



General Assembly

UN LIBRARY

PROVISIONAL

A/42/PV.77

30 November 1987

ENGLISH

Forty-second session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SEVENTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 20 November 1987, at 10 a.m.

President:	Mr. FLORIN	(German Democratic Republic)
later:	Mr. MOUMIN (Vice-President)	(Comoros)
later:	Mr. FLORIN	(German Democratic Republic)
later:	Mr. CANETE (Vice-President)	(Netherlands)

- Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa [33] (continued)

- (a) Reports of the Special Committee against Apartheid
- (b) Report of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa
- (c) Reports of the Secretary-General
- (d) Report of the Special Political Committee
- (e) Draft resolutions
- (f) Report of the Fifth Committee

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

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

87-64462/A 1727V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 33 (continued)

POLICIES OF APARTHEID OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA

- (a) REPORTS OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID (A/42/22, A/42/22/A d.1)
- (b) REPORT OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL GROUP TO MONITOR THE SUPPLY AND SHIPPI G OF OIL AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS TO SOUTH AFRICA (A/42/45)
- (c) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/42/659, A/42/691, A/42/710)
- (d) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/42/765)
- (e) DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/42/L.26 and Corr.1, A/42/L.27 and Corr.1, A/42/L. 8 and Corr.1, A/42/L.29 and Corr.1, A/42/L.30 and Corr.1, A/42/L.31, A/42/L. 2, A/42/L.36)
- (f) REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/42/785)

Mr. MOHAMMED (Trinidad and Tobago): Apartheid is not just an internal affair of South Africa as this problem has transcended national boundaries and has raised serious political and social questions of concern to all countries of the international community. Each and every country has an obligation to take appropriate action to eliminate this pernicious system of institutionalized racism, exploitation and repression so assiduously pursued by the racist régime in South Africa. The logical consequence of this is that apartheid must be considered a threat to international peace and security which requires appropriate action at the international level.

The struggle against apartheid is for the total elimination of apartheid and the establishment of a non-racial and democratic State with rights, duties, obligations and guarantees for all its citizens.

Within recent times the South African régime has been purporting to reform apartheid by introducing changes and reforms in its political process. These so-called changes and reforms are a sham, are spurious and, in addition, are accompanied by an unprecedented use of force and terror within South Africa itself and of aggression against and destabilization of neighbouring independent States.

(Mr. Mohammed, Trinidad and Tobago)

The continued struggle against apartheid must proceed on several fronts. Measures must be taken completely to isolate the apartheid régime politically, militarily, economically, and culturally. To attain this objective the international community has, by and large, built up a system of sanctions. It is regrettable, however, that the system we have built up is neither comprehensive nor foolproof. As far back as 1977 the Security Council instituted a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa. Yet today several countries supply military and nuclear technology and equipment to, and procure military equipment and related matériel from, South Africa. Crude oil and petroleum products continue to be supplied and transported to South Africa, and the technology for prospecting for and producing hydrocarbons and developing alternative supplies of energy continues to be provided. South Africa continues to receive new foreign investments and loans, and the recent rescheduling of South Africa's debt only served to bolster the régime. In the sports and cultural field the boycott should be intensified and airline links and tourism should be terminated.

It is for each individual country, and for the international community meeting in an international institutional framework, to define practical modalities and to introduce concrete action for the structuring, intensification, and universalization of sanctions, for my delegation is convinced that the growing international movement, together with the national struggle, has been of some concern to the apartheid régime.

The measures taken to isolate South Africa politically have been weakened by a number of ill-conceived measures. The first is, of course, the so-called policy of constructive engagement. Based as it was on the concept that there could be some accommodation with the South African régime and that the system of apartheid could be reformed, this policy was doomed to failure from its very inception. My

(Mr. Mohammed, Trinidad and
Tobago)

delegation appeals to the advocates and purveyors of this spurious policy to bury it lock, stock and barrel, once and for all. Equally barren of any validity whatsoever is the geostrategic concept that the apartheid régime's survival is essential for the security of the West. It would seem self-evident that the most effective bulwark is the existence of a truly democratic Government in South Africa which upholds and maintains human rights and human dignity.

One Western Government, while professing to sympathize with the plight of black South Africans, has even stated that because of its massive investments in South Africa it cannot take the appropriate measures to bring down this relic of institutionalized racism. This attitude and this policy, which place profits above respect for human rights, are unconscionable and short-sighted.

It appears, too, that some Western Governments have refrained from taking decisive political action against the apartheid régime because of their concern for the future of South African whites, that is, the "kith and kin" factor. Let me simply recall that the kith and kin factor, which was invoked in dealing with Southern Rhodesia, has been put to rest, because what we have in place of Southern Rhodesia is a multiracial, stable and progressive Zimbabwe.

To sum up, the very existence of the apartheid régime in South Africa poses a threat to international peace and security, because of both the internal use of force and terror and the continuing aggression against neighbouring States. There is need, therefore, to intensify the struggle against apartheid, which should include the following action.

The United Nations has already defined apartheid as a crime against humanity. Consideration should now be given to widening the range and scope of the activities envisaged in the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid.

(Mr. Mohammed, Trinidad and Tobago)

Comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter should be instituted. My delegation is fully aware that the will of the international community is being frustrated by the resort to an outdated procedural device by some countries. It is time for the international community to devise alternative mechanisms to prevent the obstruction of its will.

All countries have a responsibility, as an interim measure, to enforce scrupulously those sanctions that they have committed themselves to applying.

Increased support should be given to the front-line States to enable them better to withstand the pressures from South Africa.

The international public opinion campaign should be intensified so that each individual becomes more aware that he has a direct responsibility in the eradication of apartheid in South Africa and the establishment of a democratic society and Government in which each of its citizens could pursue a life of self-respect, equality and dignity.

Mr. MAYE ELA (Equatorial Guinea) (interpretation from Spanish); Mr. President, my delegation wishes to associate itself with the good wishes conveyed to you and to express our confidence that under your enlightened guidance this debate will make an important contribution to consideration of agenda item 33, entitled "Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa".

Once again, as in previous years, we are meeting in this Assembly specifically to consider the policy of apartheid of the South African Government. The intransigence of that minority régime that practises apartheid in South Africa not only endangers peace and stability in this important part of the African continent but, if it persists, with the consequent violence and suffering, could lead to irreparable disasters for the world.

(Mr. Maye Ela, Equatorial Guinea)

At the present level of world development it is an insult to the international community and unacceptable that certain countries with special responsibilities for ensuring respect for the principles of the Charter should support, because of certain vested interests, the persistence of a régime that by its very nature is doomed to disappear.

Southern Africa continues to be the scene of new clashes. The situation is deteriorating from day to day, as a minority redoubles its efforts to perpetuate its racist policy. It also worsens with each military action by the Pretoria régime against the Namibian people and the front-line States. In the face of this situation, world public opinion has been demanding concerted action by the international community to make the Pretoria authorities change their policy.

Equatorial Guinea has supported the General Assembly's resolutions calling for comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa and for concerted efforts to bring about the total elimination of apartheid. We therefore find it incomprehensible that some countries that have made the greatest contributions to defining and applying democratic principles in pluralist, multiracial societies should resist the application of such sanctions.

Equatorial Guinea reiterates its deep concern over the continued practice of the policy of apartheid. Similarly, we deplore the climate of generalized repression and the holding of whites-only elections by the National Party in May this year, with the aim of reaffirming the Party's authority and giving the stamp of legality to its constitutional plan for government based on ethnic considerations. The result of those elections was that the National Party was returned to power with a large majority - a reflection of the fears and the intransigence of most of the white minority and their belief in the promise of stability and security made by the National Party.

(Mr. Maye Ela, Equatorial Guinea)

My country rejects the Pretoria Government's constitutional plan to settle Africans living in urban areas outside the homelands, because we regard it as a policy of coercion and expropriation. Similarly, we deplore the institutionalization of the occupation of the black townships by the police and the army, including the practice of putting armed men in educational institutions, and the imposition of the state of emergency, in which many people have lost their lives as a result of police violence against striking workers and communities that resist the forced removals.

Despite increased repression, resistance to apartheid in South Africa is still growing. The national liberation movements, the black trade union movement, students and other young persons, and religious leaders and institutions have given new dimensions to the anti-apartheid struggle. The régime has been unable to find true leaders prepared to co-operate in the implementation of its plans for so-called reforms and in the perpetuation of apartheid.

