



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/40/PV.56
31 October 1985

ENGLISH

Fortieth session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 31 October 1985, at 10.30 a.m.

<u>President:</u>	Mr. DE PINIÉS	(Spain)
later:	Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Vice-President)	(Costa Rica)
later:	Mr. DE FINIÉS (President)	(Spain)
later:	Mr. KIILU (Vice-President)	(Kenya)

- Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency [14]
 - (a) Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Agency
 - (b) Draft resolution
- 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 10.35 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 14

REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

- (a) NOTE BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL TRANSMITTING THE REPORT OF THE AGENCY (A/40/576 and Corr.1)
- (b) DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/40/L.8)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): In accordance with the decision taken by the Assembly at the plenary meeting held yesterday afternoon, the Assembly will now begin its consideration of agenda item 14, entitled "Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency".

The Assembly has before it a note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Agency (document A/40/576 and Corr.1)

I invite the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Mr. Hans Blix, to present the report of the Agency for the year 1984.

Mr. BLIX (International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)): May I begin by thanking you, Mr. President, and the Assembly for your kindness in allowing me to make my presentation this morning, despite your heavy schedule.

Since its inception 40 years ago the United Nations has had to face the consequences of man's conquest of nuclear energy. In the first resolution it ever adopted, the General Assembly in January 1946 set up a United Nations Commission to consider problems arising from the discovery of atomic energy. At that time there were no nuclear-power reactors in the world and only one nuclear-weapon State. The situation today, with some 370 power reactors producing electricity and some 50,000 nuclear warheads in five different States, marks the success and the failure of the world to come to grips with the challenges of the new technology.

Since 1955, when the first United Nations Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy was held in Geneva, the two-pronged approach of free access to

(Mr. Blix, IAEA)

nuclear energy technology for peaceful purposes and commitments against military development has been pursued. This approach of actively assisting the peaceful uses and of contributing to impeding military uses also characterizes the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) which was set up in 1957 as an autonomous body with direct links to the Security Council and to the General Assembly.

A rational approach to the world's energy problems continues to call for the promotion of nuclear power, and a rational approach to the world's security problems continues to call for the dismantling of its suicidal nuclear weapons capacity and the prevention of the spread of such weapons capacity to further countries.

The annual report of IAEA for 1984 is now before the General Assembly. In my presentation today I should like to call your attention to some matters in the nuclear field, to emphasize some of our activities and to supplement our report for 1984 with information from the current year.

Before reporting in greater detail, let me very briefly mention some of the most important points.

First, despite a zero real growth budget, the IAEA in 1984 expanded its promotional activities, notably co-operation with developing countries, and it continued to strengthen safeguards activities. Both developments were made possible thanks to savings in some areas and increased efficiency.

Secondly, last February an agreement was signed pursuant to the voluntary offer of the Soviet Union to accept IAEA safeguards on some of its peaceful nuclear installations, and the first inspection under that agreement took place in August of this year.

(Mr. Blix, IAEA)

Thirdly, in August-September of this year at the Third Review Conference of the States Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) the IAEA presented substantive reports, particularly on its work in the fields of the transfer of peaceful nuclear technology and on safeguards. The Conference reached a consensus on a final declaration which contains a number of points of direct relevance to the Agency.

Fourthly, in September at the IAEA General Conference, China announced its intention to place some of its civilian nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards.

I turn now to the development of nuclear power and the Agency's work in this field.

During 1984 the total installed nuclear power capacity in the world increased by 17 per cent, the largest annual increase since the beginning of the large-scale introduction of nuclear power in the early 1970s. Nuclear power today accounts for some 13 per cent of the world's electricity and by the year 2000 it is expected to generate around 20-25 per cent. In a world where economic development and growth are resuming and where fossil fuels pose particular environmental problems in the form of acid rain and production of carbon dioxide, nuclear power, I submit, will be viewed increasingly as a chief and indispensable option to meet growing demand for electricity. While primary energy consumption has been stagnating, increase in the demand for electricity is parallel to the increase in gross domestic production.

Some recent developments have contributed to making the economic picture for nuclear power even more positive than a few years ago, for instance, new types of more efficient nuclear fuel and longer cycles of operation.

In most places nuclear power retains a clear economic edge over coal. Standardization in design of plants, streamlined regulatory procedures and rigid management controls are ways of keeping costs under control.

(Mr. Blix, IAEA)

The whole question of financing nuclear power plants, however, has become a major constraint, not only for developing countries, but for some industrialized countries as well, because of the high initial capital investment required. In the nuclear case, we are talking about a total capital cost, including interest during construction, for a plant in the 600-700 megawatts range of the order of \$1.5-2 billion. The IAEA is not a financing institution, but it has been asked by its members and by the Third Review Conference of the NPT to begin devoting more attention to this particular obstacle to the introduction of nuclear power by studying new approaches and bringing together energy planning officials and financing institutions.

One way of bringing nuclear power more within the reach of a larger number of developing countries or other areas with limited electrical grids, would be the use of small and medium-sized power reactors. The first phase of an Agency study on this subject has now been completed, showing that some 23 plant designs with an electrical output below 600 megawatts are available. However, discussion also continues regarding designs that would be simpler and have more inherent safety than those with which we currently have practical experience. These plants could be a longer-term option for both developing countries and industrialized countries from around the year 2000.

A pre-condition for the further expansion of nuclear power is that it is safe and is so perceived by the public. The Three Mile Island accident seriously damaged confidence in nuclear power. The intense reporting of this accident - in which only in significant quantities of radioactive material escaped and in which no person was injured - flooded the media world and washed away years of dry statistics on the safe operation of nuclear plants.

(Mr. Blix, IAEA)

What is the real situation regarding safety in nuclear power today? Some generalizations and objective data can be offered.

We now have an accumulated experience of some 3,600 reactor years without one single fatal radiation accident in a commercial nuclear plant being reported. Accidents and incidents continue, of course, to occur in nuclear plants, but as the availability figures show, better maintenance and operation reduce their numbers and limit their consequences. Good safety is good economy. Moreover, analysis of the Three Mile Island accident is beginning to provide the world with a more realistic view of the possible course and consequences of a core melt. The area of the unknown is also being gradually clarified through research and experiments.

The IAEA has a very active programme to assist members in their efforts to maintain and further enhance nuclear safety. The programme has been considerably expanded in the last few years through an incident reporting system, through radiation protection advisory teams and through an International Nuclear Safety Advisory Group established this year.

Responsibility for the management of spent fuel and ultimate disposal of radioactive waste, like responsibility for nuclear operational safety, naturally rests with the Governments permitting the activity which produces the waste. For several years now experts all over the world have been convinced that no scientific or technological breakthroughs are needed to achieve a disposal that remains safe during the long time-spans under which high-level waste will remain active. Indeed, to many people the complete isolation of high-level nuclear waste from the biosphere contrasts very favourably with the manner in which waste from other industries is handled. This, in their view, is an important argument in favour of nuclear power. However, in several countries, a fairly strong public opinion does not see the issue in this light and fears about nuclear waste are behind much of the opposition to nuclear power which we witness in those countries.

(Mr. Blix, IAEA)

Several measures can be expected favourably to influence this public opinion. Most important, probably, is the actual construction of disposal installations of adequate capacity for intermediate storage of high-level waste and preparation of sites or installations for low and medium-level waste. Such installations and sites are, in fact, under way in many countries. The dissemination of more factual information about the waste issue and about our ability to cope with it will also be useful. The IAEA is active in the waste field, ensuring that its members exchange their practical experiences and that the cumulative experience of the membership is available to all and laid down in recommendations and guidelines.

Before I close my remarks on the question of waste disposal I should report to you that, pursuant to its responsibilities under the London dumping Convention, the IAEA has prepared a revision of the "definition" of high-level wastes unsuitable for sea disposal and "recommendations" for other radioactive wastes. Considerable effort was devoted to this task, in which the Agency worked in close co-operation with other United Nations agencies and intergovernmental organizations.

At the September meeting of the Contracting Parties to the London Convention, the majority of Parties agreed to a suspension of all dumping at sea of radioactive wastes until further studies and assessments have been made. The IAEA will be carrying out some of these assessments as part of its responsibilities under the Convention.

Promoting the transfer of nuclear energy technology for peaceful uses has remained important throughout the period following the United Nations Geneva Conference in 1955. As was recently emphasized by the Third Review Conference of the NPT, the IAEA is the main multilateral channel for this purpose. Nowhere is technology transfer more called for than in the developing countries, which need to bridge the technology gap.

(Mr. Blix, IAEA)

Total available resources for the technical assistance and co-operation programme in the IAEA almost doubled between 1980 and 1984, amounting to some \$36 million in 1984. Extrabudgetary sources have continued to provide some 25 per cent of the total funds received. I am also very happy to report that a consensus on a 12 per cent increase annually in the target for the contributions to the Technical Assistance and Co-operation Fund for the three-year period 1987-1989 was reached recently in the Agency's Board of Governors. This gives the Agency a stable basis for the planning of its development co-operation programme. Naturally we hope that the Fund will, even more than in the past, be supplemented by further contributions for individual projects which cannot be financed through the Fund.

I am pleased to report also that our technical co-operation activities in food and agriculture are placing emphasis on Africa, thereby contributing to the United Nations system's efforts to face the emergency situation in Africa and to link relief assistance to a process of sustainable development.*

*Mrs. Castro de Barish (Costa Rica), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Blix, IAEA)

In fact more than 40 per cent of the Agency's technical co-operation projects in food and agriculture are in Africa. Among these, a large-scale demonstration project in Nigeria has successfully shown the feasibility of using the sterile insect technique to control a species of the tsetse and could serve as a model for other African countries. I might also mention that isotope techniques are being promoted in seven African countries as a tool in the assessment and development of water resources.

Turning now to the IAEA safeguards function I should first report that 1984 and 1985 have been a period of further expansion and consolidation. As the bulk of our safeguards work takes place under agreements made in pursuance of obligations under the NPT, the Agency reported at length on its safeguards activities to the Third NPT Review Conference. It was gratifying that the Final Declaration of the Conference reflected a consensus among States Parties on the need and usefulness of the safeguards system maintained by the IAEA. While there are certainly diverse views on various aspects of its implementation, on how it should be paid for, and so on, all agree that it is indispensable for maintaining nuclear trade, for facilitating the transfer of nuclear technology and for creating confidence. I might cite paragraph 11 of the Declaration in which:

"The conference notes with satisfaction the improvement of IAEA safeguards which has enabled it to continue to apply safeguards effectively during a period of rapid growth in the number of safeguarded facilities. It also notes that the safeguards approaches are capable of adequately dealing with facilities under safeguards ..."

While the NPT Review Conference recommended the continued pursuit of the principle of universal application of IAEA safeguards to all peaceful nuclear activities in all States, the General Assembly of the United Nations and the IAEA General Conference have expressed particular concern about the nuclear capability

(Mr. Blix, IAEA)

of South Africa and Israel and have called specifically upon both those countries' to place all their nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards.

