change is delayed, the more chaos and bloodshed we will see in South Africa.

The present racist régime in South Africa is, to put it quite simply, a totalitarian régime. Totalitarian régimes can survive in the long run only if they can somehow win the support of the subject populations. To do so, as we learn from history, such totalitarian régimes try to wrap themselves in some mythical legitimacy, whipping up patriotic sentiment to justify their continuance in power. All too often, alas, this has worked. It will not work, however, in South Africa. Nowhere in the world, certainly not in South Africa, nor even among the few countries that accord it diplomatic recognition, does the South African régime enjoy any real legitimacy. If there is one thing that the whole world agrees upon, it is that any régime which openly, by legislation, classifies a group of people as subhuman is clearly an immoral régime.

The United Nations has played a critical role in undermining the legitimacy of the South African régime. As Mr. Garba, Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, said in this debate two days ago,

"General Assembly resolutions have established the international jurisprudence on apartheid, as it were." (A/40/PV.51, p. 9)

Those critics of the United Nations who maintain that all United Nations resolutions have been an exercise in futility should pause to consider the cumulative political and moral impact of these resolutions over the years. The more we can do, therefore, to implement any United Nations resolution, the more likely it is that resolutions on South Africa will be respected.

(Mr. Mahbubani, Singapore)

Deprived of the myth of legitimacy, the totalitarian South African régime has tried to create a myth of invincibility. Reaching back into its history, it has tried to recreate the legends of the Great Trek, the legends of the laager mentality and the legends of the Boers circling their wagons to fight against great odds, to prove to itself and the outside world that it is a stubborn and invincible race. Stubborn it may be; invincible it is not.

In today's world, if the white South Africans were to circle their wagons they would only help to accomplish what many in the United Nations have tried to do by advocating the imposition of sanctions against South Africa. With the passage of time and the growing sophistication and global interdependence of the South African economy, South Africa needs to import an unusually high proportion of intermediate goods and almost all the technology needed to run its industrial sector. Again, as Mr. Garba said,

"without foreign investment, foreign loans, foreign oil supplies, let alone foreign trade, it simply could not function." (p. 24-25)

Barely 15 months ago the South African economy seemed to be rock solid. The sophisticated political-risk analysts in the developed world, who have helped in their own way to perpetuate the myth of invincibility of the South African régime, used to assert confidently that South Africa was one of the best investment risks available. Would they dare to assert that today?

In fact, a few months ago the South African régime even stood on the verge of bankruptcy, unable to roll over its huge foreign debt. International bankers suddenly questioned the wisdom of pouring money into South Africa. The latest meeting of South African officials with the representatives of 30 major international banks, held in London on 23 October, barely a week ago, ended inconclusively. This was not an expression of moral or humanitarian concern on the part of the international bankers over the recent outrageous incidents in South

(Mr. Mahbubani, Singapore)

Africa. It was only an expression of concern on their part over the viability of the South African economy after they had made their appropriate calculations.

Here again, some conventional wisdom would like to suggest that the present difficulties are temporary. The fundamentals of the South African economy, we are assured, are rock solid.

Let us consider the fundamentals. South Africa's economy is uniquely dependent upon gold for its financial strength and for its economic growth, and no amount of economic planning can erase its fundamental vulnerability to fluctuations in the gold price. South Africa produces half the world's gold. Every decrease of \$10 in the gold price reduces South Africa's annual foreign exchange earnings by some \$220 million.

At the same time, South Africa's economy also depends heavily on diamond exports. There is an interesting new book by E. J. Epstein, The death of the diamond: the coming collapse in diamond prices, in which he documents that a South African cartel keeps world diamond prices artificially high by first purchasing all the diamonds produced all over the world and then fostering the myth that since "diamonds are for ever" they are the best safeguard against inflation. Perhaps they are, but if this myth is ever shattered, as Epstein has tried to shatter it in his book, another major hole could be knocked into the South African economy. This fundamental also turns out, on examination, to be not so solid after all. The vulnerability of its two major exports, gold and diamonds, has led to the recent shrinking of South Africa's economy by 2.1 per cent in 1985. Hence the South African rand today is worth one quarter of what it was worth in 1980, its lowest level ever.

In recent years the South African defence budget increased by 1,000 per cent between 1970 and 1981, when it reached \$US 2.76 billion. Another 21.4 per cent

(Mr. Mahbubani, Singapore)

increase was announced in 1984, at a time when the economy could barely meet the strains. Given the prevailing weaknesses in the South African economy, there could be no better time for the United Nations to send a clear message to the South African régime that it needs to change its policies.

Two sets of arguments are advanced against the imposition of sanctions. The first set claims that sanctions will only make the white régime of South Africa more stubborn, that it will force the white South Africans to circle their wagons. In today's world, as I said earlier, if they tried to do that it would only enhance the effectiveness of the sanctions. The second set of arguments suggests that sanctions will not work. If sanctions do not work, why hesitate to impose them? If sanctions do not work, why do most black South African leaders advocate them? If sanctions do not work, why does the South African régime lobby so strongly against such sanctions?

Those who oppose the imposition of sanctions are not doing the South African régime a favour. Sooner or later apartheid will have to be dismantled. The forces of history are working inevitably in that direction, as, ironically, are the present policies of the South African régime. In its effort to create a modern, sophisticated and fairly well developed industrial State, using, for instance, 60 per cent of the electricity generated in the whole of Africa, the South African régime has to create a large modern industrial working class of blacks. Between 1966 and 1980, 800,000 blacks joined this working class.

(Mr. Mahubani, Singapore)

Such a working class, once exposed to the conditions of the modern world in its workplace, can no longer meekly accept the sub-human status that apartheid tries to impose upon it. A nineteenth-century doctrine of white supremacy therefore cannot survive in a twenty-first-century sophisticated and developed economy.

There is no dam that the South African régime can build that will arrest the flow of history. But when and how the doctrine of apartheid dies will depend on the actions of South Africans - and the actions of the world community. The time when the majority of South Africans would accept this abominable and cruel system meekly is long past. The daily scenes we see of police violence and brutality, the fact that almost 800 people have been killed in the last 15 months, indicate the breadth and the depth of the opposition faced by the South African régime. Of course, the régime can increase its repression and unleash an even bloodier war against its own citizens. That might yet win them a respite internally but it would almost certainly guarantee the total loss of whatever limited support South Africa enjoys from the external world. The nervous international bankers will flee even further from South Africa. The economy will sink even more. Without economic growth, the stability of the régime will be undermined even more.

In this shrinking world, more and more South African blacks are aware that each individual human being on this globe is entitled to some basic human rights. The edifice of apartheid constructed out of measures such as the Group Areas Act, the system of influx controls and pass laws, the system of racial classifications and the creation of bantustans continues to deny the black South African even the most basic human rights in his own land.

As so many speakers have stressed in this debate, apartheid cannot be reformed. The entire system of apartheid has to be dismantled totally. Again, as Bishop Desmond Tutu said so forcefully in this Hall a few days ago, the following four points need to be implemented immediately: first, emergency rule has to be ended; secondly, apartheid must be dismantled; thirdly, political prisoners must be

(Mr. Mahbubani, Singapore)

released and political exiles must be allowed to return; and, fourthly, a dialogue should begin with the authentic representatives of black South Africans, especially Nelson Mandela. We endorse those four points.

On this fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, many world leaders have spoken at this forum. All of them have condemned apartheid. There is a need now to convey their firm and unequivocal message to the South African régime. The recent Commonwealth Summit in the Bahamas has taken a small step forward with its agreement to impose a variety of sanctions against South Africa. Let this General Assembly take another step forward by calling for comprehensive and mandatory economic sanctions as outlined in Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. We believe that only such a firm and direct message might finally convince the white minority régime in South Africa to face reality and to realize that it is ultimately in the interest of all South Africans, blacks and whites, to dismantle the cruel and inhumane apartheid régime.

Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): There is no greater abhorrence of racism than that felt by Zionism. To be a Jew and a Zionist is to be against racism. To be a Zionist is to be for the freedom of all peoples. For Israelis, for Zionists, for Jews, apartheid is the ultimate abomination. It is an expression of the cruellest inhumanity that man is capable of. It is a moral evil of the first order. It has no place in our world.