In the light of recent developments in South Africa and to give a renewed impetus to concerted international measures against apartheid, my country urges the international community to demand that the Pretoria régime lift the state of emergency; free Nelson Mandela and all other political prisoners; guarantee the safe return of political exiles and repeal the ban on national liberation movements and political organizations; reaffirm its condemnation of the policy and practice of apartheid, the repression carried out by the South African régime in the country and its acts of aggression and destabilization in the region, because they constitute a crime against humanity and a threat to international peace and security; and condemn the execution of freedom fighters captured in South Africa, and demand that those condemned to death shall not be executed.

(Mr. Maye Ela, Equatorial Guinea)

Aware that the peoples of Namibia and South Africa continue to be subjugated by the Pretoria régime under its policy of apartheid, the United Nations should redouble its efforts to ensure peaceful transition to a fully democratic society in which all racial groups can live in peace. Any other path will lead to violence without precedent in the region. If we do not take vigorous action today, tomorrow will be too late.

Mr. MUDENGE (Zimbabwe): Addressing the South African Parliament in 1955 one of the architects of apartheid, the then South African Prime Minister, Johannes G. Strydom, said of the policies of apartheid:

"Call it paramountcy, baaskap or what you will; it is still domination. I am being as blunt as I can. I am making no excuses. Either the white man dominates or the black man takes over. The only way the Europeans can maintain supremacy is by domination. And the only way they can maintain domination is by withholding the vote from non-Europeans. If it were not for that we would not be here in Parliament today ... under the existing laws it is not possible for the natives, through merit or any other means, to get the government into their hands. The government of the country is in the hands of the white man as a result of the franchise laws and for that reason the white man is baas in South Africa."

The issue in South Africa is about one man, one vote, and one vote, one value. Mr. Mandela is not interested in swimming with Botha either in the Indian Ocean or the Atlantic Ocean, or indeed in the municipal swimming pools in Cape Town. But what he is suffering for, and if need be is prepared to sacrifice his very life for, is to swim with Botha in the Houses of Parliament in Cape Town.

On the other hand, Mr. Botha says he will never, ever agree to one man, one vote in South Africa. He argues that such a system will lead to the domination of

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

the minority by the majority. Rule by the majority is anathema to Botha. He wants what he calls power-sharing. But what share of the power should the majority have? Botha is very clear on that. Power must be so shared that the majority should not be dominant; that is, there should never be majority rule in South Africa. Since the majority in South Africa happen to be black, this in effect means there can never be black rule in South Africa, according to Botha. Botha's so-called reforms are therefore means to re-create versions of the status quo - white domination. As Strydom said,

"Either the white man dominates or the black man takes over... And the only way [the white man] can maintain domination is by withholding the vote from non-Europeans."

This is exactly how Botha looks at it, and his so-called reforms must be seen through the distortions of this Afrikaner prism.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

The so-called reforms that the Pretoria régime seeks to sell to the international community are a sham. It is clear that any reform that Pretoria is prepared to accept is a reform that safeguards white domination in South Africa. The Bill submitted to Parliament on 11 September 1987, by which Pretoria seeks to create the so-called national council which it is envisaged will give blacks a role in the running of the country, should be treated with the contempt it deserves. This ploy is not new at all and should not deceive anyone. In fact, Pretoria tried it before and it was a dismal failure. This is a rerun of an old movie.

It will be recalled that in 1936 the Pretoria régime, through the Native Affairs Act, created the Native Representative Council, a body on which the blacks were represented and which was supposed to play a role in the running of that country. The result was quite the contrary; the Native Affairs Council went down in history as a body whose decisions were constantly ignored, and hence had no impact whatsoever on the running of the country. Indeed, when the Dr. Jekyll of apartheid, Hendriek Verwoed, became Minister for Home Affairs, he convened the Native Council merely to tell it of the need for apartheid. The Native Council was a toothless bulldog. It was finally disbanded in 1951.

The recent ploy by South Africa to introduce a warmed-up version of the Native Council through the so-called National Council is nothing more than an attempt to deceive the international community into thinking that meaningful change is taking place in South Africa. It is a tactic that, like its pathetic predecessor, is doomed to failure.

Most of us know that the doctrine of apartheid emphasizes the separation of the races and entrenches the dominant role of the white minority in South Africa. It says that man's station in South Africa is determined not by his ability or effort but largely by the colour of his skin and that it is the accident of colour that says where a man may be born, live, work, die or be buried.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

We know also that the United Nations has already declared apartheid to be a crime against humanity and that it is bereft of any moral justification, but perhaps what is not always well known is the absurdity and wastefulness of the system economically. It has been argued that South Africa could be 50 per cent richer if apartheid were abolished today. Because of apartheid, South Africa and its so-called independent homelands have one civil servant for every 27 South Africans, an exceptionally high figure. Again, because of the absurdities of apartheid, South Africa has five Presidents, one real and four fictitious, but all being paid for; five Ministers of Finance; five Ministers of Foreign Affairs; five Ministers of Defence; five Ministers of Education; six Ministers of Housing, and so on. It has a number of so-called Chief Ministers in charge of some homelands. It has 151 Government departments and almost 1,200 Members of Parliament.

All these are for a population of slightly over 30 million people. If South Africa had had no need to have such a bloated civil service and Government departments in order to service apartheid it would have saved about 56 billion rands in 1985 alone and cleared all its international debts. To defend apartheid against its internal opponents in 1986 South Africa had to kill an average of 3.5 people a day, arrest an average of 30.1 every day and detain 82.6 persons daily.

Besides the well-known heroes languishing in Pretoria's gaols there is another breed of captives now to be found in those institutions of infamy and shame. This new breed of hostages are children, sometimes as young as five or six years old. It is a nightmare for one to be a parent in South Africa's black townships today, for one cannot send one's children to the grocery store without worrying that the police will stop them, beat them up or arrest them for no good reason. Even if they are playing in one's own yard they may be shot by police or military patrols roaming the neighbourhood. Police may come to one's home in the middle of the

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

night and take one's sons and daughters away. Troops may surround one's children's school and arrest the entire student body. Children in custody, who may never even be charged with a crime, may be beaten, tortured. One would be unable to learn if and where they were being held.

The suffering of black children under the apartheid system today is a major issue that cannot be left until the day of emancipation in South Africa. At a recent International Conference on Children and Law held in the capital city of the country, Harare, it was revealed that from 1984 through 1986 children under 18, including some as young as five years old, were subjected to the following level of police violence: 300 children killed; 1,000 wounded; 11,000 detained without trial; 18,000 arrested for protest activities; and 173,000 held in prison cells awaiting trial. It reads like a military casualty list. It is a list of shame.

The stories of detention, torture and killing have a horrible redundancy. In time, no one story stands out from the others. A typical story goes like this. Children are playing, be it in the school yard or in their parents' backyard. The security forces or police line them up, kick and beat them and then take them into police custody, where the same treatment continues. They are interrogated and then kept in solitary confinement for days, weeks or months, during which time they are interrogated daily, mostly to get the names of students involved in anti-apartheid activities, such as school boycotts. Sometimes these children are handcuffed and pinned against a wall with a table pushed against their waists. Police on occasion jump up and down on them. Many of them go for many nights without sleep and are subjected to various forms of torture, including having buckets of cold water poured over them, or electric torture. It was disclosed at the Harare Conference that an 11-year-old was awakened by policemen at 2 a.m. one day last October.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

They took him and his 14-year-old sister to a van already holding eight other children. These kids were driven to the police station, put in cells, and deprived of food for 16 hours. The next day, the 11-year-old was interrogated. Even when he said he was not involved in the burning of cars and schools in the townships, a policeman beat him up. He lost four teeth. After almost four weeks, he was transferred to a prison. His face was swollen and he was unable to eat, but he was never allowed to see a doctor. Another child, a little girl of 11, Fannie Gosuka, was detained without trial for 57 days.

These stories are endless. One child is beaten with fists and rifle butts. Another simply disappears. One is tortured with electric shocks to the spine. Another is threatened with being burned alive. One is hit by police buckshot while playing in the street. Another is shot in the back while under arrest.

There is now a new dimension added to the cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment meted out to black South African children. In prison now, black children are subjected to various kinds of pressure to make them agree to enter so-called reorientation camps to undergo brainwashing and so-called rehabilitation, which may last as long as one month, before they return to their communities. In these camps, children are brainwashed and pressured to become informers and collaborators of the régime. They are turned into some kind of Hitler youth.