As regards South Africa, the IAEA Board of Governors and the Director General have been requested to contribute to the implementation of the relevant General Assembly resolutions in so far as they relate to the Agency's work. We continue to do so. For its part, the General Conference of the IAEA this year adopted a resolution on South Africa, inter alia, requesting all Member States to halt all nuclear co-operation with South Africa. While, regrettably, no progress has been made so far on the question of full-scope safeguards, discussions are proceeding with the South African authorities on the application of safeguards to a semi-commercial enrichment plant.

As regards Israel, the General Conference of the IAEA, discussing the consequences of the Israeli military attack on the Iraqi nuclear research reactor, considered a letter containing undertakings on behalf of the Government of Israel and noted that by this letter:

"Israel has committed itself not to attack peaceful nuclear facilities in Iraq, elsewhere in the Middle East, or anywhere else".

The Conference further held that:

"the safeguards system of the IAEA brings evidence of and an opportunity to review the peaceful nature of nuclear facilities subject to such safeguards" and appealed to:

"competent international organs to take steps, in accordance with their mandates, to ensure the inviolability of peaceful nuclear facilities and to contribute thereby to the safe development of nuclear energy."

This brings me to a point of some importance, namely, what - apart from the facilitation of trade and technology transfer - a State may expect from submitting

(Mr. Blix, IAEA)

its whole nuclear programme or a nuclear facility to safeguards and what is the nature of this submission!

It is sometimes suggested that safeguards verification and inspections are an inroad on the sovereignty of States. In my view this is an erroneous position. Safeguards only take place upon the invitation of a sovereign State and on the basis of an agreement made with it. It would be more appropriate to view the verification system as a service to a sovereign State wishing to create confidence which it cannot equally well create by itself. .

When it avails itself of the service it will naturally expect to obtain the benefit that other States will be confident about the peaceful operation of safeguarded installations and will act accordingly. So far no generally ratified rules on the protection of nuclear installations from armed attack have emerged, relying upon safeguards or otherwise. However, a formula offering protection to nuclear-power generating stations was included in 1977 in Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Convention and the matter has been discussed at length - though so far without result - in the context of the Conference on Disarmament. Most recently the NPT Review Conference, concerning itself with the question of attacks on safeguarded nuclear facilities, urged all States to co-operate towards a speedy conclusion offering protection. Such an appeal was also made in the General Conference of the IAEA.

The NPT Review Conference devoted special attention to safeguards agreements made with nuclear-weapon States and urged the IAEA to take full advantage of the co-operation offered by those States in implementing the agreements. The Conference - as I mentioned a moment ago - also recommended the continued pursuit of the principle of universal application of IAEA safeguards to all peaceful nuclear activities in all States, no exception being made for nuclear-weapon States.

(Mr. Blix, IAEA)

The importance of safeguards activities in nuclear-weapon States evidently does not lie so much in the field of non-proliferation. It may be valuable, however, that there is assurance that particular facilities, imports from other States or, indeed, a whole programme in a nuclear-weapon State is confined to peaceful uses. Perhaps an even greater significance of safeguards in nuclear-weapon States lies in the fact that they give the world a precedent of verification of nuclear activities in those States and a first experience of such activities. That precedent is the more interesting now that a first inspection has been carried out in the Soviet Union besides those which have occurred in the United States, the United Kingdom and France. The intention of China to conclude a safeguards agreement is also to be welcomed.

In this context it is pertinent to recall the 1985 Report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in which he states:

"The International Atomic Energy Agency has unique experience in monitoring non-proliferation compliance and ensuring the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. This expertise could be built on and expanded to provide a monitoring capability for nuclear-arms agreements." (A/40/L, p. 8)

I fully share the Secretary-General's views and I should like to amplify by submitting that several lessons may be learnt from the operation of safeguards. First, if agreements on the non-acquisition of nuclear weapons required an elaborate on-site verification system we may safely assume that any agreements relating to actual nuclear disarmament will require reliable verification, including some on-site inspection. Secondly, we must recognize that verification machinery can never become an international police force. Where it discovers a breach or is unable to come to a conclusion it cannot physically intervene; it can

(Mr. Blix, IAEA)

only raise the alarm. Thirdly, we can foresee that in most cases verification is not likely to be allowed to operate all over a State's territory but only in identified installations or areas, exceptions perhaps being made for various forms of verification after challenge or complaint.

I should like to conclude by referring to the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations. The United Nations and most of the organizations of the United Nations family came into being in the wake of the Second World War and the public all over the world supported them and expected that they would facilitate co-operation and prevent conflict. There is no doubt that they often do this and that the institutionalized co-operation contributes to the gradual weaving of an international social fabric, the development of an international community. I have tried to show how the IAEA contributes to this.

(Mr. Blix, IAEA)

There is also no doubt, however, that the public in many countries has a feeling of frustration over international debates that seem never to result in solutions and items that never end, over the same matters being treated in different forums and over secretariats perceived to be too large, too well remunerated and unproductive. It would be a mistake on the part of both Governments and secretariats to ignore the impatience that underlies that criticism. Rather, it is their common task to ensure that organizations are constructively and efficiently used and that a reasonable distribution of work is arranged to prevent overlapping and repetition. The fortieth anniversary should in my view prompt new initiatives in that direction.

In making efforts to increase efficiency and reduce costs, we must take care, however, not to damage the system. Being responsible for the Secretariat of the IAEA, which is part of the United Nations common system, I feel duty bound to report to the Assembly that certain attitudes and actions are resulting in malaise and concern among the staff.

If we are to run efficient organizations - as is rightly demanded of us - we must be able to rely on capable and motivated staff. There is no doubt that our ability to recruit and retain such staff is affected by conditions of employment. Good staff will gradually leave us if they feel subjected to unfair criticism or to arbitrary administrative action. Recent decisions and actions relative to the United Nations staff pension system and to the operation of the post adjustment system are seen by our staff not only as an erosion of their conditions of employment but as a challenge to the credibility of the common system and its established machinery.

I cannot believe it was the intention to provoke experienced and dedicated staff into taking early retirement despite the fact that they could have had many years of productive service ahead of them. But such, I must report, is the case.

(Mr. Blix, IAEA)

The possibility of the loss of benefits and rights which staff had every reason to believe were acquired has led to that result.

The General Assembly will this session again consider recommendations by the competent and expert organs of the common system, the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board and the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC), pertaining to the conditions of employment of staff. I shall not dwell on the details of those recommendations but I feel bound to express my sincere hope that, when actions are taken, it will be borne in mind that they have a direct and profound effect on our ability to ensure the efficient and effective management of organizations.

How Member Governments conduct themselves vis-à-vis one another, what initiatives they take, to what extent and how genuinely they seek to use the machinery of the international organizations to harmonize their actions and to solve their differences are no doubt decisive for the effectiveness of those organizations. However, morale and motivation in the secretariats also have some importance for the quality of documents on which discussions are based, for the organization of meetings, for the quality of technical assistance and for the execution of a multitude of decisions in all fields. I would therefore conclude by appealing that in the course of reviewing and modifying work and procedures in the United Nations family, renewed attention be given to the need to maintain a healthy human resources policy vis-à-vis the staff serving the family. Let me also, here in New York, express our appreciation to the Government of Austria, the host Government of the IAEA, for all the co-operation and assistance that it extends to the Agency.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the Director General for introducing the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The Assembly will continue consideration of that item on a subsequent date to be announced in the Journal.

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)

Mr. FARAH DIRIR (Djibouti): The tragic situation in South Africa has defied any reasonable solution, as we see that the great majority of black Africans is still kept under the cruel system of apartheid and is denied its fundamental human and political rights and liberties.

The Pretoria régime has arrogantly ignored all international appeals, including decisions and resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, that it redress its apartheid practices.

The black South African majority was never discouraged in the face of that denial. It has continued its struggle in the most unfavourable environment for the exercise of its inalienable rights to freedom and justice, and has met all discouraging acts of oppression with enviable courage and determination.

The South African régime, confronted with acute resistance by the masses, has not stopped at anything in escalating its obnoxious military and police violence and intimidation. As a result, tension, violence and the mass destruction of life and property have become the order of the day.

Thus, the spectre of apartheid has made the territory of South Africa, despite its human, animal and natural resources as well as its mineral wealth, one of the unhappiest countries on earth.

Indeed, the policies of the apartheid régime of South Africa, seen against the background of relentless terror and violence, have aroused intense international

(Mr. Farah Dirir, Djibouti)

outrage that warrants intensified international action to eradicate the evil of apartheid.

How could the freedom-loving world tolerate a system that subjects the great majority of its population to the most extreme humiliation of segregation, racial discrimination and insult? How could a system that denies basic rights to those who challenge it peacefully and that kills on a massive scale those who confront it be allowed to flourish?

It is very sad indeed to realize that the international community - especially that part of it with the leverage of influence - has become a mere bystander as concerns the system of apartheid, under which the majority leaders of the black community are imprisoned without trial and tortured and killed in prison, under which schoolchildren and their parents are killed in the streets by the hundreds and thousands, and under which innocent families are intimidated and their houses broken into without any search warrant. In the face of such atrocities, it has not been surprising to witness the huge storm of resistance and opposition welling up within community organizations and among workers and their unions, students and religious institutions as well as an increasing number of international calls to inflict a heavy blow upon the apartheid system and its odious practices.

The South African régime, as obstinate as ever and refusing to be dissuaded from its evil design, has lately imposed a state of emergency in the country, thus creating an unprecedented reign of terror. As a result, violence has erupted and spread to many African townships and has continued to escalate to an alarming degree. The international community has been alarmed by the spectre of police forces turning peaceful strikes by those various sectors of African society into bloodbaths which have claimed thousands of innocent lives.*

*The President returned to the Chair.

(Mr. Farah Dirir, Djibouti)

We are certain that, in spite of all this horror, the campaign of blatant intimidation and harassment against mineworkers, the raids on various townships by police forces, the arrest and detention of African students, scholars, mineworkers and politicians are reckless tactics that are all doomed to complete failure. It is our considered opinion that, since the international community has condemned apartheid as a crime against humanity, it is high time that this world community mobilized its forces to eliminate that evil system completely and support the legitimate struggle of the South Africa people to dismantle it and eventually establish a democratic society.

We see signs that apartheid is on the decline, and we would like to believe that the rising tide of international outrage is finally awakening the moral and political forces of the world community and causing it to call upon the South African régime to abandon its apartheid practices. We would also like to believe that this new awakening will soon gather enough strength and momentum to bring pressure to bear on the Pretoria régime to lift the state of emergency, release all political prisoners and detainees, withdraw all emergency police forces from the African townships and reform its policy of apartheid so that the African majority can gain the basic necessities for their survival.

The international community, in its action against apartheid, should seriously consider all possibilities for economic and military sanctions, leading to complete disinvestment, a trade embargo, full and effective implementation of the arms embargo against South Africa and, especially, measures to prevent that country from acquiring nuclear-weapon capability.