Our revulsion towards and opposition to apartheid has been expressed so often, in so many forums, by so many of our leaders - most recently, here in this Hall by Prime Minister Peres and Vice-Prime-Minister Shamir, during their visits to the United Nations - that they are well known by now. What may not be so widely known or understood is the special reason for our revulsion towards racism - a revulsion rooted in our experience, unlike that of any other people.

I am not referring here, in the first instance, merely to the terrible price - a price that I think everyone here is familiar with - exacted from the Jewish

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

people by the uncontrollable fires of racial hatred. That came much later in our history and culminated in the racist madness of Nazi anti-Semitism in this century. But to understand the primal source of our abhorrence, one must go to the womb of Jewish history and the origins of moral thought.

Modern Zionism developed, in practical terms, only in recent times; but it has its roots in a tradition of liberty and resistance to evil - especially the evil of enslavement - that reaches back thousands of years, to the beginning of our people.

The Jewish people introduced to the world the universal concept of the obligation of man to man. At a time when all mankind was shackled in vast expanses of perpetual, irredeemable slavery, the Jews introduced to the world, millenia ago, a stunning idea: that men are inherently free, that no man is naturally born a slave, and that those who are forced into slavery must be given their freedom. And this was not merely a concept: it was put into formal, explicit, written law more than 3,000 years ago. When Moses, the great law-giver, the greatest teacher in the Jewish faith, struck down the Pharaonic guard, who had himself struck a slave, he changed history for ever. The Mosaic code of liberty not only was revolutionary in relation to the vast slave despotisms of the East, like Babylon or Persia or Assyria, but was an incomprehensible concept at the time. Even in the brief flash of democracy in the West, when the prophets were preaching in Jerusalem about the innate liberty and equality of all men, when they were railing against the sins of slavery in all forms, no less a figure than Aristotle was contemporaneously - in the fifth century B.C. - writing in Athens of slaves as mere beasts of burden, as mechanical instruments, as he called them.

Democracy was to be given to a chosen few. In the West as in the East, the natural state of mankind was slavery. Now, Greece may have given the world the genius of science and abstraction, but it was from Judea - and only from Judea - that emerged the first conceptions of morality and a passion for justice and liberty.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

From that tiny dusty strip at the edge of Asia sprang the lofty teachings of Amos and Jeremiah and Isaiah, that revolutionized the history of man. "Am I my brother's keeper?" asked Cain of God in the very first pages of the Bible, and the answer comes with a certainty and a clarity that was never heard before and never improved on since: "Yes, thou art thy brother's keeper".

Man has a responsibility to his fellow man. There are universal obligations that we have to one another that transcend family or tribe or race or nation. Men are neither born slaves nor can they be allowed to become ready prey for others to pillage, or plunder or murder. We are our brothers' keepers.

But it was not only because of their moral origins that the Jews always identified with the suffering of others, and foremost with the victims of slavery and racial discrimination. Our unique identification with the blacks, with those blacks suffering today under apartheid, is also the result of our unique historical experience in the two millenia since the period of the prophets. We suffered in our exile incomparable oppression, degradation, humiliation and mutilation at the hands of others. The coupling of Jewish moral passion and Jewish historical experience is what led Jewish people to become the champions of human equality in modern times. And you can search any modern movement for liberation, from the national liberation movements of the last century - take the Italian Risorgimento or any other of the great movements - or the labour organizers in the last century and in this century, in Europe, in Latin America and elsewhere, and look at the civil rights movement in this country just a few decades ago, and you will find an inordinate number of Jews, Jewish activists, Jewish leaders, Jewish writers, Jewish agitators for the cause of liberty.

Zionism, the movement for the liberty of the Jews themselves, was thus instantly sympathetic to the quest for liberty of other oppressed peoples, but especially black people. That is why Theodor Herzl, the founder of modern Zionism,

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

wrote that after the liberation of the Jews, "We shall turn to assist in the liberation of the blacks", and that is why the black thinker, William Dubois, one of the early champions of black and African liberty, regarded Zionism as a model of liberation for the blacks. In 1919 he wrote this:

"The African movement means to us what the Zionist movement means to the Jews."

This genuine affinity with the struggle of blacks is what led Israel to share its newly found expertise in nation-building with the newly independent African nations, a relationship that was sharply curtailed by the 1973 oil embargo, but which, I am happy to say, is developing, in fact thriving once more.

This brief review of the moral foundations of Zionism and Jewish ethics and their profound empathy with black people ought to be enough to demonstrate the preposterousness of - the only word I can use is "scandalous" - this scandalous allegation that Zionism equals racism. I think that without a doubt this is the most brazen application of the "big lie technique" since Hitler. The sheer monstrosity of that slander has probably hurt the standing and the international repute of the United Nations more than any other iniquitous and imbalanced resolution that has been forced on this body by those who shun truth. But the fact that it continues to be uttered after the Israeli airlift of Ethiopian Jews to Israel is frankly grotesque. It is absurd. Nothing put the lie more clearly, more forcefully, to the slander that Zionism equals racism, nothing better illuminates the true nature of Zionism than Israel's rescue of our long-lost brethren, the black Jews of Ethiopia. While the entire world watched as thousands and tens of thousands died, Israel acted. With our meagre resources, we took action to save our black brothers. Zionism is racism? One of our writers noted:

"Tell that to the black Jews of Ethiopia kissing the tarmac in Tel Aviv.
Zionism is a victory over racism."

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

I have briefly discussed the moral foundation of our special Jewish revolution with the policy of apartheid. We share in the grief and pain of those who are suffering under its yoke. It should be abolished immediately. It should be banished, never to return.

Now I should like to turn to our accusers in the Arab world. These are the people who are the authors of this and so many other "reports" of Israel's policies vis-à-vis apartheid, as they call it. What has been their contribution to the domain of human rights and racial tolerance? I am talking about the attitudes demonstrated by many Arab Governments today, countries that are signatories and sponsors of this document, countries like Syria, the same Syria that shelters and sustains - indeed, employs - such arch-racist nazi criminals as Alois Brunner.

Here is Alois Brunner. Here is his picture in Damascus, rather happy, I must say. He is called "the right-hand man of Hitler". Here is another picture in his villa supplied by the Syrian Government in Damascus. Here is another picture of Alois Brunner with a Syrian guard to protect him, to comfort him, in Damascus. Alois Brunner was one of the greatest war criminals, one of the greatest racists in this century, but he was not the greatest. The greatest was Adolf Hitler, and Hitler appears in another picture here which I will happily circulate to representatives. This is a picture of Hitler with a man whom Yasser Arafat and other Arab leaders call their mentor and their guide: the Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin Al-Husseini, who flew to Europe, who demanded from Hitler that he establish SS squads in the East to carry on extermination in the East. Hitler said, "Well, I can't, I do not have the resources". And the Mufti said, "I will supply you with the resources, I will help you organize Moslem SS squads," which he promptly did in the Balkans and exterminated thousands of Jews. That is the mentor of the PLO and of so many others in the Arab world.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

Hitler did not only kill Jews. His racism and his hatred was not only directed at Jews. What do you think would have happened to the blacks? What happened to the other non-Aryan minorities that were not in league at that time with Hitler? He exterminated them just as promptly, and would have exterminated every last black man on earth whom he did not seek to incorporate into some slave empire.

These are the allies then, these proto-nazis and then the Nazis and then the neo-nazis that work together hand in hand with Arab extremists in Damascus, in the PLO camps, in Iraq and elsewhere.

But the record of Arab intolerance, the record of Arab leaders' intolerance, does not begin here. It itself is a natural culmination of a historical attitude, a historical practice, vis-à-vis blacks. And I would ask you to compare that with Theodor Herzl's remark that I have just mentioned? He made that remark in 1901, at the turn of the century, about the liberation of the blacks.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

In 1901 the British High Commissioner wrote to London about the Arab slave traders. He said:

"There is perhaps not another region in the Dark Continent where the hunt for slaves persists in such a terrible fashion, in such abundance and is so systematically carried out as in the British Protectorate of Northern Nigeria" - now Niger - "Every year when the grass dries slave traders go to work to round up the slaves. They are not prudent in their hunt, for those who are useless as slaves are killed in large numbers the villages are burned and the survivors abandoned to die of hunger in the forests."