We know that these camps exist, the hitherto secret existence of these camps having been exposed in the South African Parliament on 11 September 1986 by the opposition M.P.'s. These camps are linked to the minority racist régime's national security apparatus. They are run by the Joint Management Committees, some 500 of which exist throughout the country. The more important committees are run by officers of the armed forces, who play a major role at all levels, including the local committee levels. These committees are part of the comprehensive national security management system set up by the apartheid regime after it adopted its

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

strategy of all out war in 1977. The system is headed by the State Security Council, presided over by P. W. Botha, the President of South Africa, and composed of the main police and army chiefs and ministers occupying positions considered to be of strategic importance.

The international community cannot afford to remain silent in the face of such barbaric acts being committed by the Pretoria régime. The General Assembly must demand the immediate release of the detained and jailed children. The way South Africa is treating black children is a crime for which history will judge not only South Africa but all of us. What did civilized man do to stop such barbarities? We all have an obligation to those children and to ourselves to put an end to this form of state terrorism against the weak and defenceless. Let Pretoria know that mankind is outraged and is not prepared to have its moral standards debased by appearing to acquiesce to Pretoria's brutality towards children. We demand the release of all political prisoners in South Africa and support the campaign to unlock apartheid jails.

The Pretoria régime not only seeks to dominate the majority population of South Africa, but, through its policies of aggression and destabilization, the régime seeks to impose pax Afrikana on the rest of southern Africa as a way of safeguarding its apartheid policies. This year alone Pretoria has made a number of unprovoked direct and indirect attacks on the front-line States. On 15 April 1987 the racist commandos struck deep into Zambia by helicopter, killing four Zambians and destroying two buildings. And as I speak today, thousands of South African troops are occupying southern Angola in violation of that country's sovereign and territorial integrity.

The General Assembly should waste no time in condemning such an unprovoked act of aggression against the people of Angola. Pretoria should not be allowed to continue flouting the provisions of the United Nations Charter and other norms of

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

conduct of international relations among States with impunity. The international community is duty bound to see to it that the racists in Pretoria are brought to book. The people of Angola should be given all forms of assistance necessary for them to resist such aggression.

Acts of destabilization by the apartheid régime go further than direct incursions into neighbouring States. The régime uses bandits in Mozambique, Angola, Zambia and Zimbabwe to try to overthrow the legitimate Governments of those countries. These surrogates perpetuate heinous acts of murder, rape and general harassment of the innocent people of those countries. In July this year, we learnt with a deep sense of shock and revulsion of the murder in cold blood of 386 Mozambicans by the MNR bandits in Inhambane province in southern Mozambique. These victims included pregnant women, children and hospital patients, whose ears and noses were slashed off by the bandits. Many more murders of innocent civilians in Mozambique have been perpetrated by the MNR bandits since then.

The cost to the countries of southern Africa of Pretoria's destabilization activities has been enormous. The countries of the region have had to divert their scarce resources which should have been used for development, to the defence of their territories against Pretoria's aggression. As a result, the prospects for development of these countries have been seriously undermined. While in other parts of the world, drought and other natural hazards are responsible for starvation, in southern Africa, apartheid is the number one factor responsible for malnutrition and the starvation of thousands of people. I need not repeat the horrifying accounts published in the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) report, entitled "Children of the front-line", in order to illustrate the worsening situation in southern Africa.

Events during the past year have once again proved beyond any doubt that the racist régime of South Africa is impervious to reason and that it will not move to

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

dismantle the evil system of apartheid unless it is compelled to do so. It is therefore imperative that the international community move without further delay to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria régime, in order to compel it to heed the voice of reason and to put an end to the suffering in southern Africa. The international community has shown great patience over the years. Regrettably, this has not elicited any positive response on the part of the racist rulers in South Africa. The time to act is now. We ask those who in the past have by their vetoes given comfort to the Pretoria régime, to reconsider their position and join the international community in the just quest to put an end to apartheid.

Meanwhile, the international community should make a concerted effort to co-ordinate the implementation of the various packages of sanctions already adopted by a number of Member States of the United Nations. For these measures to be effective, it is important that they be brought under the United Nations and that they be made comprehensive and mandatory.

Hand in hand with the imposition of sanctions on the Pretoria régime, the international community should increase its support to the front-line States and the liberation movements in order to enable them to resist Pretoria's aggression. We commend those countries that have already made contributions to this cause through the AFRICA Fund and other available channels and urge those who have not done so to join in this noble cause.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

In conclusion, allow me to join those who have spoken before me in expressing appreciation of the sterling work of the Special Committee against Apartheid and the crucial role played by the special radio unit against apartheid, under the United Nations Department of Public Information, in keeping the international community and the oppressed peoples of Africa informed of the issues. My delegation pledges to work closely with these agencies to ensure that their important work continues to expand from strength to strength.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item of the agenda.

I call on the representative of Nigeria, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/42/L.26 and Corr.1, entitled "International solidarity with the liberation struggle in South Africa", and draft resolution A/42/L.30 and Corr.1, entitled "Programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid".

Mr. GARBA (Nigeria): On behalf of the sponsors, which include my own delegation, I have the honour to introduce the draft resolution A/42/L.26 and Corr.1, entitled "International solidarity with the liberation struggle in South Africa", and draft resolution A/42/L.30 and Corr.1 entitled "Programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid".

I would like first, however, to bring to the Assembly's attention the efforts that the sponsors of draft resolutions A/42/L.26 to L.30 have made this year to introduce five draft resolutions each of which focuses on one particular subject in unemotional, succinct and sober language, and with added brevity. The Assembly will appreciate that the length of the draft resolutions has been substantially curtailed, and that the preambular paragraphs have been limited to the minimum, to the extent that overlapping is virtually eliminated. Even in the substance we have tried to avoid condemnations and have responded to some comments made in the past by a number of countries. Let me say that the sponsors have made a genuine effort

(Mr. Garba, Nigeria)

to facilitate broad acceptance of these draft resolutions. Having listened to the statements in the debate on this agenda item, I shall be surprised if most Western countries do not support all of these draft resolutions. We sincerely hope that we shall see in the voting a tangible, positive response to the efforts we have made this year.

I now wish to introduce, first, draft resolution A/42/L.26 and Corr.1, on international solidarity with the liberation struggle in South Africa. This is a similar draft resolution to draft resolutions which the General Assembly has traditionally adopted in the past in a more lengthy form under the title "Situation in South Africa". The thrust of the draft resolution emanates from the report of the Special Committee, particularly the parts dealing with the review of developments in South Africa and the conclusions and recommendations of the report. In its preambular paragraphs we express our concern at the escalating repression of and the State-sponsored terror against the overwhelming majority of the people of South Africa, demonstrated by the extension of the state of emergency, the detentions, torture and killing, particularly of children, the obnoxious use of vigilante groups, which are used as death squads, and the press censorship. The draft resolution also reflects in its preamble the outrage expressed by all speakers from this rostrum during this debate at the régime's acts of aggression and destabilization against neighbouring independent African States, and the continuing illegal occupation of Namibia.

In operative paragraph 1 the General Assembly reaffirms its full support for the people of South Africa under the leadership of their national liberation movements, in their struggle to eradicate apartheid and build a free, democratic, unfragmented and non-racial South Africa. All who have spoken from this rostrum have expressed their determination to see the eradication of apartheid and a free, just and non-racial South Africa.

(Mr. Garba, Nigeria)

Operative paragraph 2 reaffirms the legitimacy of the struggle of the people of South Africa and their right to choose the necessary means, including armed resistance, to eradicate apartheid. I would like to draw the Assembly's attention to the word "resistance", which for the first time appears in our draft resolutions, and again underline the efforts that the sponsors have been making to achieve a wide consensus and at the same time reflect even more clearly the fact that it is the racist régime that initiates violence. The system of apartheid itself constitutes aggression. The people of South Africa have the right to self-defence against the violence perpetrated by the criminal system of apartheid in the same way as countries are allowed by the United Nations Charter to defend themselves with arms.

I believe that some Western countries that have had difficulties with the notion of "armed struggle" in the past cannot object to the term "armed resistance" when they themselves have been proud of the resistance they displayed during the Second World War and at other times in their history when they were under oppression and tyranny.

The United Nations cannot take from the people of South Africa and their liberation movements their right to self-defence in their legitimate fight against the criminal system of apartheid. This is particularly true in the present circumstances, when the racist régime has been escalating repression and violence against the opponents of apartheid while the United Nations has remained paralysed and unable to apply the only peaceful means available to curb the racist South Africa, namely, comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter.

Operative paragraph 3 deals with the condemnation by the General Assembly of the policy and practice of apartheid and, in particular, the execution of patriots and captured freedom fighters in South Africa. This paragraph demands that the

(Mr. Garba, Nigeria)

racist régime, first, stay the execution of those now on death row, and, secondly, abide by the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 and Additional Protocol 1 of 1977.

