



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 27:	
Question of Namibia:	
(a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;	
(b) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia . .	1715
Agenda item 28:	
Policies of <i>apartheid</i> of the Government of South Africa (<i>concluded</i>):	
(a) Report of the Special Committee against <i>Apartheid</i> ;	
(b) Report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against <i>Apartheid</i> in Sports;	
(c) Reports of the Secretary-General	1715
Agenda item 26:	
The situation in the Middle East: report of the Secretary-General (<i>concluded</i>):	1736

President: Mr. Rüdiger von WECHMAR
(Federal Republic of Germany).

AGENDA ITEM 27

Question of Namibia:

- (a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;
- (b) Report of the United Council for Namibia

1. The PRESIDENT: I put before the General Assembly the draft decision contained in document A/35/L.37/Rev.1 and Add.1. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of this draft decision is to be found in document A/35/761.

2. It is my understanding that the General Assembly is prepared to adopt the draft decision without a vote.

The draft decision was adopted (decision 35/442).

3. The PRESIDENT: With regard to the consideration of agenda item 27, entitled "Question of Namibia", at the resumed thirty-fifth session, I should like to inform the Assembly that the representative of the Sudan has confirmed to me by letter dated 15 December 1980 "that the African group, having been apprised of the current state of negotiations between the United Nations and South Africa on the implementation of Security Council resolution 385 (1976)", has requested postponement of the debate "till January 1981 so that the General Assembly can consider at that time the

outcome of the proposed pre-implementation talks scheduled to be held from 7 to 14 January 1981 under the auspices of the United Nations".

4. May I consider that the General Assembly agrees to that request, that is, to postpone the debate on the question of Namibia until the resumed session in January 1981?

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 28

Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa (*concluded*):*

- (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) Reports of the Secretary-General

5. The PRESIDENT: Members will recall that at the 85th plenary meeting on 8 December all the draft resolutions on this item were introduced. Subsequently, revised texts of two of the draft resolutions were issued as documents: A/35/L.16/Rev.1 and A/35/L.23/Rev.1.

6. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote on any or all of the 18 draft resolutions. Representatives will of course also have an opportunity to explain their vote after the vote or after all the votes have been taken. I should like to remind the General Assembly that, under rule 88 of the rules of procedure, the President will not be able to permit the proposer of a proposal or of an amendment to explain his vote on his own proposal or amendment.

7. As far as explanations of vote are concerned, representatives will recall decision 34/401 adopted at the preceding session of the Assembly to the effect that explanations of vote should be limited to 10 minutes and that they should be made from the delegations seat.

8. Mr. DIDIER (Luxembourg) (*interprétation from French*): During the debate on agenda item 28, the nine States members of the European Community unreservedly condemned the policy of *apartheid* of the South African Government [61st meeting, paras. 106-120]. In so doing they joined with the unanimous opposition of world opinion, expressed through the General Assembly in its search for a fundamental change in South Africa. The nine members of the Community remain convinced that fundamental changes must take place in South Africa before the

* Resumed from the 85th meeting.

opportunity to eliminate the *apartheid* system by peaceful means is lost.

9. However, out of concern for greater effectiveness of our action, the Community deplores the fact that a greater effort was not made by the sponsors of the draft resolutions to reflect the total rejection of *apartheid* by the Assembly in texts which could have been supported by all. They regret that once again extraneous and superfluous elements should have been introduced into the draft resolutions.

10. The Community maintains that, in keeping with the Charter of the United Nations, the division of competence between the General Assembly and the Security Council must be respected. Moreover, the Assembly must remain a forum for discussion among Member States.

11. The struggle against *apartheid* has as its objective the establishment of a multiracial, free and egalitarian society in an independent and sovereign State; it is not a struggle against a colonial Power. We hope, therefore, that South Africa will soon set up institutions reflecting the aspirations and interests of all that country's inhabitants. At the same time, the nine members of the Community reaffirm their adherence to the principle of universality of the United Nations.

12. Although it is aware of the reasons that may cause individuals and groups to take to violence in an attempt to put an end to the policy of *apartheid* through armed struggle, the Community remains firmly convinced that peaceful change is possible, in keeping with the principles and purposes of the Charter. The Organization must foster peaceful solutions and, consequently, we reject any implicit or explicit approval of armed struggle in General Assembly resolutions.

13. The Community maintains its position of principle, which has been set forth on many occasions, on the applicability of the prisoner-of-war status in accordance with the relevant Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949,¹ the Additional Protocols to these Conventions, of 10 June 1977.² However, the frequency of political trials and the number of political prisoners in South Africa testify to systematic repression of those who are seeking to build a just and equitable society. The nine members of the Community wish to emphasize that they have continued to press the South African Government to free immediately and unconditionally people imprisoned because of their political convictions.

14. We cannot support a demand to break off all relations with South Africa. We believe that existing lines of communication must be used to permit the free expression of views on all the political, social and economic questions which are of concern to the population of South Africa.

15. The Community strictly adheres to the Olympic principle of non-discrimination and rejects any form of *apartheid* in sports. While respecting the independence of private organizations and the fundamental right of people to travel abroad freely, the Governments of the nine States members of the Community will

continue resolutely to discourage sporting contacts involving racial discrimination.

16. The individual rights of our citizens in the fields of freedom to travel and freedom of information and expression do not permit the imposition of constraint. Our Governments cannot support texts implying a limitation of these fundamental human rights. In particular, we cannot support formulas implying that the mass media or journalists are subject to governmental *diktats*. That would be contrary to freedom of the press and other mass media, which is a tradition in our countries.

17. The Community rejects any arbitrary and unjustified calling into question of Member States, whether by name or implicitly.

18. They regret that, for the reasons I have just indicated, it will not be possible for them to support all the texts contained in the draft resolutions before the Assembly. The nine members of the European Community reaffirm their commitment to pursue their efforts aimed at eliminating the system of *apartheid* in South Africa.

19. Mr. MANSFIELD (United Kingdom): The speakers in the debate on this item and at the introduction of the draft resolutions have expressed, without exception, a common view with which my delegation firmly associates itself, namely, that *apartheid* is an insult to the dignity of all mankind and must come to an end.

20. In addition to the fundamental positions of principle of the nine countries of the European Community, which the representative of Luxembourg has already stated, I should like, on behalf of my Government, to place on record particular reservations on draft resolution A/35/L.19 and Add.1, which we have before us today.

21. My delegation would like to confirm that we do not believe that the isolation of South Africa will bring about the fundamental change of view necessary for a peaceful solution of this problem; we do not consider that the General Assembly should attempt to determine the means by which the people of South Africa should decide their own future; and it clearly does not lie within the Assembly's responsibility to prescribe measures which fall within the sphere of competence of the Security Council. Our views on the meaning of references to the "struggle" are well known.

22. Mr. FRANCIS (New Zealand): New Zealand shares the world's abhorrence of South Africa's *apartheid* system. *Apartheid* violates the most fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations. It is a system based on racism, segregation and exploitation. It deprives the majority of the South African people of basic human rights. It denies them political and economic freedom. By giving force of law to policies which determine the worth of its citizens solely by their colour, the South African Government has wilfully and tragically set itself apart from the community of nations.

23. *Apartheid*, without doubt, will eventually disappear. As long as *apartheid* exists there will be no harmony in southern Africa. The South African Government has only one peaceful option: to dismantle

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, Nos. 970-973.

² A/32/144, annexes I and II.

step by step every discriminatory aspect of the *apartheid* system.

24. New Zealand believes that the efforts of the international community must be directed towards achieving a peaceful and just solution in South Africa. Any other course would bring suffering to the people of South Africa. We shall therefore continue to support strategies designed to bring about peaceful change. We shall support actions which clearly reflect a consensus of international opinion and bring pressure to bear on South Africa. We believe that international consensus is essential if there is to be real progress and a lasting solution.

25. My delegation therefore regrets that not all the draft resolutions before us will help achieve and sustain that consensus.

26. As in the past, my delegation is unable to support draft resolutions which seek to pre-empt the functions of the Security Council. We will therefore abstain from voting on draft resolutions A/35/L.13 and Add.1, on the situation in southern Africa, A/35/L.14 and Add.1, on military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, A/35/L.15 and Add.1 on comprehensive sanctions against South Africa, A/35/L.16/Rev.1, on the oil embargo against South Africa, A/35/L.21 and Add.1 on the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa and A/35/L.27 and Add.1, on the implementation of United Nations resolutions on *apartheid* by Governments and intergovernmental organizations.

27. With regard to draft resolution A/35/L.13 and Add.1, we cannot endorse the concept of armed struggle. While we agree with the general thrust of draft resolution A/35/L.14 and Add.1, we have reservations about the selective criticism applied in the ninth preambular paragraph. We also have difficulties with the legal and practical implications of the obligations placed on Governments in operative paragraph 3 of the latter draft resolution, operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/35/L.15 and Add.1 and operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/35/L.16/Rev.1.

28. For the same reasons, my delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolutions A/35/L.17 and Add.1, on cultural, academic and other boycotts of South Africa, and A/35/L.18 and Add.1, on the role of transnational corporations in South Africa. My delegation will vote against draft resolution A/35/L.20 and Add.1, on relations between Israel and South Africa.

29. My delegation will, however, support the remaining nine draft resolutions. New Zealand has sponsored draft resolution A/35/L.32 and Add.1, on investments in South Africa, because we believe it provides a practical means of bringing pressure to bear on South Africa, peacefully and effectively. Similarly, we will continue to support the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and, therefore, draft resolution A/35/L.33 and Add.1 and the objectives of draft resolutions A/35/L.22 and Add.1, on assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement, and A/35/L.23/Rev.1, on the campaign for the release of political prisoners in South Africa, and the broad objectives of draft resolution A/35/L.19 and Add.1, on international campaigns against *apartheid*.

30. Although we have certain difficulties with them, we will also support draft resolutions A/35/L.24 and Add.1, on the dissemination of information on *apartheid*, A/35/L.26 and Add.1, on women and children under *apartheid*, and A/35/L.28 and Add.1 on the programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. However, my delegation wishes to reserve its position in respect of the endorsement of the Declaration and Recommendations of the International Seminar on Women and *Apartheid* contained in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/35/L.26 and Add.1.

31. The New Zealand Government has adhered strictly, in spirit and in practice, to the Gleneagles Agreement³ and to the principle of the elimination of racial discrimination in sport. Accordingly, my delegation will vote in favour of A/35/L.25 and Add.1 on *Apartheid* in sports. We have reservations, however, about the first preambular paragraph and about the request directed at the information media in operative paragraph 5. That particular point does not accord with New Zealand's approach to the important principle of freedom of the press.

32. Mr. MALINGA (Swaziland): My delegation would like to make the following comments by way of explaining its position before the vote.

33. The system of *apartheid* as practised by the Government of South Africa is of concern to my Government and to the international community as a whole, because it violates the fundamentals of the Charter of the United Nations and contravenes its basic principles and objectives, which make it obligatory for all States Members of the United Nations to respect the equality of rights and the right to self-determination of all peoples.

34. My country's commitment to a peaceful change in the situation in South Africa cannot be over-emphasized. As an expression of that commitment, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolutions contained in documents A/35/L.13 and Add.1, A/35/L.14 and Add.1, A/35/L.17 and Add.1 to A/35/L.19 and Add.1, A/35/L.23/Rev.1 to A/35/L.28 and Add.1, A/35/L.32 and Add.1 and A/35/L.33 and Add.1, but would, however, reserve its position on operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/35/L.13 and Add.1, operative paragraph 2 (d) of draft resolution A/35/L.18 and Add.1, operative paragraph 1 (d) of draft resolution A/35/L.19 and Add.1 and operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/35/L.27 and Add.1.

35. Though most of the draft resolutions to be voted upon coincide with our over-all desire to see a change inside South Africa, my delegation would, however, find it difficult to go along with the method of solution prescribed in draft resolutions A/35/L.15 and Add.1, A/35/L.16/Rev.1 and A/35/L.21 and Add.1, because of our geographical location. Our vulnerability obliges us to abstain from voting on these three draft resolutions. Economic sanctions against South Africa would affect the economy of Swaziland. I need not mention that this state of affairs was imposed upon us by factors of colonial history.

³ Commonwealth Statement on *Apartheid* in Sport. See Final Communiqué of the Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting in London, 8-15 June 1977 (London, Commonwealth Secretariat, 1977), pp. 21 and 22.

36. It was on account of this delicate and peculiar situation of history and geography that the nine independent African States of southern Africa formed what is known as the Southern Africa Development Co-ordination Conference in a bid to promote economic self-reliance among them. Swaziland is a member of that group, whose aim is to foster pure economic development. The Government and people of Swaziland are grateful to those countries and organizations that made generous contributions at the recent pledging conference held at Maputo in November 1980. We are indeed grateful and we hope that in future more countries will find it possible to supplement our development efforts.