We reiterate once more that international condemnation of apartheid should be translated into active support for the ongoing struggle against it and concrete and tangible assistance to the liberation movements of the South African people.

(Mr. Farah Dirir, Djibouti)

I would not like to conclude my remarks without commending the efforts deployed by the Special Committee against Apartheid, which, under the leadership of Ambassador Garba of Nigeria, has drawn the attention of the international community to the serious situation in southern Africa resulting from the aggressive and oppressive policies of the South African régime. We welcome and note with appreciation the active role that the Special Committee has played in gaining world-wide support in the global mobilization of action against apartheid, as was effectively expressed at regional and international conferences in Africa, Asia, Europe and North America. We also commend the Special Committee's efforts in promoting action on specific aspects of the campaign against apartheid in the fields of sports, and women's, children's and workers' rights.

The delegation of Djibouti concurs with the Special Committee's conclusion and accordingly supports its recommendations.

We call upon all Governments and other institutions of the international community to co-operate in the efforts to mobilize effective solutions against the South African régime and to continue to provide all necessary assistance to the people of South Africa and their national liberation movements.

We believe that with international solidarity and active support from all freedom-loving nations the day will come when majority rule will triumph and the African masses will decide their own destiny and win their constitutional right to create a free, non-racial and democratic society.

Mr. PAZ AGUIRRE (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): Only a few days after assuming the presidency of Uruguay, on 1 March 1985, a historic date that marked the restoration of full institutionalized democracy in the country, Dr. Julio Maria Sanguinetti sent a message to the Secretary-General of the United Nations in connection with the observance of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. In his message the President of Uruguay,

(Mr. Paz Aguirre, Uruguay)

expressing the will of the Uruguayan people, confirmed our absolute rejection, on moral and political grounds that are basic to our philosophical and cultural tradition, of the policy of racial discrimination.

President Sanguinetti, recalling that our country, which has been a party to the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination since 1968, was the first country to accept the competence of the Committee established to receive individual complaints, confirmed his Government's strongest support for any action aimed at putting an end to the policy of apartheid and, indeed, any policy of racial discrimination. Such policies do violence to our most deeply held humanist beliefs, which are based on the equality of all human beings.

We are living at time of great upheavals in the history of mankind, a time characterized by hatred and divisions among peoples, the proliferation of violence in all its forms in many parts of the world and persistent disregard of the fundamental principles of international coexistence.

In this world the development of science has been great, but that of our conscience has been slight indeed, and there have been many oppressive systems that violate human rights. At the same time, however, a view of human beings has developed according to which all men are equal in dignity and have certain inalienable rights, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion, to use the words of the United Nations Charter. Violations of those rights continue to affront the civilized conscience, but no legal system, no political system anywhere in the world, would dare to deny that concept, much less make an official policy of and institutionalize absolute discrimination against human beings - with a single exception: the South African régime.

In South Africa a racist society has been created that makes the colour of a man's skin a decisive factor in whether he may or may not not enjoy human rights.

(Mr. Paz Aguirre, Uruguay)

The South African régime is a challenge to the conscience of mankind. It is an overt, objective, arrogant act of defiance that does not have to be proved because it is self-evident. In this divided world Governments and nations are in rare unanimity regarding that repugnant situation.

On 11 October of this year, in connection with the observance of the Day of Solidarity with South African Political Prisoners, the Foreign Minister of Uruguay, Mr. Enrique Iglesias, sent a message to the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, Mr. Garba, in which he expressed once again his

"vigorous repudiation of the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa, the consequence of which has been the systematic violation of human rights and which constitutes a crime against humanity"

and his

"solidarity with all those who, in their fight against racism, have been and continue to be the victims of persecution, imprisonment and torture".

(Mr. Paz Aguirre, Uruguay)

This offence against universal morality and the basic values of civilization also represents a serious threat to international peace and security, not only because the situation in the country has become explosive and has involved neighbouring countries with the repeated adoption of repressive measures and the declaration of a state of emergency, which has led to much bloodshed and hardship, but also because it is a constant threat to those neighbouring countries.

It is, then, only appropriate and just that in the United Nations, this universal forum, we should condemn the odious policies of apartheid. We are aware, as other delegations have already said, of the practical limitations of the real effectiveness of this condemnation and the difficulties involved in the final abolition of these policies, but that should not discourage us from denouncing and repudiating them, from keeping world public alert, from giving the victims of apartheid the moral support and the solidarity of all the peoples of the world. It should not discourage us from trying to create a climate of deterrence against the régime or from encouraging States and the Organization to take all lawful actions to prevent the eruption of that volcano.

Uruguay believes that tenacious action through the United Nations will be fruitful and will promote the adoption of sanctions which, though not bringing new hardship to the majority in South Africa, will weaken the resistance of the white minority to the changes required by justice. There must also be, inter alia, an effective embargo on armaments and strategic materials, the denial of loans, the prohibition of new investment and the suspension of cultural and sports relations. At the same time other States must be called upon to offer the kind of humanitarian assistance needed by those who are now suffering from the harsh repression of the racist régime.

In this connection it should be pointed out that the new democratic Government in Uruguay has decided, within its competence, to put into practice the various

(Mr. Paz Aguirre, Uruguay)

resolutions that have been adopted by bodies within the United Nations system. The constitutional Government of my country is determined, inter alia, to maintain its position of not allowing the entry into our country of South African athletes, in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 38/14 and 32/105 M.

My Government is also now considering various possible ways and means of disseminating knowledge about the policies of apartheid at the national level through the competent ministries, as required by United Nations resolutions.

We are also joining in the demand that an immediate unconditional end be put to the unjust imprisonment of Nelson Mandela and all others who have been deprived of their freedom because of their opposition to the policies of apartheid.

Uruguay is a peace-loving country. We cherish peace, and we believe in peace as the only way to resolve both internal and international conflicts. We hope that such a course of action will lead to fundamental change in South African society before the stubborn blindness of the white minority becomes a kind of suicide and before the impatience of the black population leads to widespread violence. Nothing can be built on the moral and material ruins of a society, and a morally sick society like the racist society of South Africa today cannot continue forever. The only way out - there must be no delay - is a peaceful understanding among all races on the basis of full respect for human rights and freedom for all in a genuine democracy in which the majority, in keeping with political and not racial criteria, governs as the result of the free expression of the popular will and the minority's rights and duties are respected because they are full-fledged members of the community to which they belong.

Mr. van LIEROP (Vanuatu): In another time, at another place, a solitary figure - a black man, 50 years old - trudged wearily along a dusty dirt road. He was walking home from a tiring 12-hour day of work. His path led him from the paved highway near the woodmill where he worked to the lonely deserted dirt road

(Mr. van Lierop, Vanuatu)

where he lived with his family. They lived in a small one-room shack without electricity, running water or an indoor toilet.

Four adults and five children lived in that home. Despite their obvious poverty, they were an honest, hardworking church-going family that bothered no one. They belonged to no organization, except for their church, and had never participated in any political campaigns or demonstrations.

Suddenly, out of the darkness of the night, he heard the sound of an engine and saw the approaching headlights of a car. As the vehicle drew nearer, he saw that it was a pick-up truck. When he saw its occupants his heart beat faster with fear and trepidation, the constant companions of solitary blacks out at night in this particular locale. The truck came to a sudden halt near where he was walking, and four men leaped out and grabbed him roughly, cursing, punching and kicking him as they did so. He could not see their faces because they wore masks and robes to conceal their identities. As he was being attacked, he heard what sounded like the barking of dogs coming from the rear of the truck.

He was thrown to the ground and beaten until he slipped into a state of near-unconsciousness. The men standing over him smelled of cheap liquor and laughed as he lay bleeding at their feet. They spat on him, called him names and ridiculed his blackness.

They then yanked him to his feet by pulling his hair. They tied his arms and legs with ropes and dragged him to a hole he had never before noticed at the side of the road. He was shoved into the hole in a standing position and then covered with dirt until he was buried up to his neck. The men laughed and seemed to be genuinely enjoying themselves as they contemplated his now helpless state. Being bound and buried as he was, he could move no part of his body except for his eyes, his mouth and his head, ever so slightly.

(Mr. van Lierop, Vanuatu)

One man then went to the truck and came back, being dragged by two vicious dogs that were barely restrained by the leash he held with two massive hands. The dogs salivated, their eyes fixed on the head in front of them. Their paws clawed into the ground as they tried to pull free of their restraint and get at the helpless black man.

In a slow, deliberate voice, one of the assailants told the black man that they were going to give him a fair chance to defend himself. The dogs would be turned loose and, if he should survive their assault for a period of 15 minutes, he would be dug up, untied and set free. This, he was told, was all the mercy he could expect.

(Mr. van Lierop, Vanuatu)

The four robed figures laughed at their joke and then turned the two dogs loose. The dogs now ceased their frantic pulling and slowly, almost tortuously, began to circle the black man's head. Suddenly one dog leaped. The only thing the man could think to do was to move his head slightly and try in desperation to ward the animal off by attempting to bite it before it could bite him.

When they saw this, the four cowards in robes became enraged. One ran over and, cursing as he ran, delivered a strong, swift kick to the black man's head, screaming at him, "fight fair, boy, fight fair", as he did so.

When I hear the conditions some people would impose on the black people of South Africa in their struggle to survive and to be free, I am reminded of that time, that place, that incident and the insane admonition to the helpless victim that he should fight "fair".

Very few items on our agenda have been analysed and discussed as extensively as apartheid. This particular form of institutionalized racism and what should be done about it have for too many years preoccupied the international community. Apartheid has been the subject of so much debate that at times it appears that nothing new can be added to what has already been said so many times, with so much clarity, so much conviction and so much compassion. Yet we must - all of us - try.

The originality of our words is not important. What matters is their consistency. The repetitiveness of our debate is not offensive. What is offensive is the repetitiveness of the Pretoria régime's arrogant and shortsighted intransigence, as well as its continued practice of state terrorism.

Some among us feel that this debate is merely a tiresome ritual. They believe that the United Nations would be better off without this debate. We, therefore, implore them to take effective and unequivocal action today against apartheid. We assure them that should they do so the debate will assume a different tone, if in fact there will even be a need to continue the debate.

(Mr. van Lierop, Vanuatu)

We do not profess to be so learned or so virtuous that we know with absolute certainty how to hasten the demise of apartheid. After all, the perverse sickness of racism has persisted in many other parts of the world under many guises.

However, even the man whose torture I described at the beginning of this statement has a different life today. His world may still not be perfect, but at least his grandchildren have some hope. Their life is better. They can measure appreciable progress in their lifetimes. They have a stake in the land of their birth. Can the same be said of South Africa? Has the Government of South Africa committed itself to protecting the rights of all its citizens? Has it even acknowledged that all its people are citizens, or are even people?