In this paragraph cognizance is taken of the international community's belief that, if anybody ought to be jailed, it is not those who have acted to ensure the granting of the inalienable rights of all South African people, but their persecutors, who are the true criminals pursuing the policy and practice of apartheid, which has been declared a crime against humanity by the General Assembly.

The General Assembly demands again, in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, that the racist régime end repression against the oppressed people; lift the state of emergency; release unconditionally all South African political prisoners; lift the ban on the two national liberation movements of South Africa; and other specific measures as enumerated in this paragraph. It considers, in following operative paragraph 5, that the implementation of these demands would create the appropriate climate for free consultations among all the people of South Africa. Again, all speakers from this rostrum have talked about the need for negotiations on a just and lasting solution to the conflict in that country and the establishment of a free, democratic, non-racial South Africa.

As part of a concrete demonstration of the international solidarity with the liberation struggle in South Africa, the General Assembly, in operative paragraphs 6 and 7 of the draft resolution, appeals to all States, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, the mass media, and city and other local authorities, as well as individuals, to increase urgently political, economic, educational, legal, humanitarian and all other forms of necessary assistance to the people of South Africa and their liberation movements. It also appeals to them to step up material, financial and other forms of support to the front-line and other member States of the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC).

(Mr. Garba, Nigeria)

By the same token, in operative paragraph 8 all countries are urged to contribute generously to the Action for Resisting Invasion, Colonialism and Apartheid (AFRICA) Fund established with the aim of increasing support to the liberation movements fighting the apartheid régime and to the front-line States.

These paragraphs, I have no doubt, are in tune with the views of all delegations which participated in the debate and I believe that they express the consensus in this Hall.

In concluding, I wish to express my belief that, since the thrust of this draft resolution reflects the will of the international community as has been expressed in this Hall, Member States will give it their full support.

I turn now to draft resolution A/42/L.30 and Corr.1, entitled "Programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid". In the draft resolution the General Assembly commends the Special Committee against Apartheid for its work in the discharge of its responsibilities, in particular promoting international action against apartheid. It endorses the recommendations pertaining to the programme of work and activities to promote the international campaign against apartheid. Such activities are illustrated in paragraph 150 of the report of the Special Committee.

The modest financial request in operative paragraph 3 is a minimum amount that will allow the Special Committee to undertake its 1988 programmes. The Special Committee has in the past two years been very frugal and effected stringent economies in its activities. In requesting an amount of \$390,000, which is exactly the sum that was voted last year, the Special Committee is once again motivated by the need for austerity imposed by the financial difficulties of our Organization. At the same time, let me clearly state, however, that this modest amount for 1988 should in no way be construed as indicating a tendency towards diminishing our

(Mr. Garba, Nigeria)

activities. On the contrary, we plan to execute our programmes with effectiveness, selecting our priority activities with a view to maximizing pressure and mobilizing those in a position to influence decision-making.

In this draft resolution the General Assembly also requests Governments and organizations to provide financial and other forms of assistance for the special projects of the Special Committee and to make generous contributions to the Trust Fund for Publicity against Apartheid.

Finally, it appeals to all Governments, intergovernmental organizations, information media, non-governmental organizations and individuals to co-operate with the Centre against Apartheid and the Department of Public Information of the United Nations Secretariat in disseminating information on the deteriorating situation in South Africa in order to mitigate the effects of the restraints on the press in South Africa and effectively to counteract racist South African propaganda. In this connection, contributions to the Trust Fund for Publicity against Apartheid would help the Centre against Apartheid to carry out a new, revitalized programme, which, given the press censorship in South Africa, has acquired a special importance.

On behalf of the sponsors, I wish to express the hope that both the draft resolutions, A/42/L.26 and Corr.1 and A/42/L.30 and Corr.1, which I have just introduced will receive the unanimous support of the Member States represented at this session of the General Assembly.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I call on the representative of Kuwait, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/42/L.27 and Corr.1, entitled "Application of co-ordinated and strictly monitored measures against South Africa".

Mr. ABULHASAN (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): I have the privilege of introducing draft resolution A/42/L.27 and Corr.1, entitled "Application of co-ordinated and strictly monitored measures against South Africa", on behalf of the sponsors listed in document L.27/Corr.1.

The report of the Special Committee against Apartheid clearly emphasizes the need to impose co-ordinated comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. While the sponsors of this draft resolution fully share and subscribe to the conclusion of the Special Committee, they feel that the international community, pending a decision of the Security Council, is morally bound to take measures designed to bring an end to the abhorrent system of apartheid. Such measures, whether taken individually or collectively by Governments and provided that they are strictly implemented and monitored, could serve as an effective challenge to the racist régime. This draft resolution should therefore be viewed in this context and not as a substitute for mandatory sanctions imposed by the Security Council in fulfilment of its responsibility.

In the preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution the Assembly takes note of the report of the Special Committee and of the fact that measures taken by States individually and collectively vary in coverage and degree of enforcement, which allows the racist régime to exploit existing gaps.

It commends actions by States, associations and other organizations for measures that they have taken fully to isolate the apartheid régime.

In operative paragraph 1 the General Assembly urges all States, pending the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions, to adopt legislative and/or comparable measures to impose effective sanctions against South Africa. These

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

measures, which are listed in subparagraphs (a) to (e), have already been accepted in the past by the General Assembly. Most of them are among the set of collective measures that have been taken by a large number of countries, including the Nordic countries. The purpose of subparagraph (a) is to ensure the greatest possible co-ordination of measures adopted by States with a view to closing the loop-holes regarding their implementation.

In operative paragraph 2 States are called upon not only to monitor the implementation of the measures referred to in paragraph 1 but also to impose penalties on individuals and enterprises within their jurisdiction that violate these measures. This is a very important element if these measures are to be effective.

In operative paragraph 3, States are encouraged to ratify the International Convention against Apartheid in Sports. It should be noted that the word "encourages" is used here as an incentive to those countries which fully support the sports boycott against South Africa, but have some constitutional difficulties in meeting the provisions of the Convention.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

In operative paragraph 4, the Secretary-General is requested to submit a report on the measures taken by States individually and collectively and the implementation thereof.

In conclusion, on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, I should like to urge the members of the General Assembly to support it unanimously as an expression of solidarity with the oppressed people of South Africa and a token of the determination of the international community to eliminate apartheid.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I call on the representative of Nepal, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/42/L.28 and Corr.1, entitled "Comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa".

Mr. RANA (Nepal): I have the honour, on behalf of the sponsors, to introduce draft resolution A/42/L.28 and Corr.1, entitled "Comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa". The draft resolution is based on the conclusions and recommendations of the Special Committee against Apartheid, as set forth in its annual report, contained in document A/42/22, and takes into account different points highlighted during the course of the current session.

It may be recalled that the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, in opening the debate on agenda item 33, on the "Policies of Apartheid of the Government of South Africa", underlined the endeavour to improve the format of the Special Committee's reports. The draft resolution also reflects this endeavour.

In the face of the situation in and around South Africa, the international community has concluded that the imposition of sanctions against South Africa remains the only peaceful alternative for exerting pressure on the racist régime to

(Mr. Rana, Nepal)

dismantle apartheid. There is a broad consensus that the many measures adopted by States individually or collectively, while commendable, are far from adequate. Existing loopholes in relevant national legislation, violations of the United Nations embargoes, the continued collaboration of certain States with the racist régime and a lack of willingness to implement, monitor or enforce restrictive measures give the régime the opportunity to defy once again the international community's resolve to eliminate apartheid.

Taking those developments into account, the majority of States and world opinion in general are fully convinced that it lies within the responsibility of the Security Council to act urgently and decide with one voice on the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. Since apartheid constitutes a crime against humanity and a threat to international peace and security, those sanctions are the most appropriate and effective peaceful means for the Security Council to adopt in discharging its responsibilities.

As many delegations have pointed out during the debate, apartheid cannot be reformed; it has to be eliminated. The eradication of apartheid by peaceful means, is what this draft resolution calls for and recommends. It does not seek to put blame on anyone for the delay or diversion, nor does it single out Member States to that effect. It has to be seen as an urgent appeal to all peace-loving, responsible and caring people and Governments to contribute effectively to the liberation of South Africa from the evils of apartheid and thereby to pave the way for the establishment of a free, unfragmented, democratic and non-racial society in that tormented country.