37. Peace in southern Africa would come as a result of the independence of Namibia and a change in the situation inside South Africa. It is our sincere prayer that God Almighty in His infinite wisdom will intervene in the situation in South Africa and prevail against the forces that generate racial prejudice and bigotry, so that all races may live in equality, peace and harmony.

38. Mr. de ALBUQUERQUE (Portugal): Portugal's long-standing opposition to the concept and policies of *apartheid* is well known and therefore I need not elaborate on it in our explanation of vote today. I would just add that we are opposed to any form of racism or racial discrimination, as it goes against the very nature and structure of Portuguese society and the principles that inspire it. Moreover, we consider that *apartheid*, as a form of institutionalized racism, is an offense to the moral conscience of mankind. Its eradication is therefore not only a political but also a moral imperative, and it is the responsibility of the entire international community to exert its best efforts to put an end to all its manifestations.

39. Last year, when certain changes were introduced in the *apartheid* laws, we were hopeful that it represented a new attitude on the part of the South African Government, which would pave the way for the introduction of reforms with far-reaching consequences for South African society. Unfortunately, those measures did not deal a fatal blow to the whole system of *apartheid* as we had expected, but they did affect the very essence of inter-racial relations in South Africa. There are indeed some signs that seem to indicate a growing awareness today among large segments of the white population, especially the younger generation, of the need to abolish the policies and practices of *apartheid*, which have created widespread bitterness, strife and even mistrust among blacks and whites, thus putting serious strains on the entire social fabric of South African society.

40. At the official level, however, there has been little or no progress. The South African Government seems intent on pursuing its policy of bantustanization, as is evidenced by the recent announcement of the setting up of another homeland, Ciskei. This is but another way of perpetuating the institution of *apartheid* and its instruments of domination, under the guise of conferring power on the black majority.

41. Furthermore, the Pretoria régime has resorted to unprovoked armed incursions into the territory of neighbouring States, namely, Angola, Zambia and Mozambique, because of the moral and material

assistance those States have given to the cause of the oppressed peoples of South Africa.

42. But despite this gloomy outlook, we still believe that confrontation between the different ethnic communities can be avoided in South Africa if fundamental changes are brought about without further delay.

43. There are, indeed, very few people inside South Africa today who would claim in good faith that *apartheid* provides the basis for a viable society. Moreover, a considerable number of people from all walks of life are concerned that as long as *apartheid* is not terminated and the black population in South Africa is not able to participate fully in the political, economic and cultural life of their country, there will be no prospect of lasting peace and stability in southern Africa.

44. This brings us to the question of how best we can achieve our aims and find the most effective means of dealing with the problem of South Africa.

45. For its part, the Portuguese Government will continue to lend full support to all measures designed to bring to an end the policy of *apartheid*, and to all efforts aimed at promoting a new society in South Africa irrespective of race, colour or creed.

46. But this cannot, in our view, be done through a total isolation of South Africa, as called for in draft resolutions A/35/L.13 and Add.1, A/35/L.15 and Add.1, A/35/L.17 and Add.1, A/35/L.19 and Add.1 and A/35/L.27 and Add.1, and we shall not support them, for we feel duty-bound not to jeopardize the efforts of those inside South Africa who are struggling to bring about fundamental changes in the system from within.

47. On the other hand, by maintaining a constant dialogue with the South African Government, it is more likely that, by having the necessary leverage, we can influence them more easily to introduce the required measures, through the carefully directed international pressure that we would bring to bear at the appropriate moment.

48. This course might be fraught with innumerable difficulties and be a source of frustration for those involved in it, but it has to be taken lest all chances to bring about a peaceful change in the social system in South Africa be inevitably doomed to failure.

49. We do not believe the use of force to be the only way of correcting unjust situations, for we think that substantial and major changes can be brought about by non-violent means. The admissibility of the principle of the legitimacy of struggle by all available means in such situations could, in our view, entail very serious consequences for all, including innocent populations. We therefore cannot cast a positive vote on draft resolutions A/35/L.13 and Add.1 and A/35/L.27 and Add.1, calling for armed struggle or approving it.

50. But we feel very strongly about the detention of freedom fighters and hence we shall associate ourselves without hesitation with the campaign for the release of all political prisoners in South Africa, as urged in draft resolution A/35/L.23/Rev.1, although we have to enter reservations on the eighth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1.

51. We shall also lend our support to the dissemination of information on *apartheid*, as dealt with in draft resolution A/35/L.24 and Add.1 and to the programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, the subject of draft resolution A/35/L.28 and Add.1, to whose Chairman I should like to pay a public tribute. We are convinced that their combined action will contribute to bringing pressure to bear on the South African Government.

52. Finally, we are unhappy to see certain countries or groups of countries once again being singled out and condemned for their alleged collaboration with South Africa, as in the case of draft resolutions A/35/L.13 and Add.1, A/35/L.14 and Add.1 and A/35/L.20 and Add.1.

53. We also regret that certain paragraphs of draft resolutions A/35/L.13 and Add.1, A/35/L.14 and Add.1, A/35/L.15 and Add.1, A/35/L.16/Rev.1 and A/35/L.27 and Add.1 do not take into account the specific nature of the different organs of the United Nations.

54. Mr. TOUSSAINT (Haiti) (*interpretation from French*): We are once again called upon to deal with the question of the *apartheid* policies of the Government of South Africa, which today is one of the most crucial problems facing the United Nations and the entire international community.

55. Eighteen draft resolutions have been submitted under agenda item 28. This shows the international community's interest in settling the question. In spite of the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, South Africa continues to practise its shameful policy of *apartheid* and to occupy Namibia illegally. On this subject, my delegation's position has not changed. It once again calls on the international community to provide the oppressed people of South Africa and its national liberation movement with all necessary assistance in the struggle they are carrying on to establish a just society, in harmony with the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

56. My delegation, therefore, will give its unreserved support to all the draft resolutions before the Assembly.

57. Mr. THOMSON (Canada): Canada shares with the other members of the Assembly a deep abhorrence of *apartheid* and the institutionalized and systematic violation of fundamental human rights which it entails. In his address to the General Assembly on 22 September [4th meeting] the Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Mark MacGuigan, reiterated Canada's opposition to *apartheid*. At that time he stated that any society or system rooted in racist supremacy is not acceptable and never will be. South Africa must recognize the inevitability of change. The South African Government has heeded neither the appeals of the international community nor those of its own citizens who seek to exercise their basic rights of freedom and equality, and to live in dignity and to share in the political, economic and social development of their own country. The South African Government must recognize that the future peace, prosperity and security of South Africans of all races can only be assured if *apartheid* is fully and completely eradicated. Time is short for the peaceful resolution of the situation.

58. Canada's unambiguous support for the anti-*apartheid* effort should not, however, prevent us from expressing some concern over the trend towards an ever-growing number of resolutions in the annual discussion on *apartheid* in the Assembly. Too often these resolutions are ritualistic denunciations of *apartheid* which merely repeat earlier resolutions with little regard for their possible effectiveness. We urge the Assembly to focus on those areas within its jurisdiction in which it can make a concrete and constructive contribution to the struggle against *apartheid*. The goal of all delegations here is the same: the eradication of *apartheid*; we should not allow tactics to divide us.

59. There are several aspects of the draft resolutions before us which recur in the texts and which, my delegation considers, work against that common purpose. Canada does not support violence as a means of promoting or preventing change in South Africa. We must point out once again that the question of sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter is a strict prerogative of the Security Council. For these reasons, Canada is regretfully obliged to vote against several draft resolutions. We also consider that the impact on regional States of sanctions against South Africa is an important aspect to bear in mind. In this regard, we support the laudable efforts of States in the region to increase their economic independence of South Africa, but at the same time we note that the high degree of dependence on South Africa is a current reality which States in the region themselves recognize.

60. Canada imposed a voluntary embargo on the sale of arms and related material to South Africa in 1963 and voted in favour of the mandatory Security Council embargo in its resolution 418 (1977). We firmly support measures to ensure that that embargo is strictly enforced. However, we consider that draft resolution A/35/L.14 and Add.1 might have the undesirable effect of weakening incentives for South Africa to subscribe to international nuclear safeguards agreements and to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

61. Although Canada supports the spirit of other draft resolutions, we shall be forced to abstain or to vote against some of them because of the inclusion of emotive generalizations regarding the alleged effect and intent of international business dealings with South Africa and allegations of "collaboration" with South Africa by private and public institutions. With reference to other draft resolutions, Canada makes substantial contributions to humanitarian programmes designed to meet the needs of victims of *apartheid*, but we reiterate our opposition to the allocation of funds from the United Nations regular budget for the maintenance of individual liberation organizations.

62. With reference specifically to draft resolution A/35/L.25 and Add.1 on *apartheid* in sports, Canada has taken effective steps in this area by denying visas to sportsmen and officials representing South Africa or South African sporting organizations. In so doing, Canada has thereby implemented the International Declaration against *Apartheid* in Sports within the context of our legal framework. Nevertheless, we continue to have serious reservations concerning the appropriateness and utility of the proposed international convention against *apartheid* in sports, as the constitutional framework of Canada's federal system

would probably make it impossible for Canada to subscribe to it. Other Members of the Assembly may have similar difficulties.

63. In conclusion, we regret that the sponsors of these annual draft resolutions continue to include extraneous passages which only serve to divide unnecessarily the unanimous opposition in the Assembly to *apartheid* and to reduce whatever measure of effectiveness the draft resolutions might have. We suggest that a more useful approach might be to seek universal support for the principles of a declaration on *apartheid*, which could be a powerful instrument for change. We urge those who, with us, oppose *apartheid* to temper emotion with practicality. Canada has a strong desire to support the full range of anti-*apartheid* draft resolutions, but is prevented from doing so by their extremes of language, jurisdictional problems and lack of realism, despite our support for many of the principles therein.

64. Mr. BELTRAMINO (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Argentina will abstain on draft resolution A/35/L.20 and Add.1 on relations between Israel and South Africa, because we do not agree with the selective criterion on which it is based.

65. For the same reasons and although this does not prevent us from supporting all the other draft resolutions, we wish to reserve our position regarding any reference to countries in the texts on which we are voting. As has been said on earlier occasions, in the opinion of my delegation the express reference to certain countries by name, besides being unfairly discriminatory in some cases, militates against support for and, consequently, the effectiveness of the decisions which the General Assembly adopts.

66. We should also like to state our reservations regarding certain paragraphs of the following draft resolutions.

67. First, we have reservations concerning the reference to armed struggle contained in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/35/L.13 and Add.1 and in operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/35/L.27 and Add.1 because it implies support for a means of action not envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations.

68. Similarly, we wish to reserve our position on operative paragraph 3 (j) of draft resolution A/35/L.14 and Add.1 since certain assumptions not necessarily related to the subject matter are included as instances of collaboration with the Government of Pretoria.

69. In addition we should like to state expressly that in the opinion of the Argentine delegation compliance with some of the measures contained in operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/35/L.15 and Add.1 cannot be required of Governments until the Security Council, the sole body with the power to impose mandatory sanctions against a State, has adopted the relevant resolutions.

70. Finally, we should like to reserve our position with respect to the eighth preambular paragraph, to the last part of operative paragraph 1 and to operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/35/L.23/Rev.1 because the Republic of Argentina abstained in the vote on article 44 of Additional Protocol I to the

Geneva Conventions of 1949 on Combatants and Prisoners of War and, furthermore, because that Protocol is still before the Argentine authorities for study and consideration.

71. Mrs. UNAYDIN (Turkey): My delegation is pleased to be able to support this year all the draft resolutions on the question of policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa.

72. As far as draft resolutions A/35/L.32 and Add.1 and A/35/L.33 and Add.1 are concerned, we are happy to join in sponsoring them, in keeping with our traditional position on the questions of investments in South Africa and the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa.

73. Our views on the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa have been made amply clear in our statement in the Assembly on 13 November [61st meeting]. Our support for these draft resolutions, therefore, is a reflexion of our adamant opposition to the degrading and inhuman policies of *apartheid*, as well as our clear-cut recognition of the necessity of taking effective mandatory measures against the Government of South Africa because of its persistence in continuing these policies.

74. As I have stated before, my delegation will be supporting all the draft resolutions this year because we believe that an effort has been made by the sponsors to refrain from singling out some countries by name on a selective basis. My delegation would, however, like to put on record that we accept some of the provisions of these draft resolutions to the extent that they comply with the general principles underlying our foreign policy and relations, as well as those contained in the Charter of the United Nations. This is particularly true for the ninth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/35/L.14 and Add. 1 on military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, where there is a specific reference to some members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO], and operative paragraph 1 of that same draft resolution, as well as operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/35/L.13 and Add.1 on the situation in South Africa. Furthermore, as regards the ninth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution on military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa just referred to, I should like to put on record, as a member of NATO, that relations with South Africa are not within the scope of its activities.