What distinguishes apartheid is that the minority régime in South Africa has made it illegal for the people of that troubled land to even dream of a different way of life. Some may not feel that South Africa is a totalitarian State, but the overwhelming weight of the objective evidence says otherwise. How else can one define totalitarianism, if not by including South Africa today in that definition?

As painful as it might be, we must ask a few questions in order to place this matter in its proper context. Imagine for a moment that a number of Africans - black men and women, if you please - have settled in Europe and established their own segregated government. Imagine that they have occupied a corner of its most beautiful and productive land. Imagine that they have appropriated the resources of that land, robbed the people of their dignity, violated the women, brutalized the children and ruthlessly exploited the labour force. How long would this be tolerated - 500 years, 50 years, five years or five minutes? How many people need to be murdered under such a system in order to prompt comprehensive international condemnation and isolation - 700, 70, seven or just one?

(Mr. van Lierop, Vanuatu)

With so much violence being visited upon the people of South Africa, how can anyone speak of searching for a peaceful solution before violence erupts? How did so many people in South Africa lose their lives, if not by violence? How was apartheid imposed, if not by violence? How does Botha govern and intimidate, if not by violence? If the world is admonished not to negotiate with terrorists, why are we told that South Africa's people - the victims of violence - must renounce violence and negotiate with the nazis who terrorize them? How much longer must we ignore the fact that the South African Government is at war with its neighbours, at war with the United Nations, at war with its own people, of all races, and at war with every standard of decency and civilization?

We do not come here today with new ideas, magical words or simplistic solutions. We are as puzzled and frustrated as anyone else here today. We do not know what it will take for some of our Members to understand and appreciate the urgency of the situation and the need for them to join the growing international consensus. How much more time do they think we have? How much more do they think the people of South Africa will tolerate? Do they not realize that even the most gentle human beings have limits to their patience?

We wish that we could soon hear the last word on this subject. Unfortunately, we know that mankind will not soon be so blessed. Therefore we must express our abhorrence of apartheid and our appreciation to those who toil so tirelessly on behalf of the best instincts of mankind.

We, therefore, commend those who fight to free South Africa and those who expose that society for what it is. We commend the Special Committee against Apartheid and its Chairman, Mr. Garba, the Permanent Representative of Nigeria. The Committee's report and its recommendations are a sound framework within which

(Mr. van Lierop, Vanuatu)

we can all continue to lend our support to the struggle against apartheid. We hope that each nation represented here today will allow its deeds to match its words on this subject.

In the future, when apartheid no longer exists and the struggle against racism has taken on a new dimension, historians will, in their writings, judge our actions and not our words. We know what Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of India, Ambassador Garba, Oliver Tambo and so many others like them will be able to tell their grandchildren at that time. What we wonder is: what will those few who have chosen to sit on the sidelines as spectators tell their grandchildren and those of Nelson Mandela?

Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand): Once again the General Assembly is considering agenda item 35, entitled "Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa" - the policies which have been consistently condemned by the international community as a crime against humanity and a threat to international peace and security.

It is with deep regret, therefore, that we note that the agenda item before us, which has been with the Organization since its inception, remains a matter of the gravest concern. Though this year marks the fortieth anniversary of the founding of our Organization and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the indigenous African people in South Africa today are still under the oppression of the apartheid system, imposed through the most brutal means available to the racist régime of Pretoria, in defiance of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the relevant United Nations resolutions and decisions and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Hence, the General Assembly together with other organs of the United Nations and the Member States must redouble the efforts to seek, by all appropriate means, to remedy this atrocious situation.

My delegation has closely followed the deteriorating situation prevailing in South Africa and the region. We take note that resistance to the apartheid system has effectively increased, and has thus met with a new height of repressive actions on the part of the Pretoria régime. This in turn has led to mounting violence and bloodshed. We note with profound concern the loss of lives, almost on a daily basis, among the black people, some of them young children. It is an indisputable fact that the present unrest in South Africa stems directly from the persistence of the racist régime of Pretoria in denying the majority of South African people their inalienable rights, in arrogant defiance of all basic norms of human decency.

(Mr. Kasemsri, Thailand)

During the past few months alone, we have witnessed so many atrocities committed by the Pretoria régime against the black people. The heinous acts of the South African authorities at Crossroads and other townships early this year along with the imposition of the state of emergency in 36 districts in July and in Cape Town last week, as well as the barbaric execution of Mr. Moloise on Friday, 18 October, in defiance of the international appeals for clemency, and the murder of 750 black people along with the arbitrary arrest and detention of hundreds of black people have no doubt contributed to more resistance and more international support for the resistance. Such acts of the racist Pretoria régime further indicate the inhumanity of its abhorrent policies and practices as well as the moral bankruptcy of that régime. However, the South African Government continues to hold on to its immoral apartheid system in defiance of world public opinion by implementing even more determinedly the policy of bantustanization as well as its pass laws in order to deprive the black people of their rights. The Pretoria régime also pursues its imposition of the so-called new constitution, which is aimed at safeguarding the ill-gained privileges of the white minority and excluding its opponents from the exercise of any political rights.

Here I should like to quote the following eloquent words that Bishop Desmond Tutu spoke at this rostrum a few days ago:

"We run the gauntlet of road-blocks. As I said before, I am the Bishop of Johannesburg; I am a Nobel Laureate; and yet my wife and daughters have been stripped to be body-searched at a road-block. Your dignity is not just rubbed in the dust; your dignity is trodden under foot and spat on. Our people are being killed every day as if they were but flies - just statistics: one black, two blacks, six blacks have died today. Is that nothing to you who pass by? What must we say that we have not said? God give

(Mr. Kasemsri, Thailand)

us the eloquence to make the world hear that all we want is to be recognized for what we are - human beings created in His image.

"But is it nothing to the world that 800 black pupils are arrested, some as young as seven years of age who have had to spend the night in gaol? Are you not appalled and outraged? Would the West be so passive if the casualties were white rather than black? Are blacks expendable?"

(A/SPC/40/PV.15, pp. 11 and 12)

In view of the foregoing, Thailand, as a non-permanent member of the Security Council, has rendered full support to the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations, particularly Security Council resolution 556 (1984), which inter alia

"demands the immediate eradication of apartheid as the necessary step towards the full exercise of the right to self-determination in an unfragmented South Africa",

and also demands the immediate halt to bantustanization as well as the cessation of the uprooting, relocation and denationalization of the indigeneous African people. My delegation also rejects as null and void the so-called new constitution imposed by the Pretoria régime and regards it as an aggravation of the already grave situation prevailing inside South Africa. Moreover, my delegation, in support of Security Council resolution 569 (1985), demands the lifting of the state of emergency and the immediate and unconditional release of all political prisoners and detainees, including Mr. Nelson Mandela.

My delegation also takes note with grave concern of the renewed escalation of hostile, unprovoked and persistent acts of aggression committed by the Pretoria régime against the neighbouring States, in particular the recent invasions of Angola and Botswana, in violation of their sovereignty and territorial integrity. Moreover, the racist régime of South Africa continues to utilize the international Territory of Namibia as a springboard for sustaining its armed attacks against the

(Mr. Kasemsri, Thailand)

neighbouring countries, in order to weaken the unrelenting support of those countries for the Namibian people. Such illegal actions, if continued, will further heighten the threat against international peace and security of the entire region. Hence, my delegation demands that the Pretoria régime unconditionally desist from all acts of aggression against the neighbouring States and scrupulously respect their sovereignty and territorial integrity.

For the foregoing reasons, my delegation continues to cast its vote in support of the morally correct stand, both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly, on this item. Furthermore, Thailand has steadfastly supported and strictly adhered to all relevant United Nations resolutions and decisions on South Africa. Thus, Thailand has no diplomatic relations with South Africa and has voluntarily imposed a trade embargo against South Africa since July 1978.

The Government of Thailand, in compliance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, in particular resolution 39/72 of 13 December 1984, also condemns apartheid as manifested in sports and will continue to rescind any contact which would have the effect of perpetuating racial discrimination in South Africa.

My delegation would like to place on record its deep appreciation to the Special Committee against Apartheid, under the leadership of Ambassador Joseph Garba of Nigeria, and to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for their untiring efforts in enhancing the international awareness and support in this regard.

My delegation wishes to pledge once again that Thailand will stand with the Group of African States on this issue, in order to bring about the complete dismantling of the repugnant apartheid system in the southern part of Africa.

(Mr. Kasemsri, Thailand)

In conclusion I should like to quote once again the eloquent words of Bishop Tutu:

"Apartheid is a threat to world peace. We owe it to future generations to end it. Let us be part of the exhilarating enterprise of liberating South Africa for all its people, black and white together. We shall be free - all of us, black and white together - and we shall remember who helped us to be free." (A/SPC/40/PV/15, p. 16)

Mr. OFWONO (Uganda): Thirty years ago a conference of South Africans resolved that their country would never be free until all their peoples lived in brotherhood, enjoying equal rights and opportunities; that only a democratic State, based on the will of all the people, could secure their birthright to all, without distinction of colour, race, sex or belief. They pledged themselves to strive together, sparing neither strength nor courage, until democratic changes had been won in South Africa.

As the United Nations is marking its fortieth anniversary this year, the people of South Africa too are observing the thirtieth year of the adoption of a momentous and historic document - The Freedom Charter - a blueprint for a people's struggle for freedom, equality, justice, human dignity and self-determination.

It is therefore opportune and fitting that, as we take stock of the successes and failures of this Organization after four decades of its existence, the plight of the peoples of South Africa and Namibia, who have been subjected to untold sufferings under apartheid and colonialism, should assume prominence.

Forty years ago the founding Members of our Organization reaffirmed faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small. In this respect may I, on behalf of the Ugandan delegation and on my own behalf, pay a glowing tribute to Ambassador Joseph Garba of Nigeria and his Committee for their selfless efforts

(Mr. Ofwono, Uganda)

in championing human freedom and dignity. Their report has once again detailed, lucidly and comprehensively, the inhuman agonies suffered by the majority peoples of South Africa.

We convene here at a time when world attention is squarely directed at the explosive events unfolding in South Africa. This heightened concern is not misplaced. The situation in South Africa has deteriorated dramatically in recent months and has reached a critical crossroads in both its domestic and its international dimensions.

Throughout the long and bitter struggle against apartheid, the racist régime in South Africa has always resorted to intensified oppression to stem any increase in the tide of opposition. It has always met expressions of international revulsion with blatant defiance. That conduct, by itself, is nothing new in the South African situation. It is the context in which the racist régime has clung tenaciously to the method it has practised and perfected over the years that has brought South Africa perilously close to the inferno we have predicted for so long.

In July last year, against an overwhelming international injunction and internal rejection, the racist régime of South Africa proceeded to implement its avowed "constitutional reform". It instituted a tricameral parliamentary system under which the white, Asian and Coloured populations would share in a segregated and mock power structure. In doing so South Africa sought to consolidate further the system of apartheid by dividing the ranks of the oppressed and permanently disenfranchising the black majority. The so-called constitutional reform was designed to complement the bantustan policy, through which South Africa had dehumanized most of the black population and divested them of their citizenship.