The preambular paragraphs refer to basic documents for concerted international action against apartheid and to the concern of the international community at the defiance of its will by the apartheid régime. In operative paragraph 1 of the

(Mr. Rana, Nepal)

draft resolution, the Assembly would reaffirm that apartheid is a crime against humanity and a threat to international peace and security has to be eliminated without further delay. In operative paragraphs 2 and 3, the Assembly would endorse the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations and requests the Council to take immediate action to that effect. In operative paragraph 4, the Assembly would urge the strengthening of the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa in order to stop its continued violations.

In conclusion, I should like, on behalf of the sponsors, to express the hope that all Member States will once again reaffirm their deep commitment to the cause of peace, freedom and justice by voting in favour of draft resolution A/42/L.28 and Corr.1, which is designed to bring to an early end the racist policies and practices of the Pretoria régime.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I call on the representative of the Sudan, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/42/L.29 and Corr.1, entitled "Relations between Israel and South Africa".

Mr. IDRIES (Sudan) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation has the honour to introduce one of the draft resolutions recommended by the United Nations Special Committee against Apartheid, namely, that contained in document A/42/L.29 and Corr.1, entitled "Relations between Israel and South Africa".

This draft resolution was prepared with great care by the Special Committee against Apartheid and was also discussed at a meeting of the African Group. The following States have sponsored this draft resolution: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Benin, Botswana, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic,

(Mr. Idries, Sudan)

Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sudan, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

The draft resolution is consistent with and based upon the information contained -

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I call on the representative of Israel on a point of order.

Mr. JOFFE (Israel): I wish to state here that in draft resolution A/42/L.29 and Corr.1 the name of the State of the Central African Republic is not included. So I should like the representative of the Sudan to take that into consideration and to correct the list of sponsors.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I note the remarks of the representative of Israel. Would the representative of the Sudan please proceed with his statement.

Mr. IDRIES (Sudan) (interpretation from Arabic): This draft resolution is fully consistent with, and based upon, the information contained in the special report of the Special Committee against Apartheid (A/42/22/Add.1). That report refers to the following facts.

First, Israel continues to have wide-ranging ties, covert and overt, with South Africa in the military, nuclear, security, intelligence and economic fields.

Secondly, the measures adopted by Israel, for the first time, are but an attempt to circumvent the United States Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act, which stipulates that the United States Government will review the aid it gives to countries that violate the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa.

Thirdly, Israel, which ignored and continues to ignore General Assembly and Security Council relevant resolutions, had in the past affirmed that it had no ties with South Africa, although its recent measures are proof of its having misled world public opinion.

Fourthly, the Special Committee against Apartheid did not observe an element of seriousness in the resolutions and measures adopted by the Government of the Israeli entity in the past year. The report points out the following:

(a) paragraph 4 makes it clear that

(Mr. Idries, Sudan)

"Israel's reply, dated 8 October 1986, was not considered satisfactory by the Special Committee";

(b) in paragraph 5 the Special Committee considered that

"the Israeli decision to reduce its ties with South Africa has not been a serious political decision";

(c) in paragraph 8 the Special Committee decided that

"The decisions would still allow Israel covertly to continue military sales to South Africa on basically the same terms as before" (A/42/22/Add.1, pp. 5 and 6)

(d) paragraph 10 refers to the fact that these measures do not refer to military and nuclear collaboration between the two countries, leave numerous loopholes and are qualified by intentional exceptions which render these measures devoid of content and commitment; and

(e) the representative of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) made it clear that one of the gravest forms of co-operation between Israel and South Africa was the intensified co-operation between the Israeli Mossad and the racist intelligence agencies operating against the struggle of the southern Africans aimed at attaining their right to self-determination.

The draft resolution before us has been prepared in the light of all these considerations of the Special Committee against Apartheid. It contains three preambular paragraphs and four operative paragraphs. The preambular paragraphs reaffirm previous resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on this subject, namely relations between Israel and South Africa, the latest of which is resolution 41/35 C, refer to the special report of the Special Committee against Apartheid on recent developments concerning relations between Israel and South Africa and, finally, note the measures recently announced by the Government of Israel

(Mr. Idries, Sudan)

concerning its relations with South Africa. The operative paragraphs read as follows:

"1. Calls upon Israel to desist from and terminate forthwith all forms of military, nuclear, intelligence, economic and other collaboration, particularly its long-term contracts for military supplies to South Africa;

"2. Further calls upon Israel to abide scrupulously by the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council;

"3. Requests the Special Committee against Apartheid to continue to monitor developments in the relations of Israel with South Africa, including the implementation of the measures recently announced by Israel;

"4. Further requests the Special Committee to keep the matter under constant review and to report thereon to the General Assembly and the Security Council as appropriate."

In light of the fact that this draft resolution has taken into account all the developments pertaining to previous resolutions on the subject, and since it is sponsored and has been introduced by the African Group, my delegation and the sponsors hope that it will enjoy the necessary support of all other groups.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I call on the representative of Norway to introduce draft resolution A/42/L.31, entitled "Oil embargo against South Africa", and draft resolution A/42/L.32, entitled "Concerted international action for the elimination of apartheid".

Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway): Having earlier this week introduced the report of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa, it is a great pleasure for me to introduce the draft resolution on "Oil embargo against South Africa", which is contained in document A/42/L.31.

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

The draft resolution which is now before the Assembly is sponsored by all the members of the Intergovernmental Group, that is, Algeria, Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, Indonesia, Kuwait, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, the Ukrainian SSR, the United Republic of Tanzania and Norway. In addition, the following States have expressed their support for the draft resolution by joining the Group as sponsors: Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, the Byelorussian SSR, Congo, Democratic Yemen, Hungary, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Malaysia, Oman, Pakistan, Senegal, the Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Qatar, the USSR, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

I am confident that the cross-section of oil-producing States, shipping States and other States directly affected by the issue at hand which comprise the group of sponsors will be duly reflected in broad, if not unanimous, support for the proposed text.

At its forty-first session the General Assembly established the Intergovernmental Group by the adoption of resolution 41/35 F, on 10 December 1986. In that resolution the Security Council was urged to take action "to impose a mandatory embargo on the supply and shipping of oil and petroleum products to South Africa".

Furthermore, the resolution laid down a set of measures to broaden the scope of the embargo, pending a decision by the Security Council. These latter elements have been retained in this year's text.

As for the Intergovernmental Group and its future activities, I should like to draw the Assembly's attention to operative paragraphs 4 and 6. Operative paragraph 4

"Requests the Intergovernmental Group to submit to the General Assembly at its forty-third session a report on the implementation of the present

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

resolution, including a proposal for the strengthening of the mechanism to monitor the supply and shipment of oil and petroleum products to South Africa".

Operative paragraph 6

"Requests the Secretary-General to provide the Intergovernmental Group with all necessary assistance for the implementation of the present resolution".

As indicated in my introduction of the report last Monday, there is an essential need for the Group to strengthen its data base to ensure that accurate and complete information is provided to the Group on South Africa's import of oil and petroleum products. Similarly, the analysing capacity of the Group should be enhanced.

As the Group has not yet completed its mandate and will continue its activities in the year ahead, a modest allocation of resources to the Group is deemed necessary. This is reflected in operative paragraph 6. Simultaneously, a long-term perspective has to be developed whereby the Group also considers the establishment of more sophisticated procedures to monitor the supply of oil and petroleum products to South Africa. That long-term perspective is dealt with in operative paragraph 4, and it is my hope that a comprehensive proposal to this effect may be worked out by the Group and presented to the Assembly at its forty-third session.

I submit that draft resolution A/42/L.31, now before the Assembly, is of particular significance in the struggle against apartheid. My assertion is based on the following argument.

The policy of trying to abolish apartheid through a dialogue with the South African Government has been tried repeatedly, without success. Increased international pressure applied through effective sanctions is thus the only avenue left in order to eradicate apartheid by peaceful means. In this regard, an

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

effective oil embargo has a particular potential for influencing the South African society, inasmuch as oil is virtually the sole strategic commodity in which South Africa is not self-sufficient. A ban on the supply and on the shipping of oil and petroleum products cannot fail to convey the message that apartheid must be abolished. It is now incumbent upon Pretoria to make the choice either to abolish apartheid through peaceful means or to face an escalating and increasingly destructive civil war.

I call upon all States to join us in conveying that message by supporting the draft resolution on an oil embargo against South Africa.