75. As regards operative paragraph 13 of the draft resolution on the situation in South Africa, which contains an appeal to all States which have not yet done so to accede to the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* I should like here to recall that the Turkish delegation voted for the draft Convention in this regard when it was adopted at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly. However, in a statement made at the time,⁴ my delegation pointed out the substantial legal problems that the draft Convention posed for us. Certain provisions of the Convention are not compatible with some of the provisions of our national legal system. This position of the Turkish Government still remains unchanged vis-à-vis the Convention.

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth session, Third Committee, 2007th meeting, paras. 37-43.*

76. As far as draft resolution A/35/L.24 and Add.1 on dissemination of information on *apartheid* is concerned, we shall support it also, in spite of some constitutional difficulties it causes for us, especially in terms of its operative paragraph 5. Freedom of the press is one of the basic principles of the Turkish constitutional system. That being the case, we will do our best to co-operate in all activities aimed at spreading information on *apartheid* through our mass media because we interpret the main thrust of that draft resolution as the taking of all possible and effective actions against *apartheid*, action we fully support.

77. As far as the eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/35/L.23/Rev.1 on a campaign for the release of political prisoners in South Africa is concerned, it is our understanding that the words "freedom fighters" contained in that paragraph refer to the liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity [OAU].

78. Mr. BLUM (Israel): In my statement during the debate on the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa [59th meeting], I remarked that the needless insertion of unending diatribes against my country has severely undermined the very purpose of the annual debate on *apartheid*. I also took that opportunity to restate Israel's position on *apartheid* and its unequivocal rejection of racism and racial discrimination in any form.

79. I observed that for the Special Committee against *Apartheid* the facts seemed irrelevant. Reality must not be allowed to intrude on a sacred ritual. If we had not been presented today with a special draft resolution concerning Israel, it would have amounted to an admission that such a policy in the past had been mistaken and misguided. And so the Assembly is being asked to vote today on a rehashed concoction of malicious lies that have become an embarrassment to the stature and prestige of this world Organization.

80. The sponsors of draft resolution A/35/L.20 and Add.1 have seen fit to ignore official communications from my Government, contained in official documents of the United Nations, refuting the false allegations against Israel. Instead they have relied on the unsupported distortions, innuendos and speculative press reports contained in the special report of the Special Committee. It is on "evidence" like this that draft resolution A/35/L.20 and Add.1 is based. A report based on such non-evidence must be considered a non-report; and a debate based on such a non-report must be considered a non-debate; and the resultant draft resolution must be seen for what it is: pure and unadulterated non-sense.

81. It is high time that a serious assessment of this ritual take place before it backfires completely. When certain States persist in turning an *apartheid* debate into a Middle East debate they succeed only in showing their disdain for and disinterest in a subject of vital concern to both Africa and the world. Since the draft resolution contains particularly obnoxious falsehoods, it is worth considering who in fact is committing a hostile act against Africa. It is precisely this double standard that undermines the international campaign against racism and racial discrimination.

82. Not content with denying Israel a fair hearing in the Assembly, the sponsors have denied Israel's right to any hearing at all, as is made only too clear by the fact that the draft resolution, before us today was drawn up even before Israel addressed the General Assembly on this agenda item. Instead of promoting universal consensus, that draft resolution, like its predecessors, has succeeded in causing division and recrimination. Because Israel has been singled out in this agenda item as the only country in the world for specific condemnation on its own in a special draft resolution based on patent falsehoods, my delegation will not participate in the voting on this item. I request that this non-participation be duly reflected in the record. We take this stand to express our abhorrence at the cynical debasement of this entire discussion.

83. Mr. DORR (Ireland): In speaking in the course of the general debate on this item on 17 November [64th meeting], I had the opportunity to set out the views of my Government on *apartheid*. In that statement I referred to the role which we feel the international community can play in bringing about an end to that repressive system.

84. The debate on this important item has, I feel, demonstrated a number of important facts. On the one hand, it has reaffirmed the unequivocal rejection by the States Members of the United Nations of the policy of *apartheid*; on the other hand, it has also shown a significant divergence in opinion as to how the United Nations, and indeed Member States, should act in the effort to bring it to an end.

85. There are 18 draft resolutions on *apartheid* before the Assembly. Of those Ireland has sponsored two, and we will vote in favour of 10 in all. We will with regret abstain on a further seven. As in previous years, the Irish delegation will vote against one of the 18 draft resolutions because we believe it singles out and condemns selectively one Member State in an inappropriate way.

86. The fact that the Irish delegation has not found it possible to vote in favour of all the draft resolutions before the Assembly does not in any way detract from our absolute condemnation of the *apartheid* system, or our wish to see it brought to an end as soon as possible. We do, however, see room for genuine disagreement about the best means to achieve that aim; and it is this which has led us with regret to abstain on certain draft resolutions.

87. It is a measure of our deep concern about the increasingly critical situation in South Africa that we nevertheless find it possible to vote in favour of a majority of the draft resolutions before us, despite reservations on certain paragraphs which I will mention. We also, of course, share the reservations on certain draft resolutions which are held in common by member States of the European Community, and which the representative of Luxembourg just mentioned in his statement.

88. I shall first refer to the draft resolutions we support. The Irish delegation believes that the international community should continue to apply pressure in a careful and co-ordinated way to promote change in South Africa. For that reason Ireland has again joined a large number of other countries in sponsoring draft resolution A/35/L.32 and Add.1, which calls on

the Security Council to consider a ban on new investments, and we will vote in favour of draft resolution A/35/L.16/Rev.1 as we have in previous years, to reflect Ireland's general support for the principle that an oil embargo against South Africa should be considered. But, while we believe that the Security Council should consider this question, and have therefore supported the draft resolution, we do not think it right for the Assembly to pre-empt discussion by the Council, as operative paragraph 4, for example, might indicate.

89. Our concern, as I have said, is that international pressure on South Africa should be brought to bear in an effective and co-ordinated way. Some of the other draft resolutions before us call for comprehensive rather than selective measures. I have to say, however, that my Government has doubts about the wisdom of any such call for comprehensive sanctions at the present juncture. Furthermore, we would have reservations about calls for action addressed to individual Member States, which are likely to be ineffective. We would fear, indeed, that this might undermine the effort to achieve a co-ordinated and selective approach on this most important issue.

90. We would also have certain legal difficulties with some of the formulations in these draft resolutions. Accordingly, we are obliged to abstain on draft resolutions A/35/L.15 and Add.1 and A/35/L.18 and Add.1.

91. Ireland supported the proposal that the Security Council should impose an arms embargo on South Africa, and since the embargo was imposed we have implemented it fully. Ireland has therefore decided to vote in favour of draft resolution A/35/L.14 and Add.1 to show its full support for the embargo.

92. I have to say, however, that we do so with considerable hesitation and with reservations, because of other aspects of the text. In particular, we cannot accept the arbitrary condemnation contained in operative paragraph 1 of the text. We also regret that the arms issue, on which there is already a clearly defined decision of the Security Council, should have been dealt with in the same draft resolution as what has come to be called nuclear collaboration, with the consequent confusion between those two issues. We are glad, however, to be able to support draft resolution A/35/L.28 and Add.1 on the programme of work of the Special Committee Against *Apartheid*. Of course, our attitude to the recommendations in the report of the Special Committee must naturally be understood in accordance with the general policy which my delegation has outlined in this and previous statements.

93. Last year my delegation voted against the resolution on the situation in South Africa [resolution 34/93 A]. We note, however, this year that the draft resolution contained in A/35/L.13 and Add.1 contains some improvements over the text adopted last year. With that in mind, Ireland will abstain in the vote on that draft resolution. We do so balancing the positive elements against a number of other, inappropriate formulations in the text, including the explicit endorsement of "armed struggle". I have already dealt with that question in my statement in the debate on *apartheid*. For that reason, and for reasons which

I have previously outlined in that statement, my delegation will also abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/35/L.27 and Add.1.

94. The Irish Government does not maintain either diplomatic relations or cultural or similar links with South Africa. My delegation considers, however, that the provisions of operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/35/L.17 and Add.1 and, indeed, some of the elements in operative paragraph 2, go beyond the actions that our Government would be empowered to take under our laws and Constitution in relation to individuals or private bodies in Ireland. For that reason Ireland will have to abstain in the vote on that draft resolution.

95. For a somewhat similar reason we will abstain on draft resolution A/35/L.25 and Add.1. The position of the Irish Government on sports contacts in South Africa is quite clear. My Government fully supports the Olympic principle of non-discrimination in sports and will do what it can to uphold it. This position has been made clear in statements in the Assembly, most recently in my own statement in the *apartheid* debate, also in correspondence with the Special Committee Against *Apartheid*. It has also been made fully clear to the public and to sports bodies in Ireland.

96. My delegation will, however, abstain on the draft resolution on this subject because of our reservations with regard to certain provisions in the International Declaration against *Apartheid* in Sports, and also because, under our laws and Constitution, we see potential legal and other difficulties with the draft Convention.

97. However, my Government will continue, as in the past, to act in accordance with the spirit of the Declaration and will continue to uphold the Olympic principle in making clear its attitude to sports contacts with South Africa.

98. My delegation welcomed the particular attention given by the Special Committee and others to the plight of women and children under *apartheid*. However, we are obliged to abstain also on draft resolution A/35/L.26 and Add.1, since its operative paragraph 2 would have the Assembly endorse the declaration and recommendations of a non-governmental body, the International Seminar on Women and *Apartheid*—recommendations and a declaration which we cannot fully accept.

99. Ireland will, however, continue to make its own contribution to alleviating the plight of those who suffer under the *apartheid* system, including women and children, through its continuing support of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa.

100. Mr. ORTIZ SANZ (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation has always supported the struggle against the policy of *apartheid*. Consisting in the majority of indigenous peoples, the people of Bolivia organized themselves and grew with the permanent conviction that they should repudiate all forms of racial discrimination.

101. None the less, in today's voting—to our great regret—our delegation will have to abstain on certain draft resolutions, because we find the terms in which they have been drafted rather inappropriate, both from the legal and grammatical points of view. The inclu-

sion of excessive accusation and vehemence in documents and debate intended to solve problems in international life through agreement and dialogue seems to us to be contradictory.

102. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now take a decision on the various draft resolutions before it. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of these draft resolutions is contained in document A/35/776.

103. We shall vote first on draft resolution A/35/L.13 and Add.1, entitled "Situation in South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Malawi, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden.

The draft resolution was adopted by 118 votes to 10, with 15 abstentions (resolution 35/206 A).

104. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/35/L.14 and Add.1, entitled "Military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia,

Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, Dominican Republic,⁵ Greece, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Spain, Uruguay.

The draft resolution was adopted by 127 votes to 4, with 13 abstentions (resolution 35/206 B).

105. The PRESIDENT: We shall turn now to draft resolution A/35/L.15 and Add.1, entitled "Comprehensive sanctions against South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic,

⁵ The delegation of the Dominican Republic subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bolivia, Botswana, Chile, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Lesotho, Malawi, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Uruguay, Zimbabwe.

The draft resolution was adopted by 115 votes to 10, with 20 abstentions (resolution 35/206 C).

106. The PRESIDENT: We turn next to draft resolution A/35/L.16/Rev.1, entitled "Oil embargo against South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Luxembourg, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Botswana, Greece, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, Malawi, New Zealand, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland, Zimbabwe.

The draft resolution was adopted by 123 votes to 7, with 13 abstentions (resolution 35/206 D).⁶

107. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution A/35/L.17 and Add.1, entitled "Cultural, aca-

demical and other boycotts of South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Luxembourg, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bolivia, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Malawi, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden.

The draft resolution was adopted by 123 votes to 8, with 13 abstentions (resolution 35/206 E).

108. The PRESIDENT: We shall turn now to draft resolution A/35/L.18 and Add.1, entitled "Role of transnational corporations in South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal,

⁶ The delegation of Ecuador subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malawi, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Singapore, Sweden.

The draft resolution was adopted by 120 votes to 7, with 16 abstentions (resolution 35/206 F).

109. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution A/35/L.19 and Add.1, entitled "International campaigns against *apartheid*". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 133 votes to none, with 12 abstentions (resolution 35/206 G).

110. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/35/L.20 and Add.1, entitled "Relations between Israel and South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahamas, Bolivia, Burma, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Gabon, Ivory Coast, Japan, Lesotho, Malawi, Nepal, Portugal, Samoa, Singapore, Swaziland, Thailand, Uruguay.

The draft resolution was adopted by 103 votes to 19, with 21 abstentions (resolution 35/206 H).

111. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution A/35/L.21 and Add.1, entitled "International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia,

Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Luxembourg, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Malawi, New Zealand, Portugal.

The draft resolution was adopted by 130 votes to 6, with 8 abstentions (resolution 35/206 I).

112. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/35/L.22 and Add.1, entitled "Assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Bolivia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Luxembourg, Malawi.