(Mr. Ofwono, Uganda)

South Africa's action attracted world-wide condemnation. Internally it has sparked off mass reaction among the opponents of apartheid of all races. From Johannesburg to Port Elisabeth the oppressed people of South Africa have mobilized themselves against apartheid by massive demonstrations and by other forms of civil disobedience.

South Africa's reaction to this new wave of resistance has been most typical. In a manner reminiscent of Sharpeville and Soweto, the racist régime has unleashed upon the people of South Africa its entire brutal police and paramilitary machine. From one black township to another, marauding South African police have shot, killed and maimed unarmed demonstrators, most of them young men, women and children. The toll in that continuing explosion of rage rises day by day. South Africa's campaign of terror was capped in July this year by the imposition of a rigorous "state of emergency".

Meanwhile the usual pattern of repression and harassment has persisted. Many Asian leaders were arrested in the aftermath of the resounding boycott of the so-called elections imposed on their population. The majority of the leaders of the United Democratic Front have been interned; many of them face charges of treason.

More than ever before, South Africa has enhanced the operation of its death squads, whose mission it is to assassinate leading opponents of apartheid. Anti-apartheid trade unionists continue to suffer torture and death in detention. In South Africa, even the dead are feared by the apartheid Government, although everybody knows the dead tell no tales. Consequently, black mourners are gunned down, as though attendance at a funeral had become a crime. Innocent schoolchildren are daily herded to police posts to face threats and brutality.

(Mr. Ofwono, Uganda)

There is fear among the peoples of South Africa, fear among the majority and among the minority white population alike, fear of the current trend of events and fear of the future. It is high time that the fascist régime in South Africa saw the writing on the wall. Some time ago the majority peoples of South Africa turned the other cheek when they were slapped. Now they have the courage to throw stones. What next? This Organization has since 1946 impressed on the South African régime the need for reform. For the last 40 years the régime has remained adamant and ignored various United Nations resolutions. Today, it is pretending to be introducing some reforms towards a democratic system, by way of the introduction of bantustans and a tricameral parliamentary system. What a mockery of democracy. How can democratic countries defend this system of democracy in South Africa and yet not accept it in their own countries?

Those who ever doubted or ignored our repeated warnings that South Africa's notion of reform was nothing but a deception to hoodwink international opinion now have the clear evidence and the word of the masters of apartheid for it. On 15 August this year, Mr. Pieter Botha arrogantly reviled the rest of the world and reaffirmed his régime's determination to adhere to the fundamentals of apartheid to the very end. All promises that have followed in the name of reform are in the mould of the old notion.

(Mr. Ofwono, Uganda)

However, there can be no illusions about the current direction of the struggle against apartheid. The die has most clearly been cast. The oppressed people of South Africa, particularly the younger generation, have assumed the mantle of liberation and have raised to new heights the combat against apartheid. Armed with an indomitable will to freedom, they have defied the mighty military power of the racist minority régime. Together, they have set out on a determined course to make apartheid unworkable and the country, under the present system, ungovernable.

Uganda salutes the heroic youth of South Africa. We further reaffirm our strong solidarity with the national liberation movements of South Africa, particularly the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), who continue to spearhead the struggle to free their motherland from the clutches of oppression.

At this juncture of the combat against apartheid, the question before the international community is quite clear - whether to succumb to South Africa's arrogance and defiance or to act on the side of freedom and justice in order to hasten the demise of apartheid. Uganda's position on that crucial question remains unequivocal. We have long advocated the need for the international community to take decisive and concerted action, including comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa in accordance with Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

In that regard, we note with appreciation the galvanizing international consensus in favour of isolating the racist minority régime. We particularly welcome the assurances given by Canada, Australia and New Zealand and the Commonwealth Accord adopted in Nassau during the recent conference of the Commonwealth Heads of State and Government. We also welcome the imposition of selective sanctions by the Nordic countries and, more recently, by the majority of the European Economic Community countries and the United States as a promising, though limited, trend. However, we do not believe that constructive engagement can force South Africa to relent and abandon apartheid.

(Mr. Ofwono, Uganda)

The gravity of the South African situation today demands action beyond half-measures, tokenism or equivocation. For that reason, Uganda renews its call to the Security Council to adopt comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa. Similarly, we continue to condemn those Western countries and their transnational corporations which, by the collaboration with South Africa in the economic, military and nuclear fields provide the materials and psychological tools for the perpetuation of apartheid.

To summarize, the question of apartheid has three dimensions. Within South Africa itself it has meant a denial of the inalienable rights of the black majority and an affront to the principles of equality, dignity and the worth of all human beings as spelled out in the United Nations Charter. Secondly, the system has in addition been extended to Namibia by South Africa through its illegal occupation of that colonial Territory. Thirdly, South Africa has sought to make the whole region of southern Africa the buffer zone of apartheid. In pursuit of that objective, it has carried out acts of aggression and a campaign of destabilization against independent neighbouring countries.

This fortieth session of the General Assembly must therefore speak loudly and clearly on the fascist policy of apartheid. It must firmly remind South Africa that the world will not allow another fascist system based on Nazi precepts to flourish unscathed. It must demand the immediate abolition of apartheid.

Mr. OULD BOYE (Mauritania) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to renew to you, Sir, the sincere congratulations presented to you by the Foreign Minister of my country some days ago upon your election to the presidency of the General Assembly of the United Nations in this historic year of its life. We are confident that thanks to your efficiency and your vast experience, our deliberations will be crowned with success, as has indeed been the case so far.

(Mr. Juld Boye, Mauritania)

Many peoples have suffered colonialism. Colonialism represents the largest phenomenon of man's exploitation of his fellow man. However, the most repugnant and retrograde form of relationship between men is the system of apartheid that we are today witnessing in South Africa. It is a system based on arrogance, hatred and brutality, aimed at perpetuating the privileges of a minority which claims superiority for reasons of race and colour.

South Africa's system of racial discrimination resorts to all forms of pressure, terrorism and torture in order to perpetuate the state of slavery imposed upon an entire people. They have accustomed us, just as the Tel Aviv régime has done in another part of our Arab-African world, to constant challenges to the international community and disregard for its appeals and decisions. However, the terrorist practices and methods of the Pretoria régime, and its attempts to institutionalize them, have met with failure and merely led to further violence and instability. That has been born out by the developments we have been witnessing throughout the past year.

The Islamic Republic of Mauritania wishes to stress the need for strict implementation of United Nations resolutions, which define ways and means to eradicate the apartheid régime in Pretoria and replace it by a democratic system based on majority rule in a unitary State. We believe that the basic conditions for this is an immediate halt to policies of repression, torture and execution as well as the release of all political prisoners, especially the great militant, Nelson Mandela, and a halt to repeated attacks against neighbouring countries.

Experience has proved that the rulers of Pretoria will not voluntarily respond to those objective solutions which guarantee the restoration of peace and stability to the peoples and countries of southern Africa. Therefore, in this historic year, all the bodies and organs of the United Nations, especially the Security Council, must take strict measures commensurate with developments with a view to punishing

(Mr. Ould Boye, Mauritania)

the Pretoria régime by boycotting it in all fields, most particularly in the economic and military fields.

(Mr. Ould Boye, Mauritania)

Any humiliation of man by man, whatever its form, constitutes a criminal act that has been condemned by mankind throughout history. The second Caliph of the Moslems, Omar ibn-al-Khattab, in his criticism and punishment of anyone who disdained and exploited the people, spoke the famous words: "How could you enslave people when they were born free to their mothers?". And we say: What right do the racist rulers of South Africa have in continuing to impose their presence on a people who wish to enjoy on their own land a life of freedom and dignity?

The overwhelming revolutionary rise of the struggling people of South Africa, under the leadership of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), will eliminate apartheid, just as the racist régime of Southern Rhodesia was brought down. They will shatter the myth of Botha, just as the myth of Ian Smith was shattered. This will inevitably lead to victory for freedom and equality in South Africa.

Mr. ALZAMORA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): It is hard indeed to find new words and ways of expressing the feelings and purposes we all share: the repudiation and eradication of apartheid, the common objective for which we have been fighting so long.

But in this commemorative year of the United Nations, when hopes are reborn and the principles of the Organization are being reaffirmed, it is encouraging to note that the world remains convinced that, after much hardship and struggle, we can now begin the final countdown for this scourge of mankind, and that, as the effects of the first effective sanctions are beginning to be felt, the edifice of racism and oppression is crumbling. Now more than ever we must redouble our efforts, strengthen our unity and reaffirm our solidarity in the struggle.

In order to contribute to victory for justice and reason in South Africa, to show in deeds its solidarity and its support and to close ranks with the front-line countries victims of South African aggression, Peru has recently established formal

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

diplomatic relations with Angola and officially proposed such relations with Zimbabwe, Botswana and Mozambique - and the relevant announcements will be made jointly with these fraternal countries in the coming days.

In an official statement my Government emphatically condemned the execution of the patriot Benjamin Moloise as a heinous crime and once again appealed to the conscience of mankind for collective action against apartheid and against those who support it.

International pressure is gradually leading to the dismantlement of apartheid and the establishment of democracy in South Africa. The Nassau Agreements are an additional important step in this direction.

As immediate goals, we must put an end to the state of emergency, lift the ban on the activities of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) and all the parties and release Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners. We must also adopt other measures allowing for free expression and self-determination for the black majority and its legitimate representatives in choosing the country's future.

To this end we must adopt comprehensive economic sanctions immediately against South Africa and, in particular, denounce any failure to comply with the arms embargo decreed by the Security Council, no matter from what quarter, as called for in September by Peru, as a member of the Council, in connection with the latest South African attack against Angola.

The illegal occupation of Namibia, which makes such transgressions possible, is an additional factor deserving of condemnation by the international community and our Organization, which must not allow that in a few months' time there will have been 20 years of such defiance of its authority and of the international legal order it represents.

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

The world has at last identified with the tragedy of the people of South Africa and its suffering and aspirations. A world-wide movement of political and moral scope has begun to mobilize action by Governments towards a definitive solution.

The segregationist régime now more than ever before has its back against the wall, both domestically and externally. While the courageous struggle of the South African people is being stepped up in all fields, international action has considerably strengthened, including action by those countries with major economic, military and political influence, and universal condemnation of apartheid in South Africa has been expressed in the statements of the overwhelming majority of world leaders who stood at this rostrum just a few days ago.

As a member of the Special Committee against Apartheid for many years, we have witnessed the valuable contribution made to this end by its Chairman, General Joseph Garba of Nigeria, to whom we pay a tribute of admiration and appreciation. A tribute also goes to the representative of Barbados for his success in preparing and concluding the draft international convention against apartheid in sports, whose adoption by the Assembly will strengthen and unite our action in the struggle against discrimination and injustice.

Peru in voice and in deeds joins in this cause, which is also that of our people.