I turn now to draft resolution A/42/L.32, entitled "Concerted international action for the elimination of apartheid". That draft resolution addresses a crucial issue in the struggle for the elimination of apartheid, namely, the obligation of the international community to co-ordinate and strengthen its pressure against South Africa. Only through concerted international action will the anti-apartheid forces be strong enough to deliver a clear message to the South African Government to abolish apartheid immediately. It has therefore been gratifying to note the ever increasing support by Member States for resolutions on this issue. The present text is sponsored by a wide group of African and Western countries, reflecting, as previously, the broad support enjoyed by this initiative. The draft resolution is sponsored by the following States: Angola, Australia, Austria, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Madagascar, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Sweden, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe. In addition, the following States have joined us as sponsors: Antigua and Barbuda, Congo, Democratic Yemen, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Malaysia, Pakistan, Senegal and Trinidad and Tobago. It is my hope that this year there may be a potential for even more positive votes, taking into

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

account the comprehensive measures adopted by several Governments since the adoption of last year's resolution, as outlined in the report of the Secretary-General.

This year's draft resolution is to a large extent an updated version of resolution 41/35 H. Thus, the main thrust is still on the need for effective action against the South African Government and what kind of action to take. The role of the Security Council in this context is emphasized, and the Council is urged:

"to consider without delay the adoption of effective mandatory sanctions against South Africa".

Pending mandatory sanctions by the Security Council, all States are exhorted:

"to consider ... measures to increase the pressure on the apartheid régime of South Africa ..."

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

Sanctions are intended to tell South Africa where the world stands on a question of good and evil. Without sanctions, or with only a limited degree of pressure, the signals will remain mixed, which is precisely why sanctions must be kept and further strengthened.

Sanctions have already proved to be of significance in hastening the end of racism. Therefore, let me take this opportunity to urge all States to support the legitimate aspirations of the South African people by casting a positive vote on the draft resolutions now before the Assembly.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote on any or all of the eight draft resolutions.

I should like to remind the Assembly that, under rule 88 of the rules of procedure, the President shall not permit the proposer of a proposal or of an amendment to explain his vote on his own proposal or amendment.

May I recall that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by representatives from their seats. Representatives will also have an opportunity to explain their vote after all the votes have been taken.

(spoke in English)

I call first on the representative of Denmark, who will speak on behalf of the States Members of the European Community.

Mr. BIERRING (Denmark): The Twelve Member States of the European Community have made clear during this debate their utter revulsion at apartheid. We have repeatedly and unequivocally condemned it many times, both here at the United Nations and in many other forums. There should be no doubt about our objective, which is, quite simply, the eradication of this pernicious system, and

(Mr. Bierring, Denmark)

our determination to contribute to the abolition of apartheid. The United Nations has a primary role to play in this endeavour.

An effort has clearly been made this year to streamline the draft resolutions and to remove contentious language. We welcome this. However, some of the draft resolutions continue to contain elements which cause us problems of principle.

The Twelve believe that the division of competence between the General Assembly and the Security Council laid down in the Charter must be respected. Only the Security Council is empowered to adopt decisions binding on Member States.

We reaffirm once again our commitment to the principle of universality of membership of the United Nations. We cannot support calls for the total isolation of South Africa, since this would not in our view further the goal we all share - the abolition of apartheid. Channels of communication with South Africa must remain open in order to enable the outside world to maintain and increase its pressure on the South African Government for the establishment of a free and democratic society without racial oppression.

As we said in our statement in the debate, the Twelve are gravely concerned about the continuation of violence and repression in South Africa. We remain convinced, however, that a process of peaceful change is still possible and that the United Nations has the obligation to promote change by peaceful means in accordance with the Charter. Although we share the frustration felt by the majority of the people of South Africa at their predicament, we cannot agree that resolutions adopted by the General Assembly should endorse the use of force.

The Twelve reject all forms of apartheid in sports and continue firmly to discourage all sporting contacts that have any implication of racial discrimination. Sports activities are, however, organized in our respective

(Mr. Bierring, Denmark)

countries on private initiative. Sports organizations within our countries are aware of the opposition of their Governments to sports competitions that violate the Olympic ideal of non-discrimination.

The Twelve once again reject all arbitrary, selective and unjustified singling-out, whether by name or implicitly, of Member States or groups of countries.

We regret, that for the reasons I have just stated, we shall not be able to vote in favour of all the draft resolutions before us today.

I should like, however, to repeat our commitment to act both collectively and individually to impress on the South African Government the inescapable need for fundamental reform. The South African Government must be brought to see that the only way forward lies in the abolition of apartheid and the introduction of the basic changes demanded by the international community.

Sir Crispin TICKELL (United Kingdom): First, I must stress that my delegation agrees with every word said by the Permanent Representative of Denmark, speaking for the European Community. But I want to add a brief national explanation of vote.

I emphasize that my delegation shares the abhorrence of apartheid expressed by all who have spoken in the debate. There should be no doubt of the strength of our opposition to apartheid or of the efforts successive British Governments have made to persuade the South African Government to abandon that cruel, morally unacceptable and degrading system. As the British Prime Minister said at her press conference after the Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting in Vancouver on 17 October, "Apartheid is totally repugnant and must go."

(Sir Crispin Tickell, United Kingdom)

Once again, we urge the South African Government to look to the future and accept that fundamental change is inevitable. As the Permanent Representative of Denmark has just said, our aim is to secure a South African society with freedom and justice for all.

We nevertheless differ with the sponsors of the draft resolutions before us over how that aim can best be achieved. In our view, peace and security in South Africa can be achieved only through genuine dialogue and fundamental change. We do not believe that the most effective way in which the international community can help the people of South Africa to dismantle apartheid is to impose punitive economic and other measures in an attempt to isolate the country. Nor can we agree that resolutions adopted by the General Assembly should endorse the use of force or contain arbitrary and unjustified attacks on other Member States of the United Nations. For these and other reasons we shall vote against several of the draft resolutions.

We shall, however, abstain on the draft resolution dealing with the programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid, even though we do not agree with many of the elements in the Committee's report. We shall do so because the draft resolution is couched in moderate terms and out of a recognition of the goal, which we all share, of securing the elimination of apartheid.

Mr. SKINNER KLEE (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation joins in the universal condemnation of the political system of apartheid. My country is aware of the need to respect and ensure respect for basic, inalienable human rights. It is in this context that we vigorously condemn the apartheid régime and demand its immediate abolition.

Consistent with that position, Guatemala identifies itself fully with the statement that that political system and, even more, the systematic, institutionalized application of it constitute a true crime against humanity.

Guatemala also argues that development is impossible for a people subjected to a constant state of oppression. My country urges the Government of South Africa to follow the example of Central Americans and put an end to the state of emergency, declare a broad amnesty and free all political prisoners. We also believe that there should be a genuine dialogue that can produce results and positive, far-reaching changes, on the understanding that the only logical conclusion of frank and sincere dialogue will be the abolition of that system.

Similarly, we propose that the principle of free, democratic elections be respected, on the basis of one man, one vote, without distinction as to race, colour, sex, language, religion or creed.

My delegation supports internationally agreed measures for the elimination of apartheid in the full knowledge that all the arguments advanced by certain countries, to the effect that the imposition of sanctions would affect the black majority population are totally lacking in validity. We support these draft resolutions in the light of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in Article 1 of which it is stated that all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. In the case before us that principle is being systematically violated by South Africa.

(Mr. Skinner Klee, Guatemala)

In urging all States to consider appropriate measures to exert pressure upon the apartheid of South Africa and in calling for the imposition of sanctions against that racist régime, my country is doing no more than fulfil its minimal obligations to the international community and, especially, the majority population of South Africa. We are convinced that the best way to bring about the eradication of apartheid is to achieve the isolation of the régime that upholds it and the imposition of effective sanctions that will lead to the abolition of a policy that is undermining peace and denying all the rights of the people of South Africa.

We affirm our solidarity with the people of South Africa in their just struggle for liberation and our support for the efforts to establish a democratic society, free of all coercion, in which the fundamental rights of all people will be respected. For that reason Guatemala will vote in favour of the draft resolutions.

Mr. DELFOSSE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The Permanent Representative of Denmark, speaking on behalf of the 12 member States of the European Community, has just made a statement on the draft resolutions relating to the policy of apartheid of the South African Government. I need hardly say that his comments correspond entirely with the views of the Belgian delegation.

The draft resolutions before us have been altered in a positive fashion compared with those of previous years. We approve fully of the adoption of more precise and factual language and the elimination of certain individual criticisms. We hope that this process will be taken to its logical conclusion next year and that all references of that kind will be removed. In particular we call for the suppression of the draft resolution on relations between Israel and South Africa, is discriminatory and unacceptable to the Belgian delegation.