The draft resolution was adopted by 137 votes to 3 with 5 abstentions (resolution 35/206 J).

113. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution A/35/L.23/Rev.1, entitled "Campaign for the release of political prisoners in South Africa". Since there is no request for a vote, may I take it that the General Assembly adopts that draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 35/206 K).

114. The PRESIDENT: Now we shall turn to draft resolution A/35/L.24 and Add.1, entitled "Dissemination of information on apartheid". I have no request for a vote. May I therefore take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt that draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 35/206 L).

115. The PRESIDENT: We shall now turn to draft resolution A/35/L.25 and Add.1, entitled "Apartheid in sports". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 131 votes to none, with 15 abstentions (resolution 35/206 M).

116. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution A/35/L.26 and Add.1 is entitled "Women and children under apartheid". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 132 votes to none, with 13 abstentions (resolution 35/206 N).

117. The PRESIDENT: I now invite the Assembly to turn to draft resolution A/35/L.27 and Add.1, entitled "Implementation of United Nations resolutions on apartheid by Governments and intergovernmental organizations". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary,

India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bolivia, Botswana, Chile, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Lesotho, Malawi, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Uruguay, Zimbabwe.

The draft resolution was adopted by 114 votes to 10 with 22 abstentions (resolution 35/206 O).

118. The PRESIDENT: We now come to draft resolution A/35/L.28 and Add.1, entitled "Programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania,

Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Malawi, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 141 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 35/206 P).

119. The PRESIDENT: Now we come to draft resolution A/35/L.32 and Add.1, entitled "Investments in South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Arab Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Italy, Malawi, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 137 votes to none, with 9 abstentions (resolution 35/206 Q).

120. The PRESIDENT: Finally, we turn to draft resolution A/35/L.33 and Add.1, entitled "United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa". May I consider that the General Assembly adopts that draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 35/206 R).

121. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the vote.

122. Mrs. NOWOTNY (Austria): Austria has consistently rejected the policy of *apartheid* of the South African Government and has as recently as the debate on this agenda item [59th meeting, paras. 189-193] maintained that an institutionalized policy of racial discrimination can never be the basis of a viable democratic society. This firm conviction found expression in Austria's positive vote on the majority of the draft resolutions that have just been put to the vote. There are, however, several draft resolutions on which Austria had to abstain, primarily for constitutional reasons that would prohibit their implementation at the national level.

123. Furthermore, I wish to reaffirm once again that in Austria's view the United Nations should concentrate all its efforts on bringing about political and social change solely by peaceful means, as provided in the Charter of the United Nations, and should not endorse or support armed struggle or the use of force as an instrument for change. I also wish to point out that Austria's positive vote on some of the draft resolutions cannot be interpreted as endorsing the recommendations of conferences of non-governmental organizations to which some of the draft resolutions refer. In addition, we have serious objections to any interference with the due process of the Security Council's deliberations, and we will not support any prejudging of its prerogatives and decisions.

124. Mr. SCHELTEMA (Netherlands): The representative of Luxembourg gave an explanation of vote on behalf of the nine members of the European Community, which my delegation of course fully endorses. In view of the particular concern which the policies of *apartheid* arouse in my country, I should like to explain in somewhat more detail the vote of my delegation on the resolutions before us.

125. First of all, I wish to stress that my delegation supports the attempts of the Assembly to bring about the abolition of the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa. For that reason, my delegation would have wished to have been in a position to vote in favour of all the resolutions that have been adopted. The wording and the declared intention of certain resolutions, however, made it impossible for my delegation to act according to that wish in all instances.

126. Our objection to wording implying that the struggle against *apartheid* can be equated with the struggle against a colonial Power has already been referred to by the representative of Luxembourg, speaking on behalf of the Community. That applies equally to our objections regarding armed struggle, measures aimed at a severance of all relations with South Africa—measures which would violate our constitutional freedoms—and arbitrary and unjustified accusations directed against Member States.

127. An important number of those objections unfortunately apply to the resolution on the situation in South Africa and, in particular, to operative paragraphs 1, 7 and 9, as well as to a number of pre-ambular paragraphs. Notwithstanding certain improvements in the text compared to resolution 34/93 A, adopted last year on this subject, my delegation could not but vote against this resolution because my country cannot support a blanket condemnation of certain States or organizations for collaborating with South

Africa in any field, nor can it go along with armed struggle as a means of achieving the overthrow of the South African Government, as advocated in that resolution.

128. During the debate on this item [61st meeting] my delegation explained clearly that the South African Government's policies of racial discrimination and its persistent violation of human rights are at the root of the dangerous situation in southern Africa and that my Government is prepared to apply continuous pressure on South Africa both through the United Nations and nationally. For that reason my country has scrupulously implemented the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa and will continue to do so. The resolution on military and nuclear collaboration, however, widely exceeds the limits of the arms embargo, as decided upon by the Security Council, both in substance and in intention. In particular, the condemnation of certain States for activities that are clearly beyond the scope of Security Council resolution 418 (1977) has compelled my delegation to abstain in the vote on this text.

129. Another point on which we are prepared to apply pressure on South Africa is the question of cultural and other contacts. For that reason we have voted in favour of the resolution concerning cultural, academic and other boycotts of South Africa. That does not mean that we are able to comply with all the requests contained in the resolution, in particular with the request to adopt measures preventing contacts of a private nature, which would constitute violations of our Constitution or of certain traditional freedoms prevailing in our country, such as, for example, the autonomy of sports organizations. On the other hand my Government has decided to terminate the existing cultural agreement with South Africa and to institute visa requirements for South African nationals, as requested in that resolution.

130. My delegation has also voted in favour of the resolution concerning an oil embargo. My Government is in favour of an oil embargo if it is applied effectively, and would therefore welcome a Security Council decision to that end. The question of an oil embargo against South Africa was the subject of an important debate in the Netherlands Parliament last summer and my Government is in the process of consulting a number of friendly Governments on this matter. Pending the outcome of those consultations, we continue to regard the adoption of measures, as envisaged in operative paragraph 4 of the text, in the light of operative paragraph 3 thereof, in which the Security Council is requested to consider a mandatory oil embargo, for we believe that measures of this kind can be effective only if imposed by the Council or, in the case of voluntary measures, if adopted by a sufficient number of countries, including Powers that have the potential to exert effective pressure on South Africa.

131. Because my Government supports a policy of effective measures against South Africa that can be expected to speed up the peaceful process of the abolition of *apartheid*, it cannot agree to a total embargo against South Africa, since that can only bring about the total isolation of that country, leading to the final unwillingness of its Government to effectuate the desired changes. For that reason we have voted

against both the resolution on comprehensive sanctions against South Africa and that on the implementation of United Nations resolutions on *apartheid* by Governments and international organizations and we have abstained in the vote on the resolution on international campaigns against *apartheid*.

132. For the same reason we voted against the resolution on the role of transnational corporations in South Africa. Since the total isolation of South Africa is not my Government's policy, it would be inconsistent to go along with an invitation to impose such a policy on certain corporations within our jurisdiction.

133. We reject every form of *apartheid* in sports, but we abstained in the vote on the resolution on that subject for a number of reasons. We cannot go along with a blanket condemnation of every form of sports contact with South Africa, irrespective of the question of whether the sports organization concerned is indeed composed on a racial basis or not. Furthermore, our reservations concerning an international convention against *apartheid* in sports are well known.

134. At the thirty fourth session we abstained in the vote on the resolution concerning an international conference on sanctions [resolution 34/93 C] because we feared that the goal of such a conference would be the total isolation of South Africa. We have just voted in favour of the resolution on that subject because the current report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* describes the aims of the conference in terms that leave room for our policy of dialogue and pressure.

135. We also voted in favour of the resolution on assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement, despite our reservations concerning the designation of the African National Congress of South Africa and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania as South African liberation movements, which contradicts our conviction that the South African situation is not a colonial one and that those movements cannot claim to represent all the people of South Africa.

136. We voted in favour of the resolution on the programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* in spite of certain reservations, notably concerning the tasks entrusted to the Committee aimed at the total isolation of South Africa.

137. Mr. HUSSON (France) [*interpretation from French*]: My delegation associates itself completely with the statement made by the representative of Luxembourg on behalf of the nine States of the European Community. We too regret the introduction in certain draft resolutions of elements that needlessly prevented the Assembly from casting a unanimous vote. For that reason the French delegation had to cast a negative vote on some draft resolutions and to abstain in the vote on others.

138. I shall not reiterate the reservations that France has had to express on texts that repeat, sometimes in a new guise, most of the elements that were embodied in the corresponding draft resolutions that were adopted at the thirty-fourth session. Those reservations are contained in the explanation of vote that I made here at the preceding session and they remain valid.

139. I shall simply explain the vote of my delegation on some of the draft resolutions.

140. Operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of draft resolution A/35/L.14 and Add.1 contain requests to the Security Council to take certain measures to strengthen the arms embargo and in that connexion reference is made to the report of 19 September of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 421 (1977). France, which is taking an active part in the work of that Committee, expressed reservations or opposition with regard to certain proposals contained in the report. Those reservations or that opposition are mentioned in the conclusion of the document and are spelled out in the provisional summary record of the 43rd meeting of the Committee.⁷

141. With respect to draft resolution A/35/L.26 and Add.1, my delegation regrets the fact that it shows a marked departure from the essentially humanitarian nature of resolution 34/93 K, which was adopted by consensus, with the introduction of several references to armed struggle and to the conclusions of the World Conference in Copenhagen on which we had reservations. That is why my delegation abstained in the vote on that draft resolution.

142. With regard to draft resolutions A/35/L.19 and Add.1 and A/35/L.28 and Add.1, my delegation's position of principle on the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and its work is well known. In particular, it was set forth on 6 November 1962, when the vote was taken on the text adopted as resolution 1761 (XVII), by which the Assembly established that Committee. This year again we express the most formal reservations on the validity of the budgetary procedure recommended in operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/35/L.28 and Add.1.

143. My delegation joined the consensus on draft resolution A/35/L.23/Rev.1 on the campaign for the release of political prisoners in South Africa. However, we must recall that the French authorities have not signed Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 and that when it was adopted they stated that they did not consider themselves bound by its provisions. Hence, had that draft resolution been put to the vote, we would have had to abstain.

144. For reasons set forth by the representative of Luxembourg on behalf of the nine members of the European Community, France would have also abstained had a vote been taken on draft resolution A/35/L.24 and Add.1 on dissemination of information on *apartheid*.

145. On the other hand, we would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/35/L.33 and Add.1 dealing with the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa.

146. In conclusion, I wish to reaffirm the importance France attaches to the speedy and peaceful emergence in South Africa of a multiracial and democratic society. It is our fervent wish that the leaders of that country understand that they must without delay implement the reforms that have been too long in coming.

147. Mr. TOMASSON (Iceland): I have the honour of speaking on behalf of the five Nordic countries—Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden and Iceland.

148. The Nordic countries' condemnation of *apartheid* and all forms of racial discrimination has been voiced in the Assembly on many occasions. We repeat it today. Our rejection is based on the traditional Nordic concepts of justice, freedom and democracy and our belief in the equality and dignity of every human being.

149. Our commitment to these goals is also demonstrated by our continued humanitarian assistance to the victims of *apartheid* and by the measures taken by the Nordic countries in accordance with the joint Nordic programme of action against South Africa.

150. The Nordic countries have again voted for most of the resolutions just adopted. In view of the attitude of our countries towards the *apartheid* system, we regret that we have not been able to support all of them. Some have again caused us grave difficulties.

151. Those difficulties are ones of principle, and some of them were encountered in several resolutions. I shall describe the reasons for those difficulties.

152. First, the Nordic countries consider universality one of the basic principles of the Organization and we cannot, therefore, accept any formulation that in one way or another seems to put this principle in doubt.

153. Secondly, the United Nations was established in order to promote peaceful solutions to international problems. Therefore, we cannot accept endorsement by the United Nations of resort to armed struggle.

154. Thirdly, the Nordic countries deplore the inappropriate and arbitrary singling out of individual countries and groups of countries.

155. Fourthly, because of the strict adherence of the Nordic countries to the provisions of the Charter, we must generally reserve our position with regard to formulations that fail to take into account the fact that only the Security Council can adopt decisions binding on Member States.

156. Fifthly, the implementation of some of the resolutions would encroach upon the constitutional freedoms and rights of Nordic citizens and private organizations.

157. Sixthly, the Nordic countries consider that only a free democratic process based on the principle of one man, one vote can determine who can represent the South African people.

158. Those are the considerations on which most of our reservations are based. They apply to, among others, draft resolution A/35/L.13 and Add.1 concerning the situation in South Africa. The Nordic countries have noted the positive changes in this draft resolution as compared with the corresponding resolution adopted at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly [resolution 34/93 A]. We nevertheless abstained when it was put to the vote, because of the wording of several paragraphs.