Because we are devoted to peace and dialogue, we place dialogue before confrontation in the solution of problems, and we trust that Pretoria will understand the desirability of beginning a dialogue immediately. We cannot fail to recognize the legitimacy of the struggle when it is the only course of action possible to protect equality, freedom and justice in order that a people can live in dignity and with pride.

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

We continue to share the fraternal experiences with the South African people that have come about from our colonial past and from our multiracial society. That is the basis of our genuine solidarity with the struggle against apartheid, which is enshrined in our Constitution that proclaims equality for all before the law, without any distinction, and rejects all forms of imperialism, colonialism and discrimination and expresses solidarity with all the oppressed peoples of the world.

Today we reaffirm this solidarity and this commitment, and we are happy to proclaim our faith in final victory for our cause.

Mr. LEWIS (Canada): When Bishop Tutu finished speaking last Monday, my Canadian colleagues felt as though there were nothing left to be said. I was not able to be here at the time, but, reading the speech afterwards, I could see him in my mind's eye, as I have seen him before, standing at this rostrum, urgent, passionate, lucid, looking for all the world like a diminutive version of an Old Testament prophet, his voice mounting cadence upon cadence, building - unanswerably - the case against apartheid.

The beauty of Tutu is the simplicity of his eloquence. He reminded us, at the outset, of his beloved country burning and bleeding unnecessarily to death, and he reminded us at the conclusion that he would remember those who helped his people to be free. In between, throughout the argument, the analysis, the documentation, the soaring phrases, the pleas for peace, there was one thing, one truly phenomenal thing, utterly absent: there was not so much as a whisper of malice, hatred or retaliation.

That characteristic of so much of the black South African leadership has always astounded me. No matter what the provocation, no matter how deep the nadirs of despair, no matter how ugly the coercive apparatus of racism, the Tutus of the this world, like the Luthulis 25 years before them, reject vengeance, seek reconciliation, espouse racial harmony.

If I may be allowed a personal aside, it is the one dimension of the struggle with which I have some small passing experience. Back in 1959 I lived and worked with South African refugees on the campus of the University of Legon in Accra. Ghana was newly independent; Kwame Nkrumah was flying refugees out of South Africa in the dead of night, attempting to create a lifeline of escape during some of the darkest hours of the infamous Verwoerd régime. They were all youngish men caught up in the tragedy of their country, facing the whips of Afrikaner extremism were they to return, but not one of them - not one of them - embraced at the time

(Mr. Lewis, Canada)

premeditated violence. They all talked, with quiet, single-minded intensity, of equality, justice, democracy for everyone - white, Coloured, Indian, black.

I heard exactly those reverberations in the words of Bishop Tutu this week. And just as I asked myself a generation ago, I ask myself now: how do such people manage to maintain such generosity, such dignity, such vision, in the face of so prolonged and so malevolent an assault?

I do not know the answer. It may have a lot to do with religious faith; it obviously has a great deal to do with qualities of resilience and decency in the human spirit. But of one thing I am certain: this pattern of almost supernatural restraint will not last forever. As the fabric of society tears asunder, as the Government of South Africa defies reason, those who counsel moderation will find their voices stilled by violence.

That is why we are in such a race with time. And that is why, in Canada's view, the next six months are crucial. Somehow, we must keep the momentum going. There is a sense - perfectly real - that we are poised on the brink, that at any moment South Africa could descend into the maelstrom of conflict and horror. We have to maintain the faith with the black leadership that never gives up, faith with those who suffer the police in the townships, with those who languish in detention, with those who face trial, with those who are hanged at dawn, with those whose lives are already forfeit in the desperate struggle for freedom. And keeping the faith means keeping the pressure relentlessly on.

In that respect the world has come a long way in the last several months. Canada is strongly representative of that crescendo of conscience and action which now grips nation after nation. I do not think it is necessary to recapitulate for this audience each and every measure Canada has recently introduced. We have circulated all our relevant political statements as formal documents of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Lewis, Canada)

Suffice it to say that between July and September of this year Canada announced a whole range of selective sanctions cutting right across the economic spectrum, incorporating everything from the effective ban on the sale of krugerrands to a ban on bank loans, to an embargo on air transport, to a voluntary ban on the sale of crude oil, to an end of the toll-processing of uranium from Namibia. In concert with so many other nations, we have strengthened our sporting boycott, and so anxious are we to give expression to an aroused public opinion that the Canadian Government has opened a registry in which every single voluntary measure undertaken by Canadian provinces, municipalities, organizations and even private citizens can be inscribed as a testament of our implacable opposition to apartheid. As the dossier builds, we will forward the contents to the Secretary-General.

Such items, however, are simply the specific ingredients of political policy. Conceptually, we have gone much further. We have, with determination, helped to negotiate and then signed October's Commonwealth accord, a document which not only contains within it selective sanctions collectively applied, but also the terms and conditions for dismantling apartheid. And then, last week, from this very rostrum, the Canadian Prime Minister made it clear that, if South Africa resists fundamental change, we are prepared to impose total sanctions; more, that if apartheid is not dismantled, we would consider severing relations with South Africa absolutely.

There are moments in the lives of nations when the immorality of one invites the opprobrium of all. This is such a moment.

Canada recognizes that some countries and some critics argue that the world is moving too slowly on this issue. In truth, no one would have predicted, a mere six months ago, that so much would be galvanized so quickly. The pressure on South Africa is inexorably mounting. South Africa feels the pressure. The strategy now must be never to allow that pressure to abate. Over the next six months - the time

(Mr. Lewis, Canada)

frame of the Commonwealth accord, the time frame which Bishop Tutu has endorsed - we must use every device, every initiative, every opportunity, every diplomatic skill, every debate, every appropriate forum within the United Nations and beyond the United Nations, individually and collectively, to persuade South Africa that peaceful change alone makes sense and that peaceful change can only be achieved when apartheid is forever expunged from the vocabulary of human and political behaviour.

The so-called reforms are no fundamental reforms at all. There remain in existence more than 300 apartheid laws. They constitute a lexicon of oppression. They restrict and control, on the basis of race alone, virtually the entire range of human activity. They are anathema to a civilized society.

Despite the elaborate arguments of some, we are not dealing with a complex issue. We are dealing with colour and with dignity. Whenever I speak to one of my diplomatic colleagues from Africa and Asia about apartheid, the elemental pain in their faces is the pain of a simple truth: colour and dignity. I have never felt that more strongly in my life than since coming to the United Nations.

(Mr. Lewis, Canada)

This is a struggle we all must win. South Africa must be persuaded that the dismantling of apartheid, the lifting of the state of emergency, the release of Nelson Mandela and other political detainees, the revocation of the ban on the African National Congress and other political parties, and above all an immediate dialogue with the representative black leadership - are the pre-conditions for an orderly and peaceful transition to a free and non-racial democratic society.

Some people ask, what exactly does the black leadership of South Africa want? Let me end on that note with this quote:

"In government we will not be satisfied with anything less than direct individual adult suffrage and the right to stand for and be elected to all organs of government. In economic matters we will be satisfied with nothing less than equality of opportunity in every sphere and the enjoyment by all of those heritages which form the resources of the country which up to now have been appropriated on a racial whites-only basis. In culture we will be satisfied with nothing less than the opening of all doors of learning to non-segregatory institutions on the sole criterion of ability. In the social sphere we will be satisfied with nothing less than the abolition of all racial bars. We do not demand these things for people of African descent alone. We demand them for all South Africans, white and black. On these principles we are uncompromising."

Who is the author of those words? Chief Albert Lutuli, when he was head of the African National Congress. On what occasion? In 1961, in his speech upon receiving the Nobel Peace Prize.

Two Nobel Laureates, Lutuli and Tutu, almost 25 years apart.

The people of South Africa have waited long enough.

Mr. PANDEY (Nepal): This year too, as in the past, my delegation is speaking to express our strong condemnation of the policy of apartheid being pursued by the racist régime of South Africa. We do so not only because of our natural affinity with the majority population of South Africa but also because we believe that a policy based on racial discrimination is against human values. While racism is in itself a crime against humanity through its resort to barbarous and brutal methods to sustain the abhorrent policy of apartheid, the white minority régime in South Africa has today become a threat to international peace and security. As my august sovereign, His Majesty King Birendra, has said,

"blind to the realities of the day, relying on the bullet as the solution to every problem, the South African racists have defied all norms of civilized behaviour".

In spite of global condemnation and appeals by almost all the countries of the world that Pretoria desist from its policy of apartheid, the racist régime has stubbornly continued its acts of terror and repression, in total defiance of the Charter of the United Nations.*

Only recently the racist régime of South Africa declared a state of emergency with the sole purpose of subjecting the black majority of the country to greater harassment and repression. As a result hundreds of black Africans have been killed and thousands have been imprisoned. With profound grief and indignation, my delegation came to know that Benjamin Moloise, a poet of repute, had also been executed, on 18 October 1985. And, sadly, Nelson Mandela, the undisputed leader of the black Africans, is still languishing in Poolsmar prison.

*Mr. Kiilu (Kenya), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Pandey, Nepal)

In November 1983, in a bid to hoodwink international public opinion, the racist régime of Pretoria imposed on the black South African majority its so-called constitutional reforms. How can such a constitution be progressive when under it the black majority enjoys none of the fundamental human rights that are basic to known democratic constitutions.

Equally fraudulent is their scheme of bantustanization, under which indigenous black Africans are denied basic rights in their own country. Today the blacks, who number more than 20.6 million out of a total population of 25 million, live in a mere 13 per cent of the territory, whereas 87 per cent of the territory is reserved for the 4.3 million whites. It is only within limited areas along the fringes of the country that the blacks can exercise their rights. Hunger, poverty, unemployment and malnutrition are rampant in these "homelands". In addition, under a system of migrant labour, millions of black Africans have been forced to separate from their families and to work as cheap labourers for whites.

In addition to these acts of repression against non-whites within the country, the Pretoria régime is posing a direct threat to the stability and security of the adjoining States. Not surprisingly, in recent years we have seen how the South African Government is resorting to increased use of military force, not only to suppress popular resistance in Namibia but also to destabilize neighbouring non-aligned countries. These acts of aggression constitute a serious threat to international peace and security. They are also clearly in defiance of the Charter of the United Nations. In this respect we strongly denounce the military collaboration between South Africa and certain Western countries. We equally condemn the indirect support and encouragement that the South African racist régime is receiving from certain countries that profess to be staunch supporters of human rights and human dignity.

(Mr. Pandey, Nepal)

In the last 35 years of apartheid rule we have witnessed enough bloodshed, imprisonment, murders and tortures. We have also witnessed scores of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations condemning the brutal policy of apartheid, and also volumes of rhetoric hurled by more than 100 Member States of the United Nations at the Pretoria régime.

However, the chilling fact remains that apartheid is alive and well in South Africa. It is clear from this that words have little effect and that resolutions have a limited effect. In the view of my delegation only economic sanctions can have a decisive effect. But such sanctions should all be comprehensive in scope and applied by all the countries of the world, particularly the affluent and military significant countries which have maintained close economic and political relations with the racist régime.