The American anthropologist, James Willard, spent a great deal of time in the Sahara and investigated the slave trade. In his important book The Great Sahara, published in 1964, he writes:

"Under the efficient direction of the Arabs, the slave trade involved the whole civilized world. The exploitation of black labour was the contribution of the Arabs to mankind, for it was they who organized the vast traffic in human merchandise out of Africa to the Atlantic and Mediterranean ports."

The decrease in the black population was so great that Willard estimated that the Arab merchants had brought out 5,000 slaves a year by the Fezzane route alone, losing almost half of them on the way. By 1900 the Lake Chad region was practically depopulated. According to Willard - and this is confirmed by many other studies - 300,000 black Africans were imported into British colonies between 1680 and 1700. The total number of Africans sent overseas as slaves from 1510 to 1865 was at least 12 million.

If we accept the estimate of the famous Dr. Livingstone, who studied this problem, that at least 10 lives were lost for every one that reached the coast, the number of Africans who were captured, killed or exported during the four and a half centuries of the slave trade amounts to 120 million human beings.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

But slavery is not a thing of past centuries. It persisted officially well into the second half of this century. It was formally abolished in Saudi Arabia, for example, only in the 1960s - two decades ago - but in reality it is still being practised today in a variety of forms in the heartland of the Arabian peninsula and elsewhere in the Arab world.

The false accusation about Israel's support for apartheid is not merely an ordinary trampling upon the truth, for it is propagated by the worst offenders against the rights of the blacks in the history of the world.

The same distortion and hypocrisy have characterized the discussion about Israel's attitude to South Africa. We are accused of conducting massive trade with South Africa and singled out as though we had a unique co-operation with South Africa in every field. As with the other slander, about zionism equalling racism, the Arabs - and I should add here the Soviet bloc, which has its own respectable share in this definition - believe that if this lie is repeated often enough it will be accepted as fact. But what are the facts? Israel's diplomatic relations with South Africa and its commercial relations, such as they are, in no way imply support for South Africa's policies. There are 26 other countries - and I see most of them represented here - which have formal diplomatic missions in Pretoria, many - I would say the majority - of which would be universally agreed in this hall to be the most enlightened and respected Members of this Organization. But many, many other countries, as is well known, from every continent, maintain clandestine or less formal ties with South Africa. Does that mean that they recognize or support or in any way acquiesce, encourage or believe in or sustain the policy of apartheid? It does not mean that at all. It means that relations of one kind or another are conducted between States which disagree, and in the case of apartheid

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

vehemently disagree, and rightly so, with the policies of other countries. But that is the whole idea of the new international order on which the United Nations was founded.

What about the vaunted trade of Israel with South Africa? It is barely visible. Compared with that of Europe and of other States - even Arab States - it is insignificant. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) publishes statistics about Israel's trade with South Africa and it amounts to less than one-half of one per cent of exports and three-quarters of one per cent of South Africa's imports. It is trivial in the case of Israel's own figures as well, the trade with South Africa vis à vis the Israeli economy amounts to 1.7 per cent of total Israeli exports and 2 per cent of our imports. It is trivial both ways.

South Africa's major trading partners are seven countries. I do not have to name them here. Representatives may look them up for themselves. Together those seven countries account for well over half of South Africa's trade. The IMF's Direction of Trade for 1984 reports that Israel ranks 17th among the countries receiving South Africa's exports and 23rd among those supplying the nation's imports.

What about the Arabs? What about their trade with South Africa? The IMF does not give any figures. South Africa does not give any figures. I would say that until recently the Arab States enjoyed immunity from public exposure on this entire issue. There was a kind of conspiracy of silence in the international community to hide the truth, often by Governments which knew the truth perfectly well, because while trading in the billions of dollars with South Africa the Arabs hurled accusations at others, especially at Israel and especially here in this forum, for the very practices that they were involved in up to their necks. I suggest that it is time to tear the mask from Arab hypocrisy, for how do we know the magnitude of

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

Arab trade with South Africa because, as I have said, the Arabs do not publish the figures. There is a way of knowing. Everything that I shall now say I shall support with documents, which I shall submit and which may be circulated to delegations so that they may scrutinize the information I am about to give and be totally convinced of its veracity and, I think, of its importance.

South Africa depends on imported oil to meet the energy requirements of its armed forces and motor vehicle transportation, its economy, and imports about \$3 billion worth of oil annually. There are several anti-apartheid forces outside South Africa which recognize the critical importance of oil and South Africa's dependence on oil imports, and they have organized an embargo on sales of petroleum to Pretoria. To evade that embargo, as is well known, South Africa conducts a massive secret trade in oil, systematically concealing its sources of supply.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

In the Netherlands there is an anti-apartheid organization called the Shipping Research Bureau. It works in association with the United Nations Centre against Apartheid. It monitors tankers actually making deliveries to South Africa and, as far as possible, it traces their ownership and management, as well as the origin of the oil those tankers are carrying. Curiously - or not so curiously - the Bureau publishes the names of the owners and managers of those ships and their nationalities, but it systematically conceals the countries of origin of the oil. But if one takes the data published by the Shipping Research Bureau and cross-registers them with Lloyd's voyage records - which are public knowledge and can be obtained in any large library - one can trace the shipments to the point of origin, and the findings are striking.

The latest complete report we have is for 1984, and it gives the figures for 1981 and 1982. What do we see? Of the 49 shipments that the Bureau was able to trace to origin in the years 1981 and 1982, 37 shipments - that is, 76 per cent of the total - came from four Arab countries. Saudi Arabia for 39 per cent, the United Arab Emirates for 24 per cent, Oman for 10 per cent and Kuwait for 2 per cent. An additional 6 per cent came from Iran.

The 1981-82 survey also showed supplies from Iraq, Qatar, Bahrain, Abu Dhabi and Dubai. It is also significant that the Arab share of South African oil, substantial as it already is - 76 per cent in those years - has grown even further in recent years. That figure, 76 per cent, that appears in the 1984 report is significantly higher - it is almost double - the figure in the 1981 report. In 1981 it was 38 per cent. So it has grown by a factor of 2 between the 1981 report and the 1984 report.

As far as we can see, based on the information that we have in 1985, it has gone well past that. It went from 38 per cent to 76 per cent - to what? Eighteen shipments have been traced so far in 1985 and one in the 1985 report, and 17 of

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

those have been traced to the Arabian Gulf - that is, 95 per cent. Other Governments have other sources of information and that figure of 95 per cent has recently been corroborated by the Under-Secretary of the Norwegian Foreign Ministry, Mr. G. Froyanes. Speaking in the Norwegian Parliament - this was reported in Oslo on 9 July - he said:

"Ninety-five per cent of the oil supplied to South Africa comes from Arab States on the Persian Gulf, one half of this in direct shipments."

What is the financial value of that oil? If we take a minimalist view, if we look only at the oil that we know, on the basis of the information with which I will supply the Assembly - that is, the oil that has been definitely traced to the Persian Gulf - Arab exports comprise a minimum of \$1.1 billion per year. But if untraced oil comes from sources in the same proportions as the Norwegian Deputy Minister says, and as we can confirm, Arab oil exports to South Africa comprise about \$2.2 billion a year. This makes the Arab States bigger exporters to South Africa than Britain, at \$2.1 billion, or Japan, at \$1.7 billion, and it makes them much bigger exporters than Israel, whose total trade - not just oil - amounts to \$100 million. Indeed, Arab oil exports alone to South Africa are about 20 times as great as Israel's entire trade.

But what about the other Arab trade with South Africa? The Arab States are also large-scale importers of diamonds and gold from South Africa. World trade in those commodities passes through intermediate markets, often London in the case of gold, and it is very hard to trace it. I hope that for the next General Assembly, for the next meeting on this item of the agenda, we shall be able to provide the Assembly with equally detailed statistics and data on this part of Arab trade.