159. With regard to draft resolution A/35/L.14 and Add.1 on military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, we have reservations regarding the arbitrary and inappropriate singling out of States and groups of States in the ninth preambular paragraph. On behalf of the three Nordic countries members of NATO—Denmark, Norway and Iceland—I categorically reject the notion that there exists any co-

⁷ S/AC.20/SR.43.

operator. between NATO and South Africa. The Nordic countries also have reservations of principle concerning operative paragraph 5.

160. Regarding the question of an oil embargo against South Africa, I should like to take this opportunity to reaffirm that the Nordic countries are ready to lend their support to such an endeavour on the basis of a mandatory decision by the Security Council. Our affirmative vote on draft resolution A/35/L.16/Rev.1 must be seen in the light of this basic attitude. It is therefore our view that operative paragraph 4 and all elements therein should be conceived as an extension of operative paragraph 3, that is, as subject to a decision by the Security Council. The Nordic countries cannot accept the various measures called for in operative paragraph 4, for example the call for the seizure of ships in the absence of binding international measures giving legal effect to such a provision.

161. With regard to draft resolution A/35/L.17 and Add.1 on cultural, academic and other boycotts, the Nordic countries wish to state that no Nordic Government is either promoting or participating in the type of collaboration or exchange mentioned. According to the joint Nordic programme of action against South Africa, a number of restrictive measures have been taken in this respect. We must clearly reserve our position, however, with regard to certain elements in this text which infringe on the constitutional rights enjoyed by citizens in free and democratic societies.

162. On draft resolution A/35/L.18 and Add.1 concerning transnational corporations in South Africa, the Nordic countries wish to state that, although they agree with the main thrust of the resolution, some of its provisions are of such a far-reaching nature that enforcement action under Chapter VII of the Charter would be required.

163. All the Nordic countries voted against draft resolution A/35/L.20 and Add.1 concerning relations between Israel and South Africa. Such a singling out of one individual country is highly inappropriate in this context. It must be deplored that such a draft resolution should have been introduced once again, as it seriously detracts from the main thrust of the other resolutions before us.

164. On draft resolution A/35/L.23/Rev.1 concerning political prisoners in South Africa, we should like to restate our reservation concerning operative paragraph 1 and the applicability of prisoner-of-war status in accordance with the relevant Geneva Conventions.

165. Concerning A/35/L.25 and Add.1 on *apartheid* in sports, the Nordic Governments support the general objectives of the International Declaration against *Apartheid* in Sports. We should like to point out, however, as we have done on previous occasions, that the sports organizations in the Nordic countries are private and independent entities. While in some Nordic countries the authorities may suggest that they act in a certain manner, the organizations are free to take that advice or reject it. The Nordic countries cannot accept operative paragraph 5, as it contradicts the freedom of the press and runs counter to the provisions of our Constitutions.

166. The Nordic countries, while supporting many elements of draft resolution A/35/L.26 and Add.1 on women and children under *apartheid*, must reserve their position concerning some of its elements, and in particular operative paragraph 2.

167. In conclusion, I wish to repeat that the Nordic countries have supported most of the draft resolutions just adopted and sponsored some of them. This is in line with our consistent opposition to the system of *apartheid* in all its forms and manifestations. Our commitment to combat actively the evil of *apartheid* remains firm.

168. Mr. SEZAKI (Japan): My Government has firmly and consistently opposed all forms of racial discrimination, and it has time and again demanded that the Government of South Africa abolish its abhorrent policies of *apartheid*. The Government of Japan has supported numerous resolutions on this item, and has extended maximum co-operation to the efforts of the world community to eradicate *apartheid*. We cannot support, however, the view that questions the legitimacy of the Government of South Africa and that seeks to resolve the problem of *apartheid* in the context of decolonization. Moreover, as a matter of principle, we refuse to endorse the notion of the United Nations encouraging armed struggle, no matter what the context. We also believe that assistance to a national liberation movement should not include military assistance. In our view, it is essential to seek a peaceful solution of the problem through talks among all racial groups in South Africa and, in order to induce changes within South African society, to apply to South Africa, in a realistic and practical manner, as much international pressure as possible.

169. Furthermore, we cannot accept some of the conclusions and recommendations contained in the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. In particular, the report of that Committee indicates, in paragraphs 210 and 211, that included among the 94 underwriters of the loan to South Africa are Japanese banks and investment houses. According to a footnote, this so-called fact is derived from a bond advertisement appearing in the *International Herald Tribune* on 19 June 1980. However, an intensive investigation conducted by the monetary authorities of Japan has found, first, that all of these so-called Japanese companies are in fact local corporations established under the local laws and regulations of the countries concerned and supervised by the authorities of those countries: therefore, they are excluded from Japanese jurisdiction. Secondly, those local corporations underwrite bonds with a view to reselling them, and, in fact, at this time are no longer in possession of the bonds.

170. Even though such dealings are clearly not loans, the particular reference to Japan in the report describes the matter as if Japan had extended loans to South Africa. The aforementioned investigation, however, clearly shows that this is not the case, and my delegation unequivocally rejects such allegations. It is a well-known fact that the Government of Japan, respecting the relevant United Nations resolutions, has long and steadfastly called upon Japanese foreign exchange banks and their branches abroad which are under Japanese jurisdiction to refrain from extending any

loans to South Africa. My delegation hopes the Special Committee will acknowledge this fact in its future work.

171. My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/35/L.17 and Add.1 on cultural, academic and other boycotts of South Africa, because we support the main thrust of the draft resolution. However, some aspects of the resolution contradict freedoms guaranteed to Japanese citizens by the Constitution, and some others would be difficult to implement.

172. Likewise, although my delegation supported draft resolution A/35/L.19 and Add.1 on international campaigns against *apartheid*, it does not necessarily approve of all the wording contained in it.

173. As for draft resolution A/35/L.23/Rev.1 on political prisoners in South Africa, which was adopted by consensus, we wish to state for the record that we have reservations on the eighth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3 because of certain legal questions involved.

174. My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/35/L.25 and Add.1 on *apartheid* in sports although some of the provisions of the International Declaration against *Apartheid* in Sports referred to in the first preambular paragraph will be difficult to implement.

175. It is regrettable that we could not adopt by consensus, as we have done in previous years, draft resolution A/35/L.26 and Add.1 on women and children under *apartheid*. My delegation abstained from voting on this draft resolution because in it the Assembly endorsed the Declaration and Recommendations of the International Seminar on Women and *Apartheid* which, in paragraph 27, arbitrarily singles out and accuses my country, as well as other countries, of collaborating with South Africa. As my delegation made very clear in the discussions of the Fourth Committee on foreign economic interests and other activities,⁸ such a formulation is not a correct reflection of the facts. If the draft resolution had not contained any reference to the Declaration and Recommendations, my delegation would have joined the consensus without any reservation.

176. With regard to draft resolution A/35/L.28 and Add.1 on the programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* we voted in favour of it because we support its main thrust. However, we must record our difficulties in supporting some objectives of the draft resolution as well as certain recent practices of the Special Committee.

177. Mr. KATAPODIS (Greece): Greece has participated consistently in the efforts of the international community to eliminate all kinds of racial discrimination, the most abhorrent form of which, in our day, is certainly *apartheid*. It is in the same spirit that we have voted in favour of many of the draft resolutions adopted today by the General Assembly.

178. However, there are draft resolutions on which, for a number of reasons, we were not in a position to cast a positive vote. Thus, we abstained from voting on draft resolutions A/35/L.13 and Add.1, A/35/L.15

and Add.1, A/35/L.16/Rev.1, A/35/L.17 and Add.1, A/35/L.19 and Add.1 and A/35/27 and Add.1 because they contain elements which are incompatible with the internal legislation of my country and/or call on Governments to take measures which, in our case, would put in jeopardy interests of Greek nationals or persons of Greek origin living in South Africa. We voted against draft resolution A/35/L.20 and Add.1 because we consider that bilateral relations between Member States should not come under the scrutiny of the United Nations, unless they have been proved to violate principles of the Charter.

179. Mr. HUTCHENS (Australia): Australia's opposition to the policies of *apartheid* is clear, unequivocal and firmly on record. In the United Nations and elsewhere we have demonstrated our support for, and willingness to co-operate in, international efforts to achieve fundamental and meaningful change to the system of *apartheid*. My country is particularly sensitive to the problem of neighbouring African countries and is responsive to their efforts to solve the international problems created by *apartheid*. There are, however, a number of observations which my delegation wishes to have incorporated into the record concerning the resolutions which have just been adopted. They are observations which in no way qualify or limit Australia's determination to continue to play an active role in international efforts aimed at the eradication of *apartheid* and other racist practices. They do, however, show the fundamental reasons why Australia found itself unable to subscribe to some of the draft resolutions submitted under this item.

180. It is a matter of particular regret to my delegation that, on an issue which attracts universal condemnation, a number of resolutions were drafted in such a way that they could not receive the unanimous support the issue deserves. For example, the most important draft resolution on the situation in South Africa was clearly prepared without any serious attempt to reach a consensus to reflect the influence which united world opinion could bring to bear on this issue. Furthermore, in previous debates we have made clear our particular difficulties with texts which endorse the concept of the legitimacy of armed struggle and violent solutions. Australia cannot support the practice of selective and tendentious condemnation of specific countries which are accused of what is called "collaborating" in one form or another with the Government of South Africa.

181. Although my delegation supported, for example, the draft resolution on military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, we do not accept that every contact should be condemned in the terms used in some of the resolutions. Indeed, we believe that it is important to maintain contacts with the South African authorities if we are to succeed in our attempts to influence them and bring about changes in policy.

182. I should also like to note that, under the Charter of the United Nations, mandatory action under Chapter VII can be taken only by the Security Council. The Assembly should take particular care not to attempt to direct the Council in such a way as to limit its freedom to take action which it judges most appropriate in meeting its responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security.

⁸ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth session, Fourth Committee, 26th meeting, paras. 13-17, and ibid., Fourth Committee, Sessional Fascicle, corrigendum.*

183. Mr. BUENO (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation has voted in favour of draft resolution A/35/L.13 and Add.1 entitled "Situation in South Africa". We have done so as an expression of our deep commitment to the total eradication of *apartheid* in South Africa.

184. Although we fully support the main thrust and the basic purposes of the draft resolution, we do have some doubts as to the appropriateness of the language in some of its provisions.

185. Mr. DÍEZ (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation voted in favour of nearly all the draft resolutions submitted under the agenda item relating to the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa. We did so to reaffirm our unswerving rejection of any kind of racial discrimination, in particular *apartheid*, which has been declared by the General Assembly to be a crime against humanity.

186. We should like to emphasize, however, the reservations of our delegation regarding the inclusion of certain provisions in these draft resolutions which, in our opinion, far from contributing consistently and effectively to the struggle of the peoples of the world against racism, have a negative connotation, are unproductive and confused. The singling out of certain States as collaborators with South Africa is a clear example of this. The demand that Member States adopt measures which indisputably fall within their internal jurisdiction and sovereignty besides being inconsistent with a free régime, gives rise to certain serious doubts on our part as to the course adopted by the sponsors.

187. Furthermore, we should like to express our disagreement with the General Assembly's endorsement of armed struggle. The treatment of this subject by the Assembly implies the intention of the international community to proceed by peaceful means and untiringly towards its goal of eradicating *apartheid*, and efforts therefore should consequently be in line with these peaceful means.

188. By pointing out this discrepancy—and in so doing we feel sure we are united with many of the delegations here present—we repeat our traditional rejection of all forms of racism and our aversion to *apartheid*.

189. Mr. REMEDI (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): We have asked to speak to explain our position on the draft resolutions that we have just adopted on the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa.

190. As our delegation has stated on many occasions, Uruguay has consistently condemned any political system based on racial discrimination, especially the policy of *apartheid*, a practice alien to our traditions and the tenets of our domestic law which is based on natural law and on the notion that rights, duties and guarantees derive from the human person.

191. Once again, in line with our traditional policy on the matter, we voted in favour of all those draft resolutions containing initiatives which are not only realistic and feasible but basically fall within the purview of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

192. Any initiative which does not contain these two fundamental elements, but, on the contrary, disregards

them, is doomed to failure, in our judgement. In our opinion, the language of certain operative paragraphs of some of the resolutions just adopted has not been sufficiently clear and precise, and undoubtedly this will limit the impact of the original initiative. Nevertheless, we did vote in favour of those paragraphs.

193. The fact that our delegation, in order to contribute to the eradication of the policy of *apartheid*, has not posed any problems regarding matters of form, does not mean that we do not have objections to matters relating to substance. This explains our abstention on draft resolutions A/35/L.14 and Add.1, A/35/L.15 and Add.1, A/35/L.20 and Add.1 and A/35/L.27 and Add.1.

194. Uruguay cannot support initiatives presented in the Assembly which seek to legitimize armed struggle. If the Organization was created with the primary purpose of preserving succeeding generations from the scourge of war, we cannot support resolutions which, no matter how noble their ends may be, try to legitimize the use of violence to achieve those ends. For these reasons, my delegation most vigorously rejects references to armed struggle in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/35/L.13 and Add.1 and operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/35/L.27 and Add.1.