Only then will the racist régime fall; only then will there emerge a new South African State which will be non-racial, democratic and independent.

In conclusion, my delegation would like to express our total solidarity with the freedom fighters of South Africa and Namibia in their struggle for freedom, equality and justice. We should also like to express our tribute to the Special Committee against Apartheid, which has rendered valuable service in mobilizing public opinion against apartheid. As a country with profound faith in human rights, my country will extend full co-operation and support to the Special Committee against Apartheid in its struggle against the racist régime of Pretoria.

We fully support the recommendations contained in the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid.

Mr. MUDENGE (Zimbabwe): Let me at the outset convey the appreciation of my delegation to the Permanent Representative of Nigeria, Mr. Garba, and through him to the Special Committee against Apartheid for the report before this Assembly today. As on past occasions, I should like to assure him of my delegation's full support for the constructive recommendations contained in document A/40/36.

We are here today to discuss the events in the southern tip of our continent, Africa. It is often said that familiarity breeds contempt. We hope and trust that the fact that the issue before us today has been with us for so long does not in any way diminish its importance in the eyes of any one of us here today. Rather the continued existence of the issue of apartheid on our agenda, 40 years after the whole world went to war to rid our planet of the policies of nazism, should be a sad reminder to us all of the threat to international peace and security that the evil policy of apartheid poses to southern Africa and the world at large.

The past year has been an extremely difficult one for southern Africa and in particular for the oppressed people of South Africa and Namibia. In Namibia we have witnessed the racist régime of South Africa entrenching the policies of apartheid through the imposition of a puppet régime in Windhoek and through the continued militarization of every sphere of life in that Territory. Nearly 20 years after the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, the realization of fundamental freedoms and independence in that Territory remains a hope deferred. In South Africa itself we have in the past year witnessed an escalation of violence as the racist régime intensified its campaign of terror and repression against innocent civilians in defence of its immoral and abhorrent system of apartheid. In the face of the rising tide of the demands for freedom and justice in South Africa, Pretoria has become more brutal, more defiant and a master of duplicity and prevarication. Out of all this web of intrigue and insincerity

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

comes one clear message: the minority régime in Pretoria has no intention whatsoever of dismantling apartheid and will stop at nothing short of a total physical liquidation of all forms of resistance to its tyranny in order to ensure South Africa's continued survival as an apartheid State.

Of late that message has emanated from Botha himself with uncommon clarity. In a series of public statements ranging from the address to the so-called tricameral Parliament on 25 January to the address to the National Party Congress at Port Elizabeth on 30 September, the Botha régime has made it clear that it does not contemplate the possibility of meaningful political change in South Africa. At Port Elizabeth, in the now familiar display of his mastery of double talk and verbal fencing, Botha announced on the one hand that his Government was committed to the principle of a united South Africa, one citizenship and universal franchise, while on the other hand he reiterated his Government's opposition to majority rule in a unitary State. Similarly, in Durban, and with great fanfare, Botha claimed that discrimination on the basis of race, ethnic character and origin was now a thing of the past, yet in the same breath proclaimed his Government's determination to entrench apartheid in the fields of education, residential areas, health and so forth. In the same vein and without a feeling of having done injustice to his sense of logic, Botha talked about his commitment to dialogue and yet has detained thousands of the very people whom he is supposed to talk to. He claims to encourage dialogue but only recently he withdrew the passports of those among his followers that seek dialogue with the true leaders of the oppressed majority.

This is a familiar tune coming from Pretoria. We have heard of those so-called reforms before. We are now familiar with the double talk and double-dealing tactics of the Pretoria racists. These manoeuvres cannot blind the

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

world to the fact that innocent blood has been shed by the actions of the racist military machinery on the streets of Johannesburg, Durban, Cape Town and other cities in South Africa in defence of this evil system of apartheid. We cannot be made to forget about the recent senseless massacres of civilians, women and children alike, at Sebokeng, Utenhage and Langa. We remember the callous and purposeless murder on 16 October of the dear son of Africa, the poet and revolutionary, Comrade Molloise. We remember all those who have gone before him in the cause of freedom and self-determination.

It must be clear to all in this Assembly by now that the white minority in South Africa never had, does not have and will never have the intention of voluntarily liquidating its position of domination in South Africa. For anybody to imagine that a ruthless ruling minority can be charmed to sleep with fast talking and sweet words as if by some mythical sirens and that it will willingly effect "reforms" which will ultimately result in its loss of control is either naivety written large or the depth of duplicity. It is to deny the elementary lessons of history.

The Afrikaner of today is not the simple, bucolic Boer of yesterday wandering on the highlands of South Africa looking for a patch of land to till and graze his cattle away from the imperialist clutches of a foreign country. No, the Afrikaner is highly disciplined, tightly organized, determined and dedicated to maintain the position of dominance he has won for himself. He has created a powerful modern industrial state machinery in order to maintain his racial domination of South Africa. He is sophisticated, he is ruthless, and his history has taught him to respect power. He has clearly defined objectives and a sense of his own destiny. He has even made a covenant with a god of his own creation. He is convinced that it is his manifest destiny to rule South Africa. On the issue of white leadership

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

of South Africa he will not yield, at any rate not without a struggle. As the philosophical father of the modern Afrikaner politics, the late Prime Minister, Dr. Hendrick Verwoerd, put it in a speech to the South African Parliament in 1963:

"Reduced to its simplest form, the problem is nothing else than this: we want to keep South Africa white. Keeping it white can only mean one thing, namely white domination, not leadership, not guidance but control, white supremacy." Admittedly Dr. Verwoerd, that immovable granite-like sphinx, was a man of disarming frankness and had a forthrightness of speech which his successors may find somewhat embarrassing these days. But let there be no mistake that, in spite of what the famous Afrikaner writer, Andre Brink, so aptly described as Botha's "semantics of reform", Botha too is a redoubtable bastion of Afrikanerdom moulded in the Verwoerdian philosophy, as he made clear in his famed "reform" speech in Durban in August 1985:

"Destroy white South Africa and our influence in this subcontinent of southern Africa, and this country will drift into factions, strife, chaos and poverty".

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

For that reason, he continued: .

"I am not prepared to lead white South Africans and other minority groups on a road to abdication and suicide".

He is a man of the iron fist, who believes in verwoerdism and, more than any other man, is largely responsible for the growing militarization of the apartheid State machinery. It is not for nothing that he has created what has now come to be commonly known as "Botha's Junta". This is a monstrous machinery of internal repression and external aggression in order to preserve white domination not only in South Africa but in the subregion as a whole.

The Afrikaner is not just interested in maintaining domination in South Africa itself. His ambition is to dominate the whole subregion. His policy of destabilization of his neighbours is meant to weaken them so that they cannot threaten his control of South Africa either by force of example or through economic competition. His neighbours must be made subservient to and dependent on him, just as he wants the majority population in South Africa to be. This megalomaniac ambition for regional domination was enunciated on 2 December 1982 by "Radio South Africa", the official mouthpiece of the apartheid State. In a commentary entitled "Monroe Doctrine Needed for Southern Africa", the South African Broadcasting Corporation said, inter alia:

"There are growing parallels between the security role of the United States in South and Central America and that of South Africa in this part of the world. The correspondence arises from similar motives.

"From that joint commitment is emerging the Monroe Doctrine for the region. It is taking shape as new developments lead to a more comprehensive enunciation of the strategy for regional security ... It is based on the perception that peace and stability in the subcontinent require effective

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

action against alien military forces, a perception that is shared by the United States Government ... As the most advanced and powerful State in the region, South Africa has a special responsibility towards it, as the United States has long had towards its continent ... A Monroe Doctrine is needed in southern Africa."

The arrogant little men who rule South Africa are not content with their role in South Africa but seek to dominate and dictate to the southern African region as a whole.

It is important that we expose fully the ambitions and designs of the apartheid State both in South Africa and in the subregion. For a misreading of the situation can be very costly indeed, as we know from recent history, when a well-meaning gentleman waved a piece of paper declaring peace in our time. On that occasion another group of morally squalid little men duped the well-meaning with sweet reassuring noises. But in the case of South Africa, it seems some people are in danger of misleading themselves.

It will be recalled that Mr. Botha, after ensuring that the whole world would listen to his speech in August this year, went ahead to lay it on the line that he had no intention of carrying out any reforms in South Africa that threatened white control of that country. Everybody got the message, loud and clear - but apparently not the over-optimistic United States Assistant Secretary of State for Africa. To him Botha was speaking in "coded" political language which we must patiently decode. The Assistant Secretary of State for Africa should face the fact that Mr. Botha has no programme to dismantle apartheid or to share power with the majority of his countrymen. Not today; not in his lifetime; and not in a thousand years. No amount of decoding or deciphering can reveal such a non-existent plan.

Equally misguided is a comment by President Reagan; he was reported on 14 March 1981 to have said, inter alia:

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

"Can we abandon a country" - that is, South Africa - "that has stood beside us in every war we have fought, a country that strategically is essential to the free world? It has production of minerals we all must have and so forth."

The President should be told that the morally squalid little men ruling South Africa today were never his friends in any war. They were supporters of the equally morally squalid little men in Berlin. They had to be interned for their pro-Nazi activities during the war. The true friends of America and President Reagan, some of whom gave their lives during the two wars, are those now suffering under the gumboot rule of the allies of the Fascists who now dominate South Africa.

The relationship of the great Western nations with South Africa is of immense importance to the whole problem in South Africa. It can either be used as a great force for good or can become one of the biggest stumbling blocks in fighting apartheid. It is therefore pertinent that we briefly outline this involvement. The modernization of South Africa in recent years owes much to Western capital and technology. This structural dependency is exemplified by South Africa's over-reliance on Western capital and technology for its development. The United States Federal Reserve Bank reports that as of June 1983 United States banks had over \$3,883 billion worth of loans outstanding to South-African-based entities. In addition, direct American investment totals some \$2.6 billion and American shareholders own an additional \$8 billion worth of stock listed on the Johannesburg Stock Exchange. Moreover, American capital and technology have been especially vital in the development of certain key sectors of the apartheid economy. For instance, American investment in manufacturing industries account for almost 10 per cent of the fixed capital stock in the economy. According to the Investor Responsibility Research Centre, based in Washington, over 400 United States companies have affiliates in South Africa and Namibia; among them are the biggest

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

United States multinational corporations like General Motors, Mobil, Caltex and Ford. Over 6,000 companies in the United States do business with South Africa through sales agents and licencing agreements. Nowhere is this dependency more highlighted than in the computer industry, where South Africa's reliance on foreign technology is almost total. We are told that the United Kingdom has about 7 billion British pounds invested in South Africa and up to a quarter of a million British jobs are dependent on trade with South Africa. Cases of South Africa's economic relationship with other Western Powers can similarly be advanced.