My delegation would have liked to be able to reflect by its votes the assessment of the draft resolutions that we have just expressed. However, since

(Mr. Delfosse, Belgium)

several of them recall and confirm previous resolutions, we are compelled to take into account the positions that we adopted on those.

We should like to add three specific comments to the statement just made on behalf of the European Community.

Contrary to what seems to be suggested in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/42/L.26 and Corr.1, Belgium does not believe that the situation provoked by the apartheid policy of the South African Government is a situation of decolonization.

The Belgian Government cannot join in direct or indirect appeals for the implementation of comprehensive mandatory sanctions. Such measures are exclusively within the competence of the Security Council. This means that we shall abstain in the voting on the draft resolutions A/42/L.27 and Corr.1 and L.30 and Corr.1 and vote against draft resolution A/42/L.28 and Corr.1.

The Belgian delegation, for reasons given last year in connection with a similar draft resolution, will be unable to support draft resolution A/42/L.31, relating to the oil embargo, despite the embargo on the supply of crude oil to South Africa that we are applying together with our European partners.

Finally, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/42/L.32 and L.36, dealing respectively with concerted international action and the special Trust Fund.

In participating in the voting in the Assembly my delegation has uppermost in mind the grave situation in South Africa and we wish to foster solutions that are consistent with our fundamental political principles. That is why we have called tirelessly for peaceful movement towards the elimination of the universally condemned system of apartheid. It has always been clear to my country that that transition should be rapid and should lead to the total elimination of apartheid. We do not believe it is too late to achieve that objective. However, we note with

(Mr. Delfosse, Belgium)

regret and concern that during the past 12 months the South African Government, apart from certain gestures, which we appreciate, has in no way adopted that course.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): I should like to begin by reiterating two essential truths that sometimes get lost or ignored in the heat of discussions about South Africa.

First, the United State absolutely rejects apartheid and is fully committed to promoting a peaceful transition to non-racial democracy and justice for all in South Africa. It is United States policy to continue using carefully targeted political, diplomatic and economic pressures to achieve those objectives. Our stance was well defined in the speech that Secretary State Shultz made here in New York at the end of September. That speech was circulated as a United Nations document and I commend it to the attention of all here.

Secondly, we all must face the fact that it is not realistically in the power of the United Nations, or the United States of America, or any other country or even combination of countries, to impose a solution to South Africa's problems. A solution can come only from the South Africans themselves.

International efforts to ravage the South African economy are not a solution to apartheid. In the short run such efforts only harden official resistance to change. In the longer run they deprive all South Africans of the necessary means to increase wealth and build democratic institutions. Unfortunately, the draft resolutions now before the Assembly appear to point us in that direction. At the same time, my Government is pleased to note that, with the qualified exception of operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/42/L.28 and Corr.1, explicit critical references to the United States have finally disappeared from these draft resolutions. We noted that same absence of name-calling in the Namibia resolutions of two weeks ago. We recognized and appreciate this constructive change.

(Miss Byrne, United States)

Nevertheless, the United States must still disagree with some of the language and exhortations contained in these latest draft resolutions on South Africa and apartheid.

One of our most serious objections concerns the language in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/42/L.26 and Corr.1. As we have said repeatedly here and elsewhere, we object to the use of United Nations resolutions as a means to legitimize armed conflict. All sides must understand that violence only increases the likelihood of a catastrophic outcome in the region, and in South Africa in particular.

Equally misguided, in our view, is the call in several draft resolutions for a "total isolation" of South Africa, with corollaries of comprehensive mandatory sanctions and a complete withdrawal of multinational corporations. As in the past year, there is also a draft resolution urging a mandatory oil embargo against South Africa.

The United States must oppose all draft resolutions containing such prescripts. We do so because we firmly believe that sweeping, world-wide sanctions simply will not work. The United States position is consistent and principled. The corollary is that we are rigorously enforcing our own bilateral sanctions against South Africa, including those mandated by the United States Congress in the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986.

Simply put, we believe that the most effective application of pressure is for every United Nations Member to pursue the policies that it believes are the most appropriate in opposing apartheid. The Organization should not attempt to force all Members to toe a single line based on an unworkable formula of comprehensive mandatory sanctions.

A larger question is involved here. Those who call for the "total isolation" of South Africa make the mistake of lumping the people and the economy of that

(Miss Byrne, United States)

country together with its Government and the hated system of apartheid. Apartheid is not the sum total of South Africa. South Africa is also millions and millions of people struggling to support their families and to nurture fragile elements of democratic development in a hostile environment. Reckless, sledgehammer tactics on the part of the international community would harm this struggling and disadvantaged majority.

That is why it is so frustrating to hear so many speakers in this forum argue, against the evidence, that the United States and other Western countries support apartheid and that only massive external pressure and isolation of South Africa will bring the ramparts of apartheid crashing down. The truth is that this line of reasoning debases the struggles currently being waged by the oppressed majority inside South Africa. In South Africa right now, black people are building strategies and institutions that have already led to significant change and will lead to truly fundamental changes in the years ahead.

Black leadership, black economic strength, and black organizational skill, aided by powerful economic forces, are growing daily. Despite the repression of the state of emergency, blacks continue to express their grievances and flex their political and economic muscle.

A strong and growing South African economy is a powerful force for change, and it is no coincidence that the business community has played a positive role in eroding apartheid in South Africa. I am proud to say that the American business presence, though small, has played an important part in the process.

One of the current draft resolutions, A/42/L.29 and Corr.1, points a finger at single country for actions committed by many, including some who sit on the special Committee against Apartheid. We cannot support it. Another draft resolution, A/42/L.30 and Corr.1, on the "Programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid", allocates a large sum of money - in a time of fiscal

(Miss Byrne, United States)

austerity for the United Nations - for projects that in some cases interfere in the internal affairs of the United States. We cannot support it either, despite its reference to the need to combat South African censorship.

Finally, the United States will support - and join in the consensus - on the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa. We contribute to this Fund because its goals are worthy and commendable. We regret that the underlying philosophy of this draft resolution - which goes beyond rhetoric and seeks to provide direct, practical assistance to the victims of apartheid - is not adequately reflected in the other draft resolutions.

Mr. DLAMINI (Swaziland): By reason of its delicate geographical position in southern Africa, Swaziland, while rejecting the apartheid system, reserves its position in regard to comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. In light of this, Swaziland will abstain in the voting on draft resolutions A/42/L.27 and Corr.1, A/42/L.28 and Corr.1 and A/42/L.31.

Mr. ANDERSEN (Iceland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Nordic countries - Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden and Iceland. The Nordic countries have consistently condemned the apartheid policy of the South African Government as a violation of fundamental human rights and fundamental freedoms as laid down in the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In the view of the Nordic countries, apartheid also constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security. Consequently, the Security Council should as soon as possible adopt effective sanctions against South Africa as a means to achieve a peaceful abolition of apartheid. Comprehensive mandatory sanctions are the most effective instrument to this end.

In accordance with the existing joint Nordic programme of action against South Africa, the Nordic countries will further strengthen their efforts to contribute towards the abolition of the apartheid system by peaceful means. They will

(Mr. Andersen, Iceland)

intensify their work to achieve decisions as soon as possible on effective sanctions by the United Nations Security Council. Pending such sanctions the Nordic countries have adopted a wide range of unilateral measures against apartheid, including a trade embargo.

The Nordic countries consequently strongly agree with the main thrust of the draft resolutions before us. We appreciate the improvements in these draft resolutions, but regret that further changes have not been made so as to make it possible for the Nordic countries to give their full support. As they now stand, some of them continue to raise difficulties with regard to important questions of principle to the Nordic countries. I shall describe them briefly:

First, the Nordic countries consider universality as a basic principle with respect to the United Nations and we cannot, therefore, accept formulations that might put this principle in doubt.

Secondly, peaceful solutions to conflicts is a fundamental principle enshrined in the very Charter of the United Nations. Therefore, we cannot accept that the United Nations endorse the use of armed struggle, as indicated inter alia in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/49/L.30 and Corr.1.

Thirdly, the Nordic countries deplore the continued practice of selectively singling out individual countries. This practice - most evident in the draft resolution on relations between Israel and South Africa - makes it all the more difficult to achieve international concerted action in the struggle against apartheid.*

*Mr. Moumin, Vice-President (Comoros), took the Chair.

(Mr. Andersen, Iceland)

Fourthly, certain formulations would encroach upon constitutional freedoms and rights of Nordic citizens and private organizations. This applies in particular to certain parts of the International Convention against Apartheid in Sports. In view of the strict and active policy of the Nordic countries against sport contacts with South Africa, the Nordic countries regret that they cannot fully endorse the draft Convention.