195. In addition, and as we stated in the Fourth Committee,⁹ we should like to make it perfectly clear once again what our position is regarding the danger of the selective approach which has recently been taken in various bodies in the Organization.

196. Finally, we have reservations on the contents of operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/35/L.13 and Add.1 which has just been adopted, because, as we have frequently stated, it is the position of Uruguay that maintaining diplomatic, consular or other relations with another State does not in any way imply that we support either its domestic or international policies.

197. Ms. NEWSOM (United States of America): On behalf of the United States Government, I wish to reiterate our strong opposition to *apartheid* and our firm commitment to work for its eradication. We believe that *apartheid* violates the most fundamental values and we oppose all that it stands for. My Government has made it clear that unless there is meaningful progress towards the elimination of *apartheid* and towards the full participation of all South Africans in the political process of that country our relations with South Africa will deteriorate.

198. I therefore regret that a number of the draft resolutions before us today contain language and propose actions which the United States cannot accept. I sincerely hope that next year a readiness to negotiate on the part of the sponsors of the *apartheid* draft resolutions, will allow the voting on those draft resolutions to reflect the true consensus of opposition to *apartheid* which exists in the international community.

199. I will not discuss in detail those draft resolutions which we have opposed, for my Government's views on them are, I believe, well known. I wish to comment briefly on two of them, however. With regard to the

⁹ *Ibid.*, 27th meeting, para. 11, and *ibid.*, Fourth Committee, *Sessional Fascicle*, corrigendum.

draft resolution on military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, I wish to stress that the United States attaches great importance to the strict implementation of the arms embargo established by Security Council resolution 418 (1977) and that the United States has voluntarily exceeded the requirements of that Security Council resolution. I also wish to recall that the United States does not supply nuclear materials or equipment to South Africa. With regard to the draft resolution on assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement, the United States opposes United Nations financial assistance to or through liberation movements. The United States provides assistance, however, to South African refugees and contributes substantially to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and to the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa.

200. With regard to the draft resolutions on which my Government has abstained, our reservations include the following. We are opposed to the endorsement, contained in the draft resolution on women and children under *apartheid*, of recommendations of the International Seminar on Women and *Apartheid* and of resolutions 45 and 16 of the World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women relating to women and *apartheid*.

201. In the draft resolution on international campaigns against *apartheid*, the reference to isolating South Africa runs counter to our policy of maintaining contacts in an effort to promote change in that society.

202. With regard to the draft resolution on *apartheid* in sports, our position on the participation of private individuals and organizations in sporting events remains unchanged.

203. The call for total isolation of South Africa contained in the draft resolution on the programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* runs counter to our policy. We also oppose authorization of United Nations financial assistance to enable national liberation movements to participate in conferences and seminars against *apartheid*.

204. The recommendations contained in the draft resolution on investments in South Africa do not accord with United States policy.

205. We are pleased to join the consensus on three draft resolutions. On two of them, however, we have reservations. Our laws prevent the United States from carrying out certain provisions of the draft resolution on dissemination of information on *apartheid*. With regard to the draft resolution on the campaign for the release of political prisoners in South Africa, we note that by its own terms Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 can apply to liberation movements and their personnel only if they have met the requirements of article 1, paragraph 4, of that Protocol and transmitted a declaration in accordance with article 96 of the Protocol.

206. It is unfortunate that the determined opposition of the United States Government and people to *apartheid* could not be fully reflected in the votes which we have, of necessity, cast on certain of the draft resolutions before us today. As I indicated before, I hope that in the future a special effort can be made

to prepare draft resolutions worthy of broad support which can truly reflect the consensus of opinion in the international community in opposition to *apartheid* and the unity of the United Nations in seeking the elimination of *apartheid*.

207. Mr. MASHINGAIDZE (Zimbabwe): Zimbabwe's commitment to the liberation of Africa as a whole and to the liberation of South Africa and Namibia in particular is very well known and needs no elaboration here.

208. As members of the Assembly know very well, however, Zimbabwe attained nationhood after a bitter war of liberation, which left the country devastated economically and socially. As a result, Zimbabwe is facing a massive problem of resettling and rehabilitating thousands of returning refugees and displaced persons and of reconstructing its economic infrastructure. Accordingly, the delegation of Zimbabwe needs to examine very carefully the possible effects of some of the draft resolutions before the Assembly this afternoon, especially their effects on our resettlement, rehabilitation and reconstruction priorities and strategies. Thus, after careful consideration, our delegation decided to abstain on draft resolutions A/35/L.15 and Add.1, A/35/L.16/Rev.1 and A/35/L.27 and Add.1.

209. I should like to make it clear also that our delegation would also have abstained if a separate vote had been taken in respect of certain operative paragraphs of draft resolutions which we have supported. Our delegation would like to reserve its position on those operative paragraphs. I say this in specific reference to operative paragraph 6 of A/35/L.13 and Add.1 and operative paragraph 1 (d) of A/35/L.19 and Add.1. As I say, if a separate vote had been taken on these, we would have abstained, but it is important that we are reserving our position for the same reasons. This action should not, however, be seen as in any way indicating a change in Zimbabwe's attitude to the policy of *apartheid*. On the contrary, we join the rest of mankind in absolute condemnation of *apartheid* and shall continue to work for true, meaningful and qualitative political and social change in South Africa and in Namibia.

210. Mr. LEGWAILA (Botswana): For reasons which are well known to all members of the Assembly, my delegation would like to register its abstentions on operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/35/L.13 and Add.1, operative paragraphs 2 (b) and (d) of draft resolution A/35/L.17 and Add.1 and operative paragraph 1 (d) of draft resolution A/35/L.19 and Add.1.

211. We have abstained, for the same obvious reasons, on draft resolutions A/35/L.15 and Add.1, A/35/L.16/Rev.1 and A/35/L.27 and Add.1 in their entirety. We request that these abstentions be reflected in the records of the meeting.

212. Mr. LEROTHOLI (Lesotho): We have unreservedly joined in the international condemnation of the policies of *apartheid* of the South African Government. We have done so out of a deep conviction that *apartheid* is morally indefensible and the most anti-social political system in the world.

213. Although we readily join in the international effort, and especially that of the people of South Africa itself, to dismantle the system of *apartheid*, we also take cognizance of the limitations of our situation. That is why we have always stressed the need for a speedy settlement of the South African situation by peaceful means. The geographic position of Lesotho vis-à-vis the Republic of South Africa and the historical situation of economic interdependence between Lesotho and South Africa compel us to think seriously about the actions recommended in draft resolutions A/35/L.15 and Add.1, A/35/L.16/Rev.1 and A/35/L.27 and Add.1 on which we have abstained, and also in operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/35/L.13 and Add.1 and operative paragraph 1 (b) of draft resolution A/35/L.19 and Add.1, on which we seek to reserve our position for the very obvious reasons that I have stated.

214. We fully understand the impatience of the international community with the intransigence of the South African Government and its stubborn adherence to the policy of *apartheid*, racial discrimination and segregation. We also recognize that whatever punitive measures will be unleashed upon South Africa, either internally or from outside, it will have persistently invited them itself by its obdurate conduct. The inevitable tragedy which *apartheid* will bring upon the people of South Africa will be felt far and wide, and countries like mine will not escape unscathed. Unless we were to elect to indulge in the puerile and futile pleasure of cutting off our nose to spite our face, my delegation could not recommend to the international community that South Africa be destroyed economically, because that would entail the destruction of the economy of Lesotho, which for the time being is, without much choice, interdependent with that of South Africa.

215. My delegation therefore abstained in the votes on the draft resolutions referred to and voted for the other draft resolutions on agenda item 28, reserving its position on the operative paragraphs I have mentioned, consistent with the position we have always maintained.

216. The PRESIDENT: Before concluding our consideration of agenda item 28, I call upon the representative of Nigeria in his capacity as Chairman of the Special Committee Against *Apartheid*.

217. Mr. CLARK (Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*): I feel compelled at this stage to make a brief statement as Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, but first of all I should like to thank you, Mr. President, and, through you, the other representatives, for the ringing endorsement just given the work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. Of the 18 draft resolutions on the *apartheid* policies of the Government of South Africa just adopted, three were adopted unanimously, five without a single negative vote, and 10 with an average of eight opposing votes. This is a truly encouraging record far in advance of that of last year, given the perennial obstinacy of the three veto Powers acting like the proverbial monkeys that see no evil, hear no evil and speak no evil. Again they have not disappointed us with their customary negative votes on nearly all the draft resolutions.

218. During the debate on this item numerous representatives have made generous remarks on the work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and my humble self as the current Chairman of that Committee. Moreover, the draft resolutions just adopted have been very generous in their commendations of the work of the Special Committee. I wish in all sincerity to express our gratitude to the Member States and to the General Assembly as a whole, under your very able leadership, Mr. President, for its kindness. On behalf of Nigeria and all the other 18 members of the Special Committee, I wish to assure the Assembly that we will endeavour to do all in our power, with dedication, fairness, objectivity and a sense of urgency, to discharge the responsibilities entrusted to the Special Committee.

219. *Apartheid* is an issue on which the entire international community has pronounced itself unequivocally. It is also a problem which has bedevilled the Organization and the conscience of humanity for a long time. We now truly stand at the crossroads. On the one hand, if the international community can forge the unity and strength necessary to eliminate *apartheid* in South Africa, that will herald a new era in human history, for the elimination of *apartheid* is the major unfinished business in the emancipation of Africa after centuries of colonialism, humiliation, oppression and foreign exploitation. With the elimination of *apartheid* in South Africa, all of us can mark the end of the era of colonialism not only in Africa but all over the world, and the African States can concentrate their energies and resources on the struggle against poverty, illiteracy and disease inherited from their years of colonialism and can contribute effectively to the problems and tasks of international co-operation. On the other hand, so long as *apartheid* persists, there can be no stability and peace in Africa, particularly southern Africa. The nuclear ambitions of the Pretoria régime add a new critical dimension to this menace.

220. The draft resolutions that have been adopted today represent a comprehensive programme of action by the Organization and the international community as a whole. We have listened attentively to the many positive suggestions made by delegations during the debate and in explanations of vote before and after the vote. We have all recognized that the so-called reforms in South Africa are a sham, that *apartheid* cannot be reformed, but must be abolished and that there must be concrete international action and not mere verbal condemnation.

221. We have also taken note, very careful note, of the reservations expressed by some delegations, despite our disappointment that they have not moved forward. Some of the reservations relate to the strength and depth of our feeling shown in our condemnation of *apartheid* in strong terms. Others relate to a so-called lack of realism in putting forward ideas and measures which we perceive as indispensable in the fight against *apartheid*. I think the most serious cause for concern are the reservations based on an erroneous construction of the Charter. Under Article 10 of the Charter, the powers, competence and function of the Assembly to make recommendations to Member States or to the Security Council on any matter under consideration are not in doubt. There is precious little point in dragging in doctrinal texts or

pretexts to justify inaction on the part of some of our friends in particular.

222. I have also taken note of the statement made by the representative of Israel. His unfortunate innuendo directed against the Special Committee comes only a week after the visit of the South African Finance Minister to Israel and statements made by Governments before and during that visit expressing satisfaction at the growing relations between Israel and South Africa. Yet I have taken note of the affirmation of the representative of Israel that his Government opposes racism and *apartheid*. We do look forward to seeing his future actions match the protestations he made this afternoon.

223. I should also like to express our particular disappointment at the continued opposition of some Member States to the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, sponsored by the United Nations and the OAU. I must, however, express my satisfaction at the fact that some countries, particularly the Netherlands, have this year voted in favour of the draft resolution on this subject, taking account of the report of the Special Committee on the aims of the Conference [A/35/22/Add.3, paras. 15-30]. We hope that those countries will also take note of the views of the great majority of States and of the earnest and repeated appeals of the oppressed people of South Africa and of all the African States. The crimes of *apartheid* cannot be wished away, nor can the struggle be waged by semantic formulations which seek to hide the lack of will on the part of some Member States to put their commitment to human rights over and above their economic interests in South Africa.

224. I should like to assure the Assembly on behalf of the Special Committee that we will exert every effort, in accordance with the resolutions adopted today and in the light of all the views expressed, to promote international mobilization against *apartheid*, with the co-operation of all Governments and organizations as well as all men and women of conscience. I hope that we can count on the co-operation of all the Member States.

225. We hope that the efforts for the elimination of *apartheid*, to which we are all committed, will not be hindered by any external considerations, by cold war approaches, or by short-sighted material, economic or strategic interests. We will attach the utmost importance to mobilizing the public because *apartheid* is above all an affront to the conscience of all decent men and women.