What is clear today on the basis of the evidence already available is that the Arab posture - internationally and especially at the United Nations, where they pose as great friends of black Africa and spread gross exaggerations and

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

distortions about Israel's relations with that country - is a sham. The Arabs fuel, literally fuel, South Africa's economy and they make a fortune doing it.

Apartheid is too great an evil to be cynically manipulated by a campaign of defamation and slander, particularly when the slander is perpetrated as a tool in an obsessive campaign against Israel, against a Member State of this body. Racism is indivisible. One cannot oppose it in one part of the world and support or acquiesce in it in another. Let us therefore unite in a common effort to wipe out apartheid, anti-Zionism, anti-Semitism and all the other "antis", all the other diseased forms of racism and intolerance, that plague our world. Let us cleanse the earth of those evils, for the benefit of all mankind.

Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): We are pleased that the General Assembly is considering the item on apartheid at this particular time, when the attention of the whole world is directed at the popular struggle of the masses of South Africa against the arrogant régime of Pretoria.

The struggle of the people of South Africa is not new. It began with the European colonialist, expansionist, Zionist attack that swept Africa, Asia and Latin America.

(Mr. El-Pattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

That attack reached its culmination in the nineteenth century and some of its vestiges are with us today, one of them being Israel.

What is new in the South African struggle, however, is its comprehensive nature, for which there is no precedent since the inception of institutional apartheid in 1948. Today, it is being waged by every sector of the courageous people of South Africa, in every part of the country. This popular uprising is a revolution against injustice, foreign investment, exploitation and slavery. It is a revolution aimed at preserving the unity of the country. It is a revolution for self-determination in order to establish a régime of the people to replace that of the white minority. It is a revolution waged by a people determined to maintain its national identity, its freedom and the fruits of its labours. It is a revolution against alienation and marginalization. It is a revolution for freedom, equality and justice and against the divisive status quo, against relations based on black serving white. In other words, it is a revolution by the people against the imported colonialists; it is a revolution that is national as much as political, economic and social, a revolution whose goal is to rebuild social relations not on a basis of giving but on a basis of the restoration of territory and national wealth usurped by force.

The revolution aims at freeing labour relations from slavery and achieving equality so that human beings may be equal in rights and duties, and not in a relationship of slave and master. The new social contract this popular revolution is striving to achieve is a contract of freedom and equality that will replace the contract of slave and master that has been condemned by peoples everywhere and that is today being undermined and eliminated in southern Africa. Soon, the plains, hills, rivers, valleys and forests of that land will return to their legitimate owners, and they will enjoy its riches.

(Mr. El-Pattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

Today, we are witnessing a complete change in the situation, a shift in the balances in the false beliefs and predictions dictated by the arrogance of the white minority and the intransigence of the colonialists. The white minority has taken refuge in its cities, farms and ranches and uses and exploits our black brothers in South Africa in its service. Today, we see that minority that built up its defences barricaded against the black peoples harnessed to serve it. That minority thought that it had broken the black majority and sapped its will. That exploitative minority is today the prisoner of its own structures, institutions, actions and plans. In spite of the attempts of the white minority to transfer the battle to the black ghettos and bantustans, the flames of the battle have reached the enclaves of the white minority. The calculations of the white planners have proved wrong; they have fallen into the pit that they dug for others. In all their calculations, they and their friends overlooked a basic factor in the equation, namely, the ability of peoples to break the yoke of slavery.

In the wake of these developments some of the white settlers would prefer to abandon the ship that is being tossed by the wind and waves and seek safety from the stormy seas of the black population. Deep down, those whites know full well that the masses can forget and show tolerance, because it is in the nature of all noble revolutions to forgive and extend mercy to those who repent, adopt the principle of equality among peoples and believe in the rights of citizenship. As for those who remain on that ship, they are doomed to destruction.*

The courageous resistance of the people of South Africa has spread throughout the entire country, rallying to its ranks students, labourers, housewives, small entrepreneurs, brothers, sons, the relatives of the thousands in prison and under

*Mr. Agius (Malta), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian
Arab Republic)

arrest. However, the course of that resistance is being obstructed by an arrogant, intransigent Power equipped with the most sophisticated weapons. The battle, therefore, will not be either easy or short. This is because of the ferocious nature of the settler colonialist régime, which is seeking to retain power, and also because of the role it plays within the imperialist group.

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

South Africa and Israel are not the only ones in that respect, and Israel collaborates in playing its role in the imperialist group. Israel is that imperialist group's base in our region. The struggle of the peoples of South Africa is in reality a confrontation on three fronts: first, the domestic front, where the masses have to destroy with their hands the structure of apartheid; secondly, the front of the transnational corporations and the foreign investments that are defended by those who reap the profits inside and outside the country and who must and will be completely eliminated by the masses; thirdly, the front of the political, economic, military and strategic interests of world imperialism. In addition to its strategically excellent military situation, South Africa is an advance base of the policy of hegemony imposed on the African continent and several other parts of the world.

The interdependence of those three fronts and their unity places a heavy responsibility on the popular resistance of South Africa, which is fighting for itself and for others also. The interrelationship of those fronts also places a heavy responsibility on the United Nations, which must support the cause of liberation against the enemies of humanity, those who stand to benefit most from perpetuation of the life of a régime that is crushing a whole people to secure prosperity and domination for itself.

Events in South Africa do not represent a civil war. It is a local war being waged by the white minority on its own behalf and on behalf of others, for the benefit of Western capital and the imperialist military machine. The responsibility of the United Nations must go beyond mere expressions of sympathy for the people of South Africa or declarations of solidarity with the front-line States, the issuance of condemnations and non-binding resolutions. This responsibility must result in specific support for the movements of national liberation in South Africa and Namibia.

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian
Arab Republic)

The responsibility of the United Nations also involves support for the front-line States by all means and in all forms because those countries are, by virtue of the policies of Pretoria, actual front and confrontation parties - and the confrontation was imposed on those countries. Aggression against those countries has become a daily habit.

The work of the United Nations is in fact a synonym for armed struggle. Resolutions, speeches and wishes cannot replace action by the United Nations.

The ideal way to shorten the path to liberation and to alleviate the pain produced by the policy of oppression against the South African masses is to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria régime under Chapter VII of the Charter.

However, world imperialism has opted for prolongation of the conflict to maintain the agent régime. It has resorted to, and will resort to, obstruction of every serious international action to prevent the imposition of sanctions. The resolutions of the Security Council, which are controlled largely by the United States on this particular question, are resolutions with loopholes that can be used by the arms dealers and the lustful transnational corporations to bring about results contrary to those resolutions.

The realities we are considering testify to the fact that those propaganda resolutions are the reason people are left to die. Washington, which supports by all means the nazi régime in Pretoria, is still advocating the constructive engagement policy, the bankruptcy of which has been proven, particularly since the energies of the national resistance in South Africa have exploded as a result of that policy, which runs against the course of history. That policy has led to escalation of the conflict and insecurity and instability throughout southern Africa.

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian
Arab Republic)

Pretoria has escalated its acts of aggression against neighbouring States, including Angola, Mozambique, Botswana and Lesotho. It has delayed solution of the Namibian question. Even so, the spokesman for the White House says that the United States will not reconsider its policy vis-à-vis South Africa; rather, it believes in the objectives of that policy, according to The New York Times of 23 July 1985. In spite of the facts, in his statement on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations President Reagan made no reference to the situation in South Africa, as though there were no crisis, no tragedy taking place there. That prompted Bishop Tutu, who seeks to sustain human life and who advocates the non-use of force, to say that that statement supported the racist policy of South Africa and was in itself racist.

The valuable report before us under this item leaves no room for doubt that, had it not been for the collaboration between some NATO countries and South Africa, it would have been possible to alleviate the suffering, prevent so much bloodshed and accelerate the elimination of apartheid. The apartheid régime still enjoys the support and assistance of some of those countries and commands a significant part of the abilities of world imperialism at a time when world public opinion is strongly demanding that all relations with South Africa be severed, individually and collectively.

In the area of trade, the report of the Committee against Apartheid refers to the fact that some European countries object to the imposition of trade sanctions, and affirms that there has been an increase in the trade relations between the South African régime and some Western European and North American States. There has been a remarkable increase in the number of visits by European trade missions to South Africa.