Because of the West's key contribution to the emergence and sustenance of the apartheid State, the international community holds it partially responsible for the evils of apartheid. As a provider of the sinews and muscles for powering the apartheid engines, the West must be called upon to bear its key responsibility in the dismantling of this evil machine.

As the representative of the United Kingdom made clear in his anti-economic sanctions statement during this debate:

"I make no bones about the fact that sanctions would be extremely damaging for Western countries, including the United Kingdom. It is not a fact we have ever sought to conceal. We do not see the sense of punishing the ordinary people of Britain because the South African Government is pursuing bad policies". (A/40/PV.52, p. 22)

We ask our British friends to consider carefully the price they are asking 23 million black people in South Africa to pay to keep 250,000 Englishmen employed and to enable British companies to reap their profits from South Africa. We invite them to read today's death toll from South Africa, as well as yesterday's and the one of the day before that, and so on and so forth - the hundreds dead, thousands incarcerated and millions eking out a fragile existence in dust bowls called homelands.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

We ask them to look back at 1910 when the Union of South Africa was formed. Then Britain decided to win over the Boers by giving them a magnanimous constitution. Yet somebody has had to pay dearly for that act of British magnanimity to the Boers. Yes, the "price of magnanimity" after the Boer war has had to be borne by the black South African. Has this not been too high a price to pay for British magnanimity? Can we really continue asking the black South African to pay the price for British profits and employment? Is this fair?

No amount of hair-splitting casuistry will do. The issues are straightforward. It is now time for each one of us to take a stand. Verbal camouflage is no substitute for action.

The African nations have decided that enough is enough. Apartheid must be smashed. The massacres must be stopped. The United Nations, as the guardian of international peace and security, is therefore called upon today to reaffirm that apartheid is a crime against humanity, and to request the Security Council to impose and implement forthwith comprehensive mandatory sanctions on the apartheid régime under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. And if the apartheid régime persists, the United Nations will be asked to take any and all such action as shall be deemed necessary to achieve this.

There remains no more honourable course of action than the one we have just proposed. Yes, we know that some of our friends in the West may stand to lose, temporarily, I dare say, some of the profits that they are reaping from the blood of their brothers in South Africa. But the very same fears were expressed by the very same interest groups at the time of the abolition of slavery. Yet after the abolition of slavery commerce and trade did not collapse. The great nations of the West continued to prosper. History has lessons here for us. Let not greed and shortsightedness harden our hearts and numb our consciences.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

The argument of the slave masters that abolition would hurt the slaves more than the owners is as hollow now as it was then. Today we are told that comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa will hurt the black people of South Africa. There is nothing more insulting to our intelligence than this disingenuous and hypocritical drivel. It is a sanctimonious subterfuge proffered in order to evade acting firmly and resolutely. It is no more than the proverbial fig leaf of shame meant to hide the greed for super-profits which the multinationals reap in South Africa. The African people in South Africa know full well that if the physician has to operate in order to remove a tumour the patient will have to endure some degree of pain from the operation. As the late Chief Albert Luthuli, another black Nobel Prize winner from South Africa, and a great leader of his people, stated more than 25 years ago:

"The economic boycott of South Africa will entail undoubted suffering for Africans. We do not doubt that. But if it is a method that shortens the day of bloodshed, the suffering to us will be a price we are willing to pay."

In mentioning the suffering of the black people under mandatory sanctions I do not speak from abstraction or theory. I speak as a representative of a country where not so long ago the black population suffered for 15 years from the effects of comprehensive mandatory sanctions imposed by the United Nations at the instigation of the Government of the United Kingdom. The sanctions did not, by themselves, topple the Smith régime; but they were psychologically devastating to the morale of the white minority. To the vast majority of the black people in Zimbabwe comprehensive mandatory sanctions were the clearest manifestation of the international community's solidarity with the righteousness of their cause. It was a source of inspiration. There is no doubt that, despite the vaunted ingenuity of the Smith minority régime to evade sanctions - which incidentally was only

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

possible because Rhodesia to all intents and purposes had economically become the fifth province of South Africa against whom there were no sanctions - yet in spite of that, the weariness with United Nations sanctions and the escalation of the liberation war in the end forced the illegal Smith régime to the negotiating table. I have no doubt in my mind that comprehensive mandatory sanctions, diplomatic and other pressures as well as the armed struggle can ultimately bring about similar results in South Africa.

South Africa and its friends have also argued that mandatory sanctions would hurt the neighbouring black majority-ruled countries in the region. We do not deny this likelihood. However, we will not accept that the world community should use us as an excuse for not facing up to its responsibility to the people of South Africa and Namibia. The suffering of the people of Zambia, Mozambique, Botswana and Malawi did not prevent the United Nations from assuming its duty by imposing comprehensive mandatory sanctions against Rhodesia. Is it not strange that countries which only yesterday imposed sanctions against Nicaragua, Poland, Afghanistan, Argentina, and so on, should be those fighting desperately against the imposition of sanctions against South Africa on the grounds that sanctions do not work? Why this double standard? Are sanctions a valid weapon or not?

The urgent need to act decisively against the apartheid monster has never been more pressing. We stand on the precipice of disaster. There are many angry voices asking why civilized man is prepared to tolerate this form of slavery practised by a group of fascists. Why is it that when that same evil doctrine was practised in Europe mankind was roused to die fighting it? Yet when the apostles of that same doctrine practise their evil belief in South Africa today we are called upon to be "constructive" and actively to "engage" the practitioners of that evil in dialogue, to coax them out of their belief, with reason and sweet words.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

Can we blame those angry young men in Soweto, South Africa, who have begun asking the question, why this double standard in the world's reaction? Is it partly because the victims on this occasion are Othello's countrymen? It is our fervent hope and ardent wish that the colour of the victim in this case has not influenced the thinking and actions of some of the great nations of our age. For this would be such a tragedy and failure that future generations will muse in amazement how it was that man, capable of venturing into space and of so many other scientific wonderments, could still be swayed by such primeval instincts as race and colour. I honestly hope that this blight does not afflict the thinking of the great nations of this generation.

My delegation is encouraged by the increasing and irreversible momentum towards the imposition of mandatory sanctions on Pretoria, as evidenced by the adoption of Security Council resolution 566 (1985), advocating voluntary sanctions against the South African régime. A significant number of countries have taken steps towards applying voluntary sanctions. These are on the whole encouraging developments. But as the report before us rightly states:

"... voluntary, unilateral and limited sanctions of individual Western Governments are inadequate to deal with the critical situation."

(A/40/22, para. 354)

We therefore call on the United States, the United Kingdom, Japan and West Germany who are by far the most important investors in South Africa to join the growing international resolve to oblige South Africa to stop playing truant on the question of apartheid and Namibia.

While comprehensive and mandatory sanctions remain indispensable weapons in the struggle against apartheid, it goes without saying that, in the ultimate analysis, it is for the people of South Africa themselves, through their

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

legitimate representatives, the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) to intensify the liberation struggle against the racist régime. However, such an intensification of the liberation struggle is only possible if we, the members of the international community, are willing to translate our words of support into meaningful action. The international community must demonstrate its resolve by increasing support to the people of South Africa to enable them to intensify their struggle.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

In this regard my delegation fully supports the call by the Special Committee against Apartheid for increased assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa as contained in paragraphs 388-391 of its report (A/40/22). This has become even more urgent because of the increased acts of brutality and oppression by the Pretoria régime. We believe that South Africa can take the United Nations seriously only when the States Members of this international body take their obligations and commitments in the same light.

It is not my wish to end my statement sounding as a Cassandra of doom. But the vision of the Tiber foaming with blood brings me less shivers than the Armageddon that faces us in the racial conflagration threatening the African sub-continent. No multi-racial societies will be saved from the consequences of the dark forces and emotions that will be unleashed by such a horror. I therefore implore the members of the Assembly not to fiddle while Rome is burning, lest, like Nero of old, we ourselves are consumed by the resultant raging forces.

Mr. ALAQUI (Morocco) (interpretation from French): More than 30 years ago the United Nations first considered the policy of apartheid of the South African Government and its consequences for international peace and security. A number of resolutions were adopted reflecting the unanimous repudiation by the international community of the foundations and manifestations of this inhuman and degrading policy, and called for its abolition.

The Security Council and the General Assembly in particular condemned apartheid as a crime against the peace and security of mankind, recognizing thereby that the oppressed peoples were entitled to freedom and dignity. Then political, diplomatic, economic and military measures were recommended in an effort to prevail upon South Africa to repudiate the system of apartheid and lay the foundations for a democratic and non-racist society, in which all members would enjoy the same rights without distinction as to colour, race or creed.

(Mr. Alaoui, Morocco)

But far from responding to the legitimate aspirations of the South African people, and the appeals of the international community, South Africa continues its policy of exiling, imprisoning, torturing and summarily executing all those who oppose the daily manifestations of apartheid. Similarly, in its quest for status as a regional Power, which would make it possible for it to extend its hegemony over the whole of southern Africa, the South African régime continues illegally to occupy the Territory of Namibia and to commit, with impunity, acts of aggression, destabilization and economic blackmail against neighbouring countries.

Faced with the growing anti-apartheid campaign being carried out by various organizations, trade unions and religious groups, South Africa is attempting to stave off the end of its régime by introducing facsimiles of reform. But the majority of the South African population has not been taken in by this, because it has rejected such proposals which are in actual fact mere manoeuvres aimed at undermining the solidarity of its members, deflecting the attention of world public opinion, and weakening the efforts of the international community to hasten the end of the apartheid system.

Furthermore, recent events in southern Africa have only confirmed the South African régime in its intransigence and determination, at all costs, to keep the indigenous population in a state of slavery. However, the international community cannot compromise with apartheid, which is the very denial of the fundamental rights recognized in the Charter and the human values we all share. It must step up its activities to eliminate, rapidly, totally and once and for all, the system of apartheid and to bring about the free and democratic expression of the wishes of the whole South African population.

(Mr. Alaoui, Morocco)

This means that all States must apply the measures adopted by the United Nations, particularly with regard to the oil embargo, the ending of all military co-operation, and particularly nuclear co-operation with South Africa; the ending of all investments and the cutting off of all material and moral support for that régime, supporting instead the just struggle being waged by the oppressed masses for the recovery of their legitimate rights.

For its part, the Kingdom of Morocco, which has constantly and unreservedly supported the struggle of the South African people, believes that it is now time for statements and verbal condemnation to be translated into concrete, urgent and firm action to eliminate the anachronistic system of apartheid and to put an end to one of the most grave sources of instability in Africa. We express the hope that 1986, which has been proclaimed the International Year of Peace, will see a concerted and deliberate effort on the part of the international community to emancipate the Namibian people and to ensure that the peoples of South Africa enjoy their fundamental rights and freedoms.

I cannot end this statement without expressing our gratitude for the militant and devoted role played by the Special Committee against Apartheid and its Chairman, Ambassador Joseph Garba, in mobilizing world public opinion against the outrageous policy of apartheid.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.