226. The triumph of freedom in Zimbabwe, after heavy sacrifices, has created a new situation this year in our consideration of this item. Let us not lose the opportunity provided to humanity by the martyrs of Zimbabwe and by the freedom fighters of South Africa and Namibia by failing to maintain the momentum in the march to freedom and liberty in South Africa.

227. Today, 16 December, is observed by the Afrikaners in South Africa as the Day of the Covenant in connexion with their past wars of conquest against the indigenous owners of South Africa, the African people. This day is observed by the oppressed people in their struggle for freedom as a national Heroes'

Day, in memory of the martyrs. This afternoon the African group met to celebrate with the liberation movement of South Africa this day as the National Heroes' Day of the people of South Africa. Tragically, there is still a perilous gulf in South Africa between the races. The United Nations and the OAU have patiently sought a just and lasting solution in accordance with the noble principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, so that the South African people, regardless of race, may build a new society in which all men and women, irrespective of race, colour or creed, will enjoy their inalienable rights.

228. There is no greater moral challenge that unites humanity today. Let us then concert all our efforts to fulfil the pledge made by the United Nations in 1975 when the Assembly recognized its special responsibility to the oppressed people of South Africa, to the national liberation movement and to all those imprisoned, restricted and persecuted for their opposition to the crime of *apartheid*.

AGENDA ITEM 26

The situation in the Middle East: report of the Secretary-General (*concluded*)*

229. The PRESIDENT: Members will recall that at the 89th plenary meeting on 10 December the Assembly concluded its debate on that item.

230. Representatives now have before them draft resolution A/35/L.49 and Add.1. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote on this text.

231. Mr. de PINIÉS (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Spain, which in the past has always spoken on the subject of the Middle East, did not do so in the general debate on this item this year because inevitably we would have had to refer to what we had already stated in the Assembly on earlier occasions, since our position remains completely unchanged. But we would, however, like to quote what the Foreign Minister of Spain said on the Middle East in the general debate:

"The Middle East, the tense and vital nerve centre of ever-impending catastrophe, is the inevitable and natural concern of a country such as Spain, which is so closely linked to the Arab peoples and situated at the westernmost point of the Mediterranean.

"The continuing policy of illegal settlements, the adoption of the 'Basic Law' on Jerusalem, the repetition of acts of aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon and other events increasing tension in that area give rise to concern and require that the vicious circle of lack of understanding and intolerance be broken, if we wish to avoid new confrontations of unforeseeable consequences. The time for action has come.

"The Spanish Government considers it necessary for a further attempt to be made to open the door to a solution. Spain will spare no effort to that end." [4th meeting, paras. 118-120.]

232. My delegation is concerned at the situation in the Middle East: as it perpetuates itself—we must bear in

* Resumed from the 89th meeting.

mind that the immediate origins of the conflict go back to 1967—it has given rise to further conflicts in this region, which have aggravated the situation there. The Secretary-General in his report is not exactly optimistic. Unfortunately, in one year the situation in the Middle East has been considered by the General Assembly, which condemned Israel's occupation of Palestinian and other Arab territories, once again recalling that peace is indivisible and that a just and lasting settlement must be based on a comprehensive settlement, under the auspices of the United Nations, taking into account all aspects of the Arab-Israeli conflict, in particular the exercise by the Palestinians of all their inalienable rights and Israel's withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem. Subsequently, the General Assembly held an emergency special session in July this year and the Security Council held seven meetings to consider problems relating to the rights of the Palestinians, the situation in the occupied territories and the question of Jerusalem. Notwithstanding this activity the possibility of a settlement is still not yet in sight.

233. To achieve peace a new political approach must be taken, or some other approach based on recognition of the existence of all States in the area and the Palestinians' right to self-determination and to a homeland. If the Palestinian people are not granted that right, the problem of the Middle East will not easily be solved.

234. Last year my delegation said that Israel cannot be denied the right to exist but that it was necessary for the parties in the confrontation—a confrontation that has caused so much suffering and resulted in so many victims—to understand that the goal must not be to annihilate or humiliate the opposing side. Therefore, Israel cannot continue to keep the territories that it conquered in 1967, thinking that the unlawful settlements and the passing of years can create any acquired rights. Israel must realize—and eminent figures have said this—that the occupation of territory is not compatible with peace. The time has come for it to make a choice.

235. My delegation would like to express the following reservations on the draft resolution on which we are about to vote. With reference to operative paragraph 4, in our opinion the result of the exercise of the right to self-determination by the Palestinian people should not be prejudged. As far as operative paragraph 5 is concerned, as we said yesterday when the resolution on the question of Palestine was adopted, we believe that that paragraph refers only to the rights of the Palestinian people and does not affect in any way agreements which other parties in the area may have concluded. Having stated those reservations, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

236. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): I wish to make a statement of two closely correlated components: the first, a point of order, and the second an explanation of my vote before the vote.

237. I find myself compelled to make some comments on what all of us should regard as extremely ominous functional aberrations which affect the very integrity of the work of the General Assembly and its international staff. The mass media in New York can be as wide of the mark and unfair as they please. After all,

it is their right under the First Amendment. But it is most reprehensible if international civil servants in the Department of Public Information of the United Nations covering the solemn proceedings of the General Assembly should be implicated and connive in such glaring distortions of records which we presume to be accurately recorded verbatim as well as on tape. This touches the core of the integrity and solemnity of our work. How can we make statements here if they are going to be falsified in the press releases of the United Nations Department of Public Information.

238. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Israel has asked to be allowed to speak on a point of order and I call on him.

239. Mr. BLUM (Israel): The representative of Jordan engages neither in a point of order nor in an explanation of vote. I would respectfully request that you, Mr. President, remind him of the fact that we are at the stage of explanations of vote and that the last three minutes be taken into account in timing the length of his explanation of vote.

240. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Israel may not have been in this room this morning when another representative also used his right to correct a summary report issued by press officers. There are two possibilities: either to let the representative of Jordan make two statements or to let him make his two observations in one statement; and I have decided in favour of the one that we are now pursuing. My decision stands; he will continue with his two observations in one statement.

241. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): Two distortions in a period of a mere few days are: one, a press release GA/6356 of 10 December 1980 containing excerpts from a statement made by Mr. Blum alleging that I had even quoted from the so-called "Protocols of the Elders of Zion". This is of course a blatant falsehood, as every member of the Assembly knows, and a vicious fabrication. A record of my statement, to which the Israeli representative exercised his right of reply, was made by hand and by machine. I made no mention of that book, and have requested the Secretary-General to investigate such slander.

242. To my great amazement, another press release—GA/6366, of 15 December 1980—which was brought to my attention only this afternoon by one of my colleagues, one of the Arab ambassadors—a press release referring to my exercise of my right of reply yesterday evening—had the audacity to allege that I had wished to know what it was that "the distinguished bully"—meaning the Ambassador of the United States—had objected to in my morning statement. Aside from the fact that Mr. Petree is my friend, this is not language that I would demean myself by using when addressing a representative of the United States or any other country.

243. The record and the recordings will bear me out when I say that I have never used the term "distinguished bully" when referring to a colleague and friend. In the face of such serious and abrasive distortions and lies, and in order to preserve the integrity and accuracy of the proceedings of the General Assembly, I respectfully ask the President to request the Secretary-General to initiate an immediate investigation to bring the vicious culprits who wrote that press release

to account for such serious libel. I regard it as seditious libel. I regard such distortions as a type of depraved and shameful behaviour unworthy of international civil servants. I cannot but conclude that these ubiquitous fabrications are part and parcel of an overall plan that is directing the behaviour of the misfits responsible for those fabrications, and I am sure that my colleagues in this Assembly earnestly await, as I do, the outcome of an extensive investigation that I trust will also be distributed as an official document of the Assembly.

244. I am also informed that fabrications and dishonesty along similar lines—and equally audacious—have been pervasive in the various Committees of the General Assembly, particularly concerning the statements of representatives of the Arab States. We do not take those distortions lightly, and we suggest that those whose fidelity is not to the United Nations have no right to abuse their positions and malign the representatives of sovereign independent States, not to mention the integrity of the United Nations.

245. In explaining my vote before the vote on draft resolution A/35/L.49 and Add.1, I should like to say the following: the draft resolution before the General Assembly is self-explanatory and requires no clarification. The disturbing element in the whole process, however, is that an Assembly representing the entire world finds itself in the awkward and untenable position of having to vote on such resolutions year in and year out to no avail. The entire draft resolution speaks of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, of the rights of the Palestinian people and all other such provisions so solemnly and categorically laid down by the Charter of the United Nations. Are we the same United Nations whose Charter and founding fathers categorically and unconditionally rejected the acquisition of territory by force, aggression, conquest and the enslavement of other peoples?

246. It is ominous and sad to reflect that these acts of the law of the jungle should have been imposed audaciously and with impunity upon the law-abiding States that form the totality of the United Nations, and the fact that the States and peoples afflicted by such lawlessness should sustain traumatic agonies is but a part of this sordid tale. For equally ominous is the deliberate and calculated effort of anti-peace and anti-law elements to so dilapidate the very fabric of the United Nations as to ensure its ultimate disintegration and the termination of its noble mission for a world of peace, based on law and justice. If my words seem unduly bleak, I need only remind the Organization of the fate of its predecessor, the League of Nations, which, by failing to confront the challenge of aggression in 1936, set the stage for its own collapse a mere three years later and triggered the horrors of the second global war.

247. Can the world in the nuclear age afford to watch helplessly and complacently a downward spiral into a bottomless abyss? Perhaps, by acting affirmatively and justly, we might manage to avert such a catastrophe and spare future generations the ravages of war.

248. The PRESIDENT: First, I should like to inform the representative of Jordan that the Secretary-General has just assured me he will see to it that the matter the representative of Jordan has brought before the

Assembly will be investigated at once. Secondly, I should like to invite representatives to look at their watches. The representative of Jordan stayed within the 10-minute time limit and finished with two observations in nine minutes.

249. Mr. PETREE (United States of America): My delegation is voting against the draft resolution on the Middle East that is before us. This text is in our view irrelevant to the search for a comprehensive peace, as well as to a resolution of the Palestinian problem in all its aspects, to which my Government is dedicated and for which the Camp David agreements have provided the most realistic and practical framework.

250. A comprehensive settlement between Israel and its neighbours can only be negotiated in accordance with the principles of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), the only agreed basis for peace. We reject the short-sighted and tendentious approach reflected in the present draft resolution, which seeks to undermine resolution 242 (1967) by ignoring one of its central provisions. It is unrealistic to expect Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories without endorsing Israel's right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.

251. Furthermore, we hold the strong view that repeating such an unbalanced demand *ad infinitum* in General Assembly resolutions will not make it right, nor will it form the basis for the comprehensive peace we all seek.

252. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Had we been consulted, we would have expressed our favourable view with regard to the substance of the text of draft resolution A/35/L.49 and Add.1 and several of its paragraphs, because we are in favour of a solution which seeks to find peace in the Middle East, rejecting as we do the occupation of territory by force, and because we are moved by the martyrdom of the Lebanese people, attacked on several sides and struggling admirably and heroically to maintain its historical identity, which we all admire and which we all support.

253. However, in particular paragraphs of this text we are being induced to exalt and aggravate situations, rather than to accomplish the task of peace of the Organization, which should seek to calm those situations and resolve them.

254. The rejection of international agreements—duly contracted and supported not only by Governments and parliaments but by peoples which bring about the withdrawal of occupation forces and, particularly, the return of occupied territories to the country to which they legitimately belong—cannot change our convictions, in the light of our policy and our national and international conduct, as well as our view that the decisions of a sovereign people about its future must emerge only from the expression of the popular will in democratic elections.

255. We are, of course, entirely in favour of all the preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution, and in particular of its operative paragraph 6, and we have voted in keeping with this position on other decisions of the Assembly with regard to the question of Palestine and to Jerusalem. Unfortunately, we have not

been voting paragraph by paragraph, which would have been the way to resolve our objections.

256. We shall abstain in the vote on this draft resolution because we cannot agree with some of its wording, although we do agree with aspects of principle expressed in certain paragraphs. Fortunately, we have been in a position to vote in favour of other resolutions on these questions at this session and that clearly defines the position of Ecuador and its desire to find specific peaceful solutions in the Middle East, a region in which we seek cordial relations with all countries and entities.

257. Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall be very brief in explaining why we shall abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/35/L.49 and Add.1 regarding the situation in the Middle East.

258. If separate votes were to be taken on each paragraph, my delegation could abstain on operative paragraphs 4 and 5, since we have specific reservations on the manner in which they were drafted. However, my delegation wishes once again to make it quite clear that Costa Rica supports the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to exercise self-determination in its own territory in full sovereignty. Likewise, we wish to reaffirm the need for the establishment of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the region, based on full respect for the Charter and for the principles of international law, as embodied in Security Council resolution 242 (1967)

259. None the less, we wish to reiterate our position as it was expressed yesterday in the voting on draft resolution A/35/L.39 and Add.1 relating to the question of Palestine [95th meeting]. My delegation abstained in the vote on that draft resolution because we cannot reject all the partial agreements and separate peace treaties which are concluded bilaterally by States Members of the United Nations. We consider such peace agreements, although they may be limited, to be positive. We hope that the Palestinian people will be able to achieve national independence and to establish an independent State in Palestine, with all the attributes of sovereignty, including the right to elect its Government in complete freedom.