(Mr. El-Pattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

Paragraph 250 mentions an increase of 5 per cent in the gross national product during 1984 and of 4.5 per cent in the gross domestic product. If one refers to table 7 on page 57 it will be noted that the Western democracies, foremost among which is the United States, are South Africa's leading trading partners as regards exports and imports.

Paragraph 259 states that South Africa's exports to the United States accounted for 9 per cent of its total exports and that South Africa's imports from the United States accounted for 17 per cent of its total imports.

We refer to these statistics and to table 1, because we wish to refute the ideas propounded in the General Assembly and the Security Council and directed against the third world and other countries. There are some who say that the Western democracies must, in view of their nature and objectives, pursue a policy that is compatible with the wishes and aspirations of the peoples. Where are these democratic values when those Western countries contribute to the perpetuation of persecution and slavery? It is not strange, then, that racist Israel is included in the list of Western democracies.

General Assembly document A/40/22/Add.2 and Security Council document S/17562/Add.2, dated 14 October 1985, testify to the fact that the record of Israel is replete with cases of the plundering of our rights by the Zionist entity, an entity that is no different from South Africa, and they also refer to information on increasing collaboration in all areas between the Pretoria and Tel Aviv régimes. Both these régimes are based, in theory and practice, on the persecution, displacement, suppression, killing and plundering of the indigenous population, and the replacement that population by foreigners. Those resolutions go back to 1948.

Document A/40/22/Add.2 also says that Israel imposed itself on Arab lands in Palestine by force and that the last 10 years have witnessed an increasing

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

collaboration between the two régimes of Tel Aviv and Pretoria amounting to a virtual alliance threatening peace and security in southern Africa and the Middle East but also constituting a threat to international peace and security.

Suffice it to quote paragraph 5 of the report, containing a message to the Special Committee against Apartheid from Prime Minister Robert Mugabe of Zimbabwe:

"This evil crime (apartheid) is not, of course, confined to the African continent. Indeed, the doctrine of zionism is as dangerous and racist in concept as apartheid and is as much the real cause of conflict within the Middle East as apartheid itself is the central cause of conflict and tension within South Africa and in the entire region itself.

"Nothing demonstrates, or more clearly proves, the affinity between zionism and apartheid than the undeniable, ever-growing level of political, military and economic co-operation between the Boers and the Zionists - a truly unholy alliance indeed.

"Just as in South Africa there can and will be no real movement towards peace and stability until those who have it in their power to bring peace accept that apartheid itself must be eliminated, so must those same people realize that no lasting peace will come to the Middle East until the doctrine of zionism is abandoned and until meaningful, sincere dialogue begins between all parties involved in the conflict.

"Racial discrimination is indeed a scourge and a most dangerous one at that, but unlike disease or drought or famine - these being the calamities of nature - scourges such as apartheid and zionism are avoidable because they are man-made and are brought about deliberately and consciously by man.

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

"Of course, the Boers and Zionists have no intention of abandoning their cherished but so totally discredited philosophies of racial superiority. No, we cannot expect that of them for they are far too bigoted and too blind to see the tragic folly of their ways." (A/40/22/Add.2, para. 5)

After considering various areas of collaboration, particularly in the nuclear, military and economic fields, collaboration with the bantustans and academic, cultural, sports and other collaboration, the Committee ended its report with the following conclusions and recommendations:

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

"The Special Committee expresses its deep concern at the increasing and continuing collaboration between Israel and South Africa, and in particular their close military and nuclear co-operation, which constitutes a defiance of the United Nations and a threat to peace and security not only in southern Africa and the Middle East but also in the world at large.

"The Special Committee condemns this diabolical alliance between Israel and South Africa and calls for concerted international action against it".

(A/40/22/Add.2, paras. 39 and 40)

It is no secret that Israel has adopted the policies of its twin brother, the racist Pretoria régime. The following was published in The New York Times on 12 August 1985:

(spoke in English)

"Israel and South Africa have enjoyed increasingly warm relations since almost all the black African States broke diplomatic ties with Israel between 1967 and 1974. According to South African Foreign Trade Organizations figures, Israel exported about \$65 million worth of goods to South Africa last year, including animal feeds, canned goods and electronic, and imported about \$100 million from there, nearly half of it mineral products such as coal. Israel also reportedly imports nearly \$1 billion annually in South African uncut diamonds, but this amount is not included in official trade figures because they are purchased through London markets".

(continued in Arabic)

As for the Israeli Prime Minister, this is what he has said, according to the same source, The New York Times:

(spoke in English)

"Peres, in a speech here last night, said that Israel will continue to maintain diplomatic relations with Pretoria, noting that there is a large

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

Jewish community in South Africa. The community numbers about 130,000, and many of them are among the leading foreign financial supporters of Israel".

(continued in Arabic)

In regard to military collaboration between Israel and South Africa, the Economist reported the following in its issue of 20 July:

(spoke in English)

"Yet Israeli-South African relations, especially military ones, are the cosiest of all. A host of joint research projects bind the countries together. For instance, South African steel has helped to give the Merkava an extra-strong armour-plating; South Africa now makes its own version of the Kfir. A joint submarine-building project is under way; and - most sensitive of all - South African uranium (from next-door Namibia) is thought to have been used to develop Israel's capacity for making a nuclear bomb".

(continued in Arabic)

The Syrian Arab Republic, on the basis of its commitment to the resolutions adopted by the conference of the Foreign Ministers of the non-aligned countries, held in Luanda from 4 to 7 September 1985, fully supports the request of the Organization of African Unity for the convening next year, on the tenth anniversary of the Soweto uprising, of an international conference for the imposition of sanctions.

The Syrian Arab Republic pays a tribute to the victims of the racial oppression in South Africa. It expresses its admiration for and salutes the heroic resistance of the people of Azania - including children, youth, women, the elderly - against the racist killers and the gangs of the apartheid régime. We support the people of South Africa just as we support the people of Palestine. We consider that the struggle against the two régimes is a struggle against a common

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab
Republic)

enemy that has desecrated the Territories involved and has tried to trample upon all that is sacred and upon freedoms. We are confident that victory will be the ally of the struggling peoples on their path to the restoration of their legitimate rights.

That is a position of principle of ours - no matter how imperialism tries to disrupt the unity of our struggle. We, like our African brothers, know in advance that our common struggle is a struggle for our destiny. The question is: to be or not to be. And we will be. That is the logic of history.

We listened to the statement this morning by Ambassador Waters of the United States, who warned and advised us that

"one of the lessons of history is that we do not remember the lessons of history".

That is a view which we adopt and with which we agree. South Africa and Israel must accept the wisdom of those words by the representative of the United States.

This morning - and I would make it clear that this is part of my statement and not an exercise of my right of reply, as yet - we were the target of crazy, mad attacks by Israel, besieged in the General Assembly, by boycotted Israel, by Israel whose representative empties the General Assembly Hall whenever he speaks. What he said contradicts words of wisdom of Omar ibn-al-Khattab: "How could you enslave people when they were born free to their mothers?".

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

I am honoured that our President comes from a country with which we have had links of civilization for several centuries. He knows the exchanges that have taken place between our countries. European civilization today is a direct outcome of the Spanish-Arab interaction. During the Arab presence in Spain civilization flourished, and the Dark Ages, the Middle Ages, of Europe, came to an end.

That immigrant who came to my country, Palestine, that imported immigrant, comes to insult the Arabs, denying them the credit for being the first to abolish slavery, whether of whites or blacks. It was the first civilization to do it - the Islamic Arab civilization.

We come to the Assembly, and instead of hearing a clear condemnation of South Africa, instead of our making efforts to take action or at least to issue a declaration of support for the people of South Africa in its struggle, a people that is threatened with annihilation, we see the representative of the Zionist entity, which is installing settlements in Palestine, a part of the Arab territories, raising a magazine and telling the Assembly lies. When have cheap magazines been part of the Assembly's agenda? Does not that incident indicate that Israel does not take the meeting seriously? Is not that an insult to the Arabs in Asia and Africa, an insult to all our African brothers, particularly those in South Africa? Is it not a real insult, when Israel is a pioneer in its collaboration with South Africa, importing uranium from it, exporting arms to it and taking part in killing the sons of the people of South Africa, who are today launching an honourable uprising.