260. Mr. BLUM (Israel): In the course of the debate on the agenda item before us, a crudely anti-Semitic tone pervaded a number of the statements made. The crudest anti-Semitic slanders were uttered by the representative of the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan. This of course is by no means the first time that Mr. Nuseibeh has revealed his warped mentality...

261. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Jordan, on a point of order.

262. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): May I request the President to rule the representative of Israel out of order for misnaming my country, which is the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. The name he used is a travesty of the official name of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan that is accepted in the records of the United Nations. Whatever he has said is therefore a travesty of United Nations procedure.

263. The PRESIDENT: I would appeal to all representatives who participate in debates, when they refer to States Members of the United Nations to use

the official term that is used here and elsewhere, that is, the official term by which a given country wishes to be known and addressed.

264. The representative of Israel may continue.

265. Mr. BLUM (Israel): This of course is by no means the first time that Mr. Nuseibeh has revealed his warped mentality and embarrassed this Assembly by drawing almost word for word from such notoriously anti-Semitic works as the so-called "Protocols of the Elders of Zion", a scurrilous fabrication published in tsarist Russia at the turn of the century. According to Mr. Nuseibeh and I quote this words at the 86th meeting, there is a Jewish cabal "... which controls, manipulates and exploits the rest of humanity by controlling the money and wealth of the world. People like Lord Rothschild every day, in iron-clad secrecy, decide and flash round the world how high the price of gold"...

266. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Oman on a point of order.

267. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (Oman): I thought that we were in the process of voting and that we were now explaining our votes. This is not the proper time to exercise the right of reply to points which have been raised during the debate. The voting process has started and I would request that we abide by the rules.

268. The PRESIDENT: As those representatives who were present will recall, on another occasion—I think it was yesterday—I remarked that I was trying to be very lenient and liberal in letting everyone who wished to make a statement make that statement.

269. I am aware that we are in the process of explaining our votes and I express my hope that the representative of Israel will come to that point soon, within his 10-minute time limit.

270. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I definitely will, Mr. President. According to Mr. Nuseibeh, "people like Lord Rothschild every day, in iron-clad secrecy, decide and flash round the world how high the price of gold should be". In the United States, what Mr. Nuseibeh terms "the Zionists" own a lion's share—in his language—of the wealth of America, while—and I quote him again—"millions of hard-working God-fearing Americans are unemployed". Again, according to Mr. Nuseibeh: "It is a well-known fact that the Zionists are the richest people in the world and control much of its destiny." He also said in his statement in this debate: "The Zionists want all the money to be assembled in their coffers"...

271. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Jordan on a point of order.

272. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): On a point of order, I believe that the President has ruled that we should stick to explaining our votes before the voting and not exercise the right of reply—which is the right of every representative at the appropriate moment.

273. But the representative of Israel should not take the occasion of explanations of vote to make a reply, which puts his adversary at a disadvantage. For example, I did not say "Lord Rothschild"; it was *Time* magazine which wrote that, and in brackets, but I have no way of answering him now. At any rate, this is irrelevant. The important point is that he is

out of order, because he is exercising the right of reply in the course of explaining his vote on draft resolution A/35/L.49 and Add.1, which is now before us.

274. I therefore hope that the representative of Israel will stick to an explanation of his delegation's vote.

275. The PRESIDENT: I repeat that I have been in the past and shall continue to be liberal, or lenient—whichever representatives want to call it—when representatives wish to express their opinions or explain their votes.

276. However, I expect that explanations of vote come to the point of the explanations. That is a general observation, but I repeat it now in the direction of the representative of Israel so that he may come soon to explaining his vote on draft resolution A/35/L.49 and Add.1.

277. Also, I should like to recall that just a few minutes ago I gave permission to the representative of Jordan to make an observation which was not directly connected with an explanation of vote. He stayed within his time-limit of 10 minutes and I Permitted him to proceed.

278. So we shall now proceed with explanations of vote, and I should like to repeat my appeal to the representative of Israel to come to the point.

279. Mr. BLUM (Israel): On a point of order, I should just like to point out that it is not surprising that the representative of Jordan should be so upset about what I have to say. For a number of years he has used this kind of language; he has referred to my people as "a bubonic plague", as "a cancerous growth" and so forth. But now that this has become public and some of the media have seen fit to pick it up he is upset. Rather than complain to the General Assembly about the way his statement has been reported he should apologize to it for the language that he has used, debasing its meetings, because that kind of language is nothing but out-and-out anti-Semitism of the worst and most virulent kind.

280. If the Assembly had stopped playing at being a mock parliament and introduced some real parliamentary rules and ethics, such calumnies would long ago have been ruled out of order.

281. I should like now to come to my explanation of vote. The Assembly has before it draft resolution A/35/L.49 and Add.1. Just as what passes for a debate on the situation in the Middle East is merely a regurgitation of the Assembly's one-sided deliberations on the question of the Palestinian Arabs, so this draft resolution is merely a synopsis and pot-pourri of the resolutions which were adopted yesterday under agenda item 24. Its purpose is precisely the same as in those resolutions, namely, to impede the peaceful solution of the Arab-Israel conflict.

282. Like those resolutions, it is not an anti-war draft resolution, it is an anti-peace draft resolution. As such, it should be rejected.

283. The language of the draft resolution follows and exacerbates the formulations which have been advanced year after year on this item. It only goes to prove that its drafters have fallen captive to their own

obsessions and slogans and are incapable of producing any fresh ideas, certainly incapable of adopting any approaches that might contribute constructively to anything in the Middle East.

284. One presumes that clear-thinking States are aware that the perennial repetition of lies and distortions does not make them any less false. A lie, a distortion, a fabrication, remains a lie, a distortion, a fabrication, no matter how often repeated by a majority in the Assembly.

285. In the tradition of resolutions on this item, the draft resolution contradicts the provisions of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and the foundations on which it rests. That resolution was, and remains, one of the few positive contributions which the Organization has made to the cause of peace in the Middle East. The sponsors of the draft resolution before us appear to begrudge the Organization that contribution, and hence seek to undermine it.

286. In sum, this draft resolution, like the resolutions adopted yesterday on agenda item 24, is in flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and all it stands for. It turns the United Nations against its very *raison d'être*—the prevention of war and the promotion of peace. It goes without saying, therefore, that States which hold aloft the ideals of peace and of the United Nations in general should dissociate themselves from this draft resolution.

287. The PRESIDENT: Before proceeding to the voting on draft resolution A/35/L.49 and Add.1, I should like to make a general observation and a recommendation for the future.

288. If representatives want to take issue with other representatives on statements they have made, I urge them to make use of the right of reply, which we provide for in our rules of procedure. Representatives would thus also gain an extra few minutes for their explanations of vote within the 10-minute time-limit.

289. The Assembly will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/35/L.49 and Add.1. A separate vote has been requested on operative paragraph 8, and I now put it to the vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania,

Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Operative paragraph 8 was adopted by 144 votes to none.

290. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution A/35/L.49 and Add.1 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour. Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Burma, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Malawi, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Portugal, Samoa, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Venezuela.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 101 votes to 13, with 30 abstentions (resolution 35/207).

291. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote.

292. Mr. KATAPODIS (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): Faithful to its well-known position on the question of the Middle East and to its respect for the principles of the Charter, on which any solution of this problem should be based, the Greek delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/35/L.49 and Add.1.

293. Nevertheless, we wish to take this opportunity to repeat that a solution can be equitable and viable only if based on the right of all the States and peoples of the region, including Israel, to live in peace within secure and recognized borders. My delegation would have preferred this principle to be reflected more explicitly in the draft resolution, especially since the principal parties, directly or indirectly concerned, have for some time accepted it in one form or another.

294. Mr. BALETA (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): The Albanian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/35/L.49 and Add.1 in accordance with the well-known position of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania on the question of the Middle East. The positions and views of the Albanian Government were clearly reiterated in our delegation's statement during the debate on the situation in the Middle East on 8 December [86th meeting].

295. The Albanian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/35/L.49 and Add.1 in the belief that the key ideas in most of the statements and requests in that text did not present any difficulties. Some of the elements of past resolutions on the situation in the Middle East that gave rise to reservations and difficulties are not present in the resolution just adopted.

296. Having said that, my delegation would like to state that it still has some reservations on the draft resolution. Those reservations have been formulated and submitted on many past occasions, and we do not intend to go into them again in detail. They concern essentially the nature and content of certain documents and resolutions adopted earlier by the United Nations, to which reference is made in the present resolution. The reservations made by my delegation at the time of the adoption of resolution 35/169 A, of 15 December 1980, are also included in that category.

Mr. Albornoz (Ecuador), Vice-President, took the Chair.

297. Mr. MAYNARD (Bahamas): The Bahamas delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/35/L.49 and Add.1, on the situation in the Middle East because, *inter alia*, my Government believes strongly in the concept of, and the need for, regional as well as universal peace and security.

298. However, the Bahamas delegation had hoped for a more balanced text and would wish to record the serious reservations it has on certain operative paragraphs, especially operative paragraph 5, which do not enhance the chances of favourable results regarding a comprehensive solution to a very pressing problem.

299. Finally, the affirmative vote of my delegation on this draft resolution does not in any way nullify the objections which my Government has expressed on similar resolutions in the past.

300. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand): As my delegation supports the main thrust of the draft resolution, it was able to vote for the draft resolution as a whole.

However, my delegation's position on the framework for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, which requires that the legitimate rights of all States in the region be respected, is a matter of record. Thus its support for this draft resolution was not without some qualifications or reservations, essentially on operative paragraphs 4 and 7.

301. As regards operative paragraph 4, while my delegation's support for the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, particularly the right to self-determination, is firm and consistent, the question of the leadership of that State can only be determined through the exercise of self-determination by the Palestinian people themselves.

302. As to operative paragraph 7, while my delegation strongly maintains that all parties must strictly respect the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of a State Member of the United Nations, and thus fully supports operative paragraph 8, it wishes to express its reservations on the relevant wording of operative paragraph 7.

303. Mr. ADDABASHI (Libyan Arab Jamāhīriya) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution, on the situation in the Middle East. That does not signify, however, any change in my country's position with regard to Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), or other resolutions which my country does not acknowledge.

304. Miss SHARPE (Jamaica): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution. However, as regards operative paragraph 5 of that draft, my delegation wishes to state that our vote should not be interpreted as a rejection of the Camp David agreements, although we recognize the inadequacy of those agreements as regards the rights of the Palestinian people. The implementation of those rights represents a basic requirement for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

305. Mr. SEALY (Trinidad and Tobago): The delegation of Trinidad and Tobago voted in favour of the draft resolution.

306. We adopted that position despite the fact that the resolution contains several elements with which we are not in full agreement.

307. Mr. PELÁEZ (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation feels that in the draft resolution, which has just been voted upon, facts and circumstances are reflected on which we agree with the views of the majority of the international community;

for instance, as regards the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, Israeli withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories, respect for the international status of Jerusalem, strict observance of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Lebanon and so on. These are aspects we have approved in other resolutions of the General Assembly.

308. However, after careful consideration of the content of this draft resolution, my delegation was obliged to abstain in the voting. The Peruvian delegation has always supported any action by the Security Council or the General Assembly aimed at finding a just solution to the Middle East problem. We feel that such a solution must be sought within the framework provided by resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) of the Security Council, which we view as fundamental.

309. However, although the draft resolution just adopted deals with a situation that affects international peace and security and that accordingly has been the subject of consideration by the Security Council, it does not meet those basic requirements. Furthermore, my delegation does not agree with the use in the resolution of certain not very conciliatory language. This is not conducive, we feel, to the peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict, to which the Palestinian question is central.

310. We wish once again to express our conviction that confrontation and conflict can be resolved through a political process of co-operation with the participation of all parties concerned, thus ending several decades of sad confrontation and making possible peace in the region.

311. Mr. TRAORÉ (Togo) (*interpretation from French*): The Togolese Government has always supported, and will continue to support, the Palestinian people in its just struggle to exercise its inalienable national rights. The Togolese delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution, but would like to say that it has the most serious reservations on paragraph 5 of that resolution. Togolese policy is traditionally based on dialogue and joint effort, and we give pride of place to these in the settlement of disputes among nations. Thus, we consider the partial agreements referred to in the resolution to be one stage in the comprehensive solution of the problem of the Middle East. The Togolese delegation consequently dissociates itself from the spirit and the letter of operative paragraph 5. If that paragraph had been voted on separately, my delegation would have abstained.'

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.