It is not enough to be complacent, to praise oneself, to have sufficient ego to insult others. Praising oneself is not enough to divert attention. I wish to quote from The Washington Post of 18 August this year, which said that the Israeli Cabinet had unreservedly objected to the policy of apartheid in South Africa. But what does the reporter tell us in the same article in that very respectable paper? It is

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

respectable, because it is published in the neighbourhood of the White House. That respectable paper and its respectable correspondent, Mr. William Claiborne, say (spoke in English):

"Communications Minister Amnon Rubinstein, who presented a formal motion to condemn apartheid, South Africa's policy of strict racial segregation, said after the Cabinet session that he did not press for economic sanctions 'because Israel is in a state where beggars cannot be choosers. We are boycotted by so many countries in the world that where we have trade we cannot afford to give it up'."

(continued in Arabic)

In spite of that, the Israeli representative claims that his country's trade with South Africa is trivial in volume, that it amounts to less than the deals made between other countries and South Africa.

I like American newspapers, because they report from Israel what they like. The same article says that when the Communications Minister was asked why he (spoke in English):

"did not also condemn the extended emergency regulations imposed by South Africa in the face of growing racial violence there, Rubinstein replied: 'Nations have to be very careful about how they judge other countries. One must limit oneself to issues of human rights, issues of one's philosophy, one's credo. Israel, too, has emergency regulations but has not used anything like the ferocity used in South Africa.'"

(continued in Arabic)

I have faithfully quoted that paragraph. What does it indicate? What do we understand from it? What are we to understand from it after we have listened to the Israeli representative? It means that lies and hypocrisy are the suggested means to combat apartheid and to deal with it. That is the reality we face.

Mr. MOREL (Seychelles): Allow me to begin by extending to Ambassador de Piniés my delegation's warmest congratulations on his election to preside over the fortieth session of the general Assembly of the United Nations. We are confident that his vast experience, wisdom and long association with the United Nations will be instrumental in successfully presiding over the deliberations of this historic session.

It also gives me pleasure to congratulate his predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Zambia, Ambassador Paul Lusaka, for the dedication and devotion with which he guided the work of the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

Apartheid is evil, hideous, monstrous. Apartheid is a crime against humanity, an affront to the conscience of mankind. The policies of apartheid of the racist régime in Pretoria constitute a source of tension, instability and conflict, endangering national, regional and international peace and security.

It is sad to note that the very fundamental principles forming the bedrock of this Organization and of the brotherhood and sisterhood of humanity are severely threatened by the arrogance and greed of the minority régime in Pretoria. Despite the creation of tricameral parliaments - a mere elaboration of the doctrine of separation - the present, sad reality in South Africa is that racism is the order of the day. The majority is still denied participation in the process of government and the carnage continues unabated. During the past year, the only action we have witnessed is the escalation of violence within South Africa. In the pursuit of their noble struggle against oppression, exploitation and the denial of their right to exercise fully their legitimate rights to self-determination, the opponents of apartheid have been faced with arbitrary arrests, imprisonment without trial and tragic and brutal massacres. Nearly a thousand people have been killed in the streets of South Africa during the past 12 months, and the incarceration of thousands of school-children, women and workers daring to demand justice and equality still persists.

(Mr. Morel, Seychelles)

Not content with bringing misery, destruction and bloodshed to its own people, the racist régime has continued to export violence to neighbouring countries with the aim of destabilizing them.

The recent barbaric acts of aggression against innocent people in Angola, such as the sending of commando units to blow up the Cabinda oil installations in Angola in the hope of crippling the economy of that country, the recent cold-blooded murder of innocent people in Gaborone, Botswana and the different actions of the régime against Lesotho, Zambia, Mozambique and Zimbabwe, are clear manifestations of the régime's cycle of violence and destabilization. We, the people of Seychelles, will always remember the aggression by South Africa against our sovereignty and territorial integrity in November 1981.

The intensity and dimension of the uprisings and demonstrations in South Africa show that the patience of the oppressed has been exhausted. My country has never missed an opportunity to appropriately condemn the policies of apartheid both at home as well as in international forums. At great cost to our country, both in security and economic terms, we have implemented existing international resolutions against apartheid including the banning of South African Airways from landing on our soil. Let this be an expression of solidarity with the oppressed in South Africa and with the democratically minded.

My delegation believes that only the eradication of apartheid and the establishment of majority rule on the basis of free and fair exercise of universal adult suffrage by all people in a united and non-fragmented South Africa can lead to a just and lasting solution of the explosive situation prevailing in South Africa and southern Africa.

We therefore wish to reiterate as a matter of urgency the course of action proposed in the Nassau Communiqué and call on the authorities in Pretoria to heed those actions.

(Mr. Morel, Seychelles)

My delegation also wishes to make a vibrant call for the termination of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia as well as the imposition of comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions on South Africa, particularly by those nations which have the capability to make the greatest difference.

I should like to conclude by saying that the dismantling of apartheid will become reality only if there is concerted action by all concerned, especially those Powers that wield influence on South Africa. We have recently witnessed a dependent and vulnerable South Africa succumb to economic pressure from Western countries. This vulnerability was demonstrated by the nervousness that led to a heavy depreciation of South African financial instruments on international markets. The hope is that all the recent events have made it clear that the people of South Africa will not be cowed into submission. As the Special Communiqué on South Africa adopted by the Non-Aligned Movement in their recent Ministerial Conference in Luanda, Angola, stated:

"The countdown to the collapse of apartheid has started in earnest."

Mr. GOMEZ BOLAND (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): When it is a matter of defending the freedom of peoples placed under the yoke of a system as galling to human dignity as apartheid, the Government of Bolivia cannot remain indifferent. That is why my delegation, as in previous years, is raising its voice in this debate once again to express its absolute and unqualified condemnation of this despicable practice, which is in every respect incompatible with the Charter and constitutes a crime against humanity and a threat to international peace and security.

The population of Bolivia is made up several ethnic cultural groups which have learned to live in peace and harmony with each other, constituting a true nation. Our society is made up for the most part of rural populations of American origin,

(Mr. Gomez Boland, Bolivia)

of mixed race and whites. It is a society in which all enjoy equal rights, freedoms and guarantees:

"without distinction as to race, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, origin, economic or social condition, or distinction of any other kind,"

In conformity with what is laid down in article 6 of the Political Constitution of Bolivia, which provides the cornerstone for my country's legislation. That is why every Bolivian is filled with revulsion over the fact that in other countries there should persist racist régimes such as that of South Africa where the heinous régime of apartheid, which violates the most elementary human rights, still endures.

Despite countless resolutions, decisions and appeals from this Organization in the last 40 years, that is to say, virtually since its very creation, South Africa continues to defy the world, seeking to impose and to maintain by force its shameful system of racial discrimination.

We believe that the time has come to consider and further to adopt appropriate sanctions against South Africa until we have reached the complete eradication of apartheid and the establishment of a democratic government with freedom for all South Africans, which will make it possible to resolve the conflict in that country in a just and lasting way. This was also stated last August by the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of the Non-Aligned Countries.

(Mr. Gomez Boland, Bolivia)

The arrogance and high-handedness of the Pretoria régime cannot and should not continue. My delegation received with deep indignation the news of the execution on 18 October of Benjamin Moloise, perpetrated by the South African Government despite the appeals addressed to it by the international community that his life should be spared. Accordingly, we reiterate our condemnation of that murder, and from this rostrum we pay a heart-felt tribute to the memory of that South African martyr who gave his life in one of the most noble and just causes, the struggle for man's freedom and dignity.

We hope that barbaric acts such as the brutal murder of Mr. Moloise and of many other people will not be repeated in South Africa or in any other country of the world. On the contrary, we hope that there will be an end to all unjust and wrongful actions and situations, such as the long imprisonment of Nelson Mandela. We address an appeal to the Government of South Africa for the immediate and unconditional release of Mr. Mandela and the other political prisoners and detainees who are at present imprisoned in the gaols of that country.

My delegation wishes to point to the efforts made by Bishop Desmond Tutu in his struggle against racism, and we point to the efforts of made by Bishop Tutu in his struggle against racism, and we promise our firmest support for that cause. In paying a tribute to the efforts of Mr. Bishop Tutu, we are at the same time paying a tribute to the majority of South Africans, who are fighting heroically to resist the injustices of apartheid.

In conclusion, I wish to place on record the support of my Government for the work being done by the Special Committee against Apartheid and the Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against Apartheid in Sports. We hope that in the not too distant future, thanks to the work and perseverance of these Committees and other institutions and people committed to this work, mankind

(Mr. Gomez Boland, Bolivia)

will be completely free of the hateful system of apartheid and of all other forms of racial discrimination.

Mr. Khalil (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): The events that have taken place during the past few months in South Africa have clearly shown the extent of the opposition of the black majority of the citizens of that State to the policy of apartheid imposed upon it by the régime of Pretoria. They have also shown that the Pretoria régime, in dealing with these events, has clearly depended on gross violence as the only means of its survival. Instead of those events being considered as a cause for review of their policies and racist practices, they have been exploited as a reason to impose a state of emergency, to tighten the hold of that régime on the regions inhabited by the black citizens, and to eliminate any resistance or opposition, be it the spontaneous opposition of the broad masses or the organized opposition of the church and trade unions.

However, the increased and intensified opposition of the black people has spread to new areas. They have shown that, regardless of the violence that the Pretoria régime is using against the black citizens, it will not be able to stifle this resistance and to control the masses rejecting racist practices and calling for their just and legitimate rights and dignity.

This revolution inside South Africa has led to a reaction of the human conscience in various places and in all walks of life. The international community has become perfectly cognizant of the reality of the racist practices in South Africa, despite the attempts by Pretoria to deceive world opinion through the introduction of what are called reforms of the apartheid policy, regardless of the fact that this apartheid policy cannot be reformed but must be totally and completely eliminated.

Here again, the Pretoria régime has shown, through its practices and through its Prime Minister, that it pays no heed or consideration to the condemnation and

(Mr. Khalil, Egypt)

denunciation of the international community, and intends to continue to apply those policies, and to continue to challenge the international will.

There remains the question of what the international community can do and what measures can be taken to counter such acts by the Pretoria régime and its insistence on using violence against the black majority.

Mr. Oliver Tambo, the Chairman of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) responded to this question when he said in a speech made while visiting Lisbon on 20 October:

"It is important that the international community translate its pressure on the racist régime of South Africa into specific and concrete measures, for it has become clear that mere condemnations are futile."

The delegation of Egypt wishes in this context to express appreciation to the Governments and popular organizations which declared their rejection of the practices and measures adopted by the Pretoria régime, and of the acts of oppression and suppression against the majority of the population, and also to those organizations and Governments which have expressed their determination to apply sanctions against that régime. However, we believe that this should not be the alternative to a clear, specific measure to be adopted by the Security Council to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, in order to compel this régime to abide by the resolutions of the Organization and to abandon the policy of apartheid, which the General Assembly has declared to be a crime against humanity.

The crushed masses of South Africa have carried out their responsibilities in combating racism, and they have paid a heavy price in the blood of their people, many having died during the events that took place in September last year, in addition to the fact that thousands of the black people opposing apartheid are imprisoned, detained and tortured. Daily we read in the newspapers of new events

(Mr. Khalil, Egypt)

and incidents, and today we have heard the news of the death of a number of militant blacks in a very ugly manner.

Therefore it now falls to the international community, and to the United Nations which expresses the will of that community, to shoulder its responsibility in order to alleviate the sufferings of this heroic people and put an end to the hateful practice of apartheid.

The use of violence by Pretoria is not something new. The régime as such was founded on violence, both internally and externally. It continues to occupy the Territory of Namibia illegally and is carrying out acts of aggression against neighbouring African States. It is also creating disturbances and problems in the area. These should be considered as different facets of the same problem. The extent of the violence of the régime has reached an unprecedented level of brutality and intensity. It has become the main element and cause of instability and problems in the area. It has also exposed the area to various elements of influence from outside, and we are not exaggerating when we say that to allow the régime of South Africa to continue its racist policies inside the country and its acts of aggression against neighbouring States, together with its continuing occupation of Namibia, will have far-reaching consequences, not only for southern Africa but also for Africa as a whole and for world peace and security.

We are in full agreement with what has been stated in the Declaration of the recent Ministerial Regional Conference on Security, Disarmament and Development in Africa, held in Lomé between 13 and 16 August 1985. We fully agree with its statement that the elimination of the apartheid system and the attainment of immediate independence by Namibia in accordance with the pertinent resolutions of the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity would greatly reduce the climate of tension and conflict in southern Africa, and enhance the prospects for disarmament, development, security and peaceful co-operation throughout Africa.

(Mr. Khalil, Egypt)

The Egyptian delegation wishes to express its appreciation to the Special Committee against Apartheid, and in particular to its Chairman, Mr. Garba, for their efforts to follow and record all the events taking place in South Africa, and for their work in organizing conferences and seminars to reveal the truth about apartheid.

Egypt reaffirms its support for the four points set out here by Bishop Desmond Tutu. Egypt has always stood firmly and strongly by its brothers in South Africa fighting for their legitimate right to justice, equality and human dignity. We take this opportunity to reiterate our determination to provide the maximum possible material and moral support to that heroic people and its national liberation movements, until their aspiration to a democratic State, free from distinctions and discrimination between citizens, is fulfilled.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the Observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization, in accordance with resolution 3237 (XXIX), of 22 November 1974.

Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO)): At the outset, I wish to place on record our great appreciation of the work done by the Special Committee against Apartheid and the personal efforts of its Chairman, Ambassador Garba.

Before the Security Council the other day, in an attempt to justify the aggression of Israel against Tunisia, the representative of the racist junta in Tel Aviv complained that more than 600 attacks had killed or severely wounded more than 75 Israelis during the past year. Naturally, those attacks have been described by many different names, but as a result the Israeli repressive measures escalated and the forces of occupation became wilder and more barbarous, to the extent that they attacked a peace-loving State Member of this Organization, Tunisia.

I mention this because in the same period our comrades-in-arms in southern Africa developed a qualitative and quantitative change in their legitimate

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

struggle against the racist régime of Pretoria. For them it is no longer a matter of pleas, or calls, or appeals, in an endeavour to arouse the humanitarian emotions and consciousness of the world. It is not a struggle to be allowed legally to marry a white "blondie" with blue eyes. It is a revolution, the national liberation struggle of a people to achieve its full political, social and economic rights. It is the struggle by a people to attain and exercise human rights. That struggle has turned out to be the only way to attain those rights, simply because non-violence has only entrenched the obduracy of the racists. The struggle for self-determination is a legitimate course of action, and in the case of Namibia, South Africa and Palestine we, the peoples of those places, have the right to pursue that struggle by all available means, including, of course, rightful armed struggle. That course has become an inalienable right and has been reaffirmed in a number of General Assembly resolutions, in particular resolution 3070 (XXVIII), dated 30 November 1973.

The mere affirmation of the inalienable right of a people to self-determination is not the answer; it is not the solution. And in this context even the right of self-determination of the Palestinian people has been denied by the Washington Administration.

What is really needed is more than lip-service or good wishes. What is needed and demanded from the international community is action to eliminate, eradicate, the ideology, the policy and the practice of the abhorrent racist apartheid régime.

A number of speakers have asserted and affirmed that comprehensive mandatory sanctions, as provided for in the Charter, should be imposed on the régime in Pretoria. The argument that economic sanctions would bring more harm and misery to the "poor black worker" is an insult to human intelligence. Those who shed crocodile tears seem to be calling for the revival of the serf-suzerain,

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

relationship, or the slave-master relationship, or, in more recent terms, the relationship between the exploited and the transnational cartels.

So-called economic integration is a farce. We may not have heard about it in this Hall, but we have heard from many other people that in South Africa there is economic integration of the whites and the blacks. That is a farce.

What is needed is a radical change, a commitment to the international consensus, and the effective eradication of discrimination between human beings on the basis of race, colour or ethnic origin.

Violent resistance to a racist régime, whether in South Africa, Namibia or occupied Palestine, is not incidental; it is not accidental; it is not the response to some whim. It is a historical inevitability. The remedy comes through addressing the real issue, which is racism, whether we call it apartheid or Zionism. The issue is alien subjugation and foreign occupation. The issue is anachronistic ideologies and policies. It is as if the world had forgotten what nazism had brought to it and the miseries it suffered, even though this is the year in which we are celebrating the fortieth anniversary of the defeat of Hitler and his nazi ideology.

The issue is the defiance of racist régimes or juntas. The issue really is the support that those régimes and juntas receive, covertly or overtly, from the Washington Administration and the administrations of Western Powers.

There is a linkage between Pretoria and Tel Aviv that, whatever may be said in this Hall, cannot be denied. Ideologically speaking, apartheid and Zionism are ideas whose realization and affirmation are a negation and refutation of all else. Zionists and apartheid Afrikaners maintain that they are answerable to no one.

Malan - who, as we all know, was the South African Prime Minister when the Afrikaners finally gained unfettered political power, best expressed the position of his Party when he said:

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

"Our history" - that is his history - "is the greatest masterpiece of the centuries. We hold this nationhood as our due for it was given us by the Architect of the Universe"

In this context he is referring to Almighty God.

"His [God's] aim was the formation of a new nation among the nations of the world. The last hundred years have witnessed a miracle behind which must lie a divine plan. Indeed, the history of the Afrikaner reveals a will and a determination which makes one feel that Afrikanerdom is not the work of men but the creation of God."

Malan went on to say:

"God also willed that the Afrikaans people should be continually threatened by other peoples. There was the ferocious barbarian who resisted the intruding Christian civilization and caused the Afrikaner's blood to flow in streams."

On the other hand the Zionists claim

"a super-rational relationship between the Land of Israel and the tribes of Israel. The land, as the fulfilment of a promise in the Covenant to the tribes of Israel, is a holy possession of the Jews. Their claim is eternal and sacred and they cannot be divested of their rights. The establishment of the State of Israel in 1948 was, therefore, a re-establishment - a fulfilment of the prophecy of restoration; a vindication of the prophetic vision of the Bible. Israel is, therefore, unique and miraculous."

So the linkage there is very clear. Maybe that is mere ideology, but we know historically that Smuts and Weizman, who eventually became the first President of Israel, recognized their similarity and fully appreciated the commonality. They laid the groundwork for the dangerous relationship. The similarities between Israel and South Africa are basic and fundamental and therefore totally unaffected

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

by the vicissitudes of politics in both countries. These similarities and commonalities have been best expressed in the organ of the National Party in the Cape Province on 29 May 1968, as follows:

"Israel and South Africa have a common lot. Both are engaged in a struggle for existence and both are in constant clash with the decisive majorities in the United Nations. Both are reliable foci of strength within the region, which would without them fall into anti-Western anarchy. It is in South Africa's interest that Israel is successful in containing her enemies, who are among our own most vicious enemies, and Israel would have all the world against it if the navigation route around the Cape of Good Hope should be out of operation because South Africa's control is undermined. The anti-Western Powers have driven Israel and South Africa into a community of interest which had better be utilized than denied."

I repeat, that that is a quotation from the Burger, the organ of the National Party in the Cape Province, dated 29 May 1968, should anybody need further evidence about the relationship between Tel Aviv and Pretoria.

In the economic field, of course, everybody is aware of the relationship, but what is more dangerous here is that, while Europe imposes some sort of boycott on South African produce, that produce is being marketed in European markets via Israel, through the free trade zone facilities granted by Western Europe and recently by the United States. It is all right; let Western Europe and the United States impose a boycott of South African produce; they can still get it on the markets of the United States because there a free trade zone area for Israel and that is how the things come in - just marked "made in Israel" - and that is it.

A speaker this morning alleged here that Zionism was a national liberation movement. I have never heard of a national liberation movement which thrives on denying the inalienable rights of people. That is an insult to the intelligence

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

and to the common concept of national liberation. No one leads a national liberation movement by depriving people of living in peace in their own homes. Yet that was the statement this Assembly was subjected to this morning.

Where is that national liberation movement? None other than Albert Einstein, in one of his descriptions of the so-called Herut party and to the best of my knowledge the gentleman who uttered those unacceptable words this morning belongs to that party - stated:

"within the Jewish community [the Herut party] have preached a mixture of ultranationalism, religious mysticism and racial superiority. Like other Fascist parties, they have been used to break strikes, and have themselves pressed for the destruction of trade unions. In their stead they have proposed corporate unions on the Italian Fascist model.

"During the last years of sporadic anti-British violence, the Irgun Zvai Leumi and Stern groups inaugurated a reign of terror in the Palestine Jewish community. Teachers were beaten up for speaking against them; adults were shot for not letting their children join them. By gangster methods, beatings, window smashing and widespread robberies, the terrorists intimidated the population and exacted a heavy tribute.

"The people of the Herut party had no part in the constructive achievements in Palestine. They ... only detracted from the Jewish defence activities."

Albert Einstein was right. He had some documented information that the Herut party was a collaborator with the Nazis and I am ashamed that in this Hall a seat is given to a member of the Herut party, a collaborator with the Nazis.

I should like to quote from a document of the Irgun Zvai Leumi, which was a precursor or the military wing of the Herut party. It reads:

"On numerous occasions prominent statesmen of the national socialist Germany underlined in their remarks that the new order of Europe required

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

a radical solution to the Jewish question through evacuation, a Judenrein Europe. The evacuation of the Jewish masses from Europe is their pre-condition for the solution of the Jewish question, which, however, solely and finally becomes possible through resettling those masses in the homeland of the Jewish people in Palestine and through establishing a Jewish State within its historic frontiers.

"The establishment of a historical Jewish State on a national and totalitarian basis with contractual relations with the German Reich would be in the interest of maintaining and strengthening the future German position in the Middle East. And the co-operation of the Israeli liberation movement would be along the lines of one of the last speeches made by the German Reich's Chancellor, Herr Hitler, in which he stressed that he would use each combination and coalition in order to isolate and defeat England."

That is the party to which the gentleman who spoke here earlier belongs. Yet he has the audacity to come here and tell the Assembly about a national liberation movement.

However, I am not surprised because at the other tip of Africa his collaborator, Balthazar Jon Vorster, who designated himself a general in the pro-Nazi South African nationalist movement, was interned during the war against the Nazis for his opposition to the allied war effort against Nazi Germany.

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

And here we can see the ideological connection between the nazis, the Afrikaner apartheid people and the Zionists in my own country.

Maybe I have perhaps taken a good deal of time, but I thought it important to recall those things. I came this morning to speak about the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa, but then when I saw that this rostrum had been misused to defend a nazi ideology I thought I would just make things clear to the Assembly.

Reverting to the issue at hand, what is to be done? What is to be done to eliminate all forms of racism? I am sure the peoples of South Africa and of Namibia and we Palestinians, having no other option to guarantee the free exercise of our inalienable right to self-determination and other human rights recognized and categorically mentioned in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, have no other option but to pursue the course of legitimate struggle by all available means, including armed struggle.

The International Convention nowhere speaks of reform. It explicitly aims at the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. It does not deal with a patchwork of reforms and face-lifting. It calls for their elimination.

Thus, the Western Powers, and Washington D.C. in particular, have before them only one course of action - the course of action described in the principles of the Charter, those principles that we are all here to honour - and that is the unanimous decision to impose mandatory and comprehensive sanctions. And if it was not resolved yesterday, then it must be resolved today. But never leave it for tomorrow.

Saving humanity and the human race is not an issue that can be delayed indefinitely. We believe that by such action the other extreme - namely, the Zionist racist junta in Tel Aviv - will be brought to realize that its racism, its

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

racial discrimination and its racial practices and brutality will not be permitted to last eternally - not even to survive. The legitimate course of armed struggle will continue until racism and oppression have been replaced by peace and respect for human and national rights.

The meeting rose at 2.05 p.m.