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

The situation in South Africa has drastically deteriorated during the past year. The responsibility for this situation rests with the South African Government and its policy of apartheid. But the world community has moral as well as legal obligations according to the Charter of the United Nations and should therefore put further pressure on South Africa. The international community should urgently increase its economic and humanitarian assistance to the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC) and to individual countries and persons which are victims of South Africa's aggressive policy. We must all voice our strongest condemnation of apartheid and also strive to agree on concerted international action, on effective concrete steps to rapidly achieve the abolition of apartheid.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation would first like to recall its unreserved condemnation and outright repudiation of the policy of apartheid. That entirely unacceptable system can be maintained only by force and must be abolished as soon as possible.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

In order to succeed in dismantling apartheid, the French Government has been pursuing a policy of pressure on the South African Government. With this in mind, France has taken several initiatives on the national level and multilaterally. In particular I would remind the General Assembly that it was on the basis of a French proposal that, in July 1985, Security Council resolution 569 (1985) was adopted.

The objective of such a policy of pressure is to prevail upon the South African Government to break the deadlock and embark on authentic dialogue with all the political forces in the country. My delegation has had all these points in mind in considering the draft resolutions before the General Assembly.

The French delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/42/L.32, on concerted international action for the elimination of apartheid. While supporting this draft resolution, the aim of which is to promote international consensus on exerting pressure on South Africa, my delegation wishes to express reservations particularly with regard to operative paragraph 5 and in this respect to recall that the Charter confers on the Security Council alone powers in the matter of binding measures. Furthermore, the voluntary measures recommended in operative paragraph 7 do not necessarily overlap national action France may choose to take in order to step up its pressure on South Africa.

My delegation would have liked to be able to vote in favour of draft resolution A/42/L.27, on the application of co-ordinated and strictly monitored measures against South Africa. It is similar in spirit to draft resolution A/42/L.32, but it operates from a different standpoint. My delegation has a very firm position on the question of binding sanctions against South Africa.

Furthermore, my delegation will abstain on draft resolution A/42/L.26 entitled "International solidarity with the liberation struggle in South Africa". Although

(Mr. Blanc, France)

it is a considerable improvement on texts presented in previous years, this draft resolution recognizes the legitimacy of "armed resistance" and uses expressions which suggest that the situation in South Africa is purely and simply colonial in nature. The French delegation cannot subscribe to such elements. We could have voted in favour of the text had they not been included.

France supports the public education and information mission of the Special Committee against Apartheid. My delegation will, however, abstain on draft resolution A/42/L.30, on the programme of work of the Special Committee, because certain countries have been criticized by name in the Committee's report to the General Assembly.

The French Government favours oil measures, as is demonstrated by the measures it itself has applied, which have been adopted by the 12 countries of the European Community. However, we have reservations of an institutional nature with regard to operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/42/L.31, on an oil embargo against South Africa, and we cannot but recall our refusal to accept the creation of monitoring machinery exceeding the powers conferred by the Charter on the General Assembly. For the same reasons as those given last year with regard to resolution 41/35 F, my delegation will vote against draft resolution A/42/L.31.

Generally speaking, France would have liked to have been able unreservedly to support all of the draft resolutions submitted to the General Assembly on the question of apartheid. However, despite the efforts that have been made at this session to be more realistic, the excessive language that has been maintained means that it will not be possible for all the draft resolutions to be adopted by all the members of the Assembly.

Nevertheless, it would appear that such unanimity is more than ever desirable. The abolition of apartheid as soon as possible is indeed the goal we

(Mr. Blanc, France)

all pursue. The more united the international community shows itself to be, the sooner this goal will be achieved. A unanimous stand by the General Assembly in this regard would have symbolic value.

Over and above universal condemnation of its policy of apartheid, the South African Government could not help receiving a clear signal that it is now time to take the crucial step and finally embark on true dialogue that will lead to a non-racial, democratic South Africa.

Mr. JOFFE (Israel): In resolution 40/64 A, related to comprehensive sanctions against South Africa, a new operative paragraph was added. Paragraph 20 reads:

"Further requests the Special Committee to keep the matter of collaboration between South Africa and Israel and between South Africa and any other State under constant review ...".

In his opening statement on Monday, 16 November, the Chairman of the Special Committee said that the Special Committee this year had:

"refrained from ... mentioning the names of some Member States which are ...

supporters of and collaborators with the apartheid régime." (A/42/PV.69, p. 3)
Nevertheless, my country, Israel, is continuously being singled out, so again this year, as in previous ones, Israel will oppose draft resolution A/42/L.29, related to alleged unfounded relations between my country and South Africa. As we have said, it is biased, unjustified and totally unwarranted. We call on objective Member States not to lend their support to draft resolution A/42/L.29.

As for draft resolution A/42/L.28, the view of my Government is that the isolation of South Africa and the imposition of comprehensive sanctions against that country could increase existing tensions there and hurt its economy in a way which could inflict suffering and hardships on the people of South Africa,

(Mr. Joffe, Israel)

particularly its black population, and that of neighbouring States. We believe that it is important that communication with South Africa remain open in order to increase pressure on the South African Government and chances for peaceful change through genuine dialogue for the ultimate establishment of a free and democratic society without any racial oppression or discrimination.

Therefore my country will not be able to support draft resolution A/42/L.28.

(Mr. Joffe, Israel)

As to draft resolution A/42/L.32 on "Concerted international action for the elimination of apartheid", my country considers it very important. But, as we have just explained our position regarding sanctions, we have some difficulty concerning operative paragraph 5. Nevertheless, my country will support that draft resolution.

Count YORK von WARTENBURG (Federal Republic of Germany): The representative of Denmark, speaking on behalf of the 12 member States of the European Community, has already commented on the draft resolutions to be put to the vote by recalling essential political principles shared by those countries, including my own. The Twelve have made clear their utter revulsion at apartheid and their determination to contribute to its abolition.

My delegation would like to add the following. My Government shares the opinion and conviction of this Assembly that racism violates the dignity of man and is a flagrant offence of human rights, the promotion and respect of which is one of the main purposes and principles of the United Nations. There should be no doubt left that with regard to respect for human rights no deals or compromises are possible. Racism cannot be tolerated and apartheid cannot be reformed. It must be terminated. Apartheid must be eradicated from the mind of the white minority and from all the statute books in South Africa.

The Federal Government is convinced that a process of peaceful change should lead to a social and political order in South Africa in which all South Africans enjoy equal human, political and civic rights.

The dialogue between the black majority and the white minority has to be established immediately. For this dialogue to begin, it is essential that Nelson Mandela and the other political prisoners be released and that the ban on the African National Congress of South Africa and other organizations of the black majority be lifted. My Government has welcomed in this context the recent release

(Count York von Wartenburg, Federal
Republic of Germany)

of Govan Mbeki, reiterating at the same time the demand for the release of all other political prisoners.

My Government uses political and diplomatic pressure against the Government of South Africa and will continue to do so. It is the goal of this policy to convince the leaders of white South Africa of the necessity of fundamental change. Furthermore, together with our European partners, we have decided on certain restrictive economic measures against South Africa to set an unambiguous political signal. With its programme of positive measures my Government expresses solidarity with and support for the victims of apartheid.

The evil effects of apartheid are not limited to South Africa and South Africans. The apartheid policy destabilizes the region as a whole. My Government condemns South Africa's policy of destabilization and supports the countries which suffer from this policy. The recent visit of Foreign Minister Genscher to Angola and of Chancellor Kohl to Mozambique are clear signals in this connection.

The Federal Republic of Germany is in favour of the essence of most of the eight draft resolutions submitted to the Assembly. It is clear that in substance we would prefer to vote with the majority. Most unfortunately, the wording of the draft resolutions submitted is not in agreement with my Government's well-known position regarding economic sanctions, the use of force in political disputes, "name-calling" and the use of the term "State terror".

There may be differences regarding methods and formulations, yet in essence we all share the same goal and the same conviction that apartheid must end as soon as possible and be replaced by a just and democratic system acceptable to all South Africans. My Government will continue to work for this goal to the best of its ability. We are prepared to join forces with all those who work in the same direction.

Mr. TAGA (Japan): Japan firmly and steadfastly opposes racial

discrimination in all its guises and, in particular, extends maximum co-operation to United Nations efforts for the elimination of apartheid. It is in this spirit that we will support three draft resolutions, namely, A/42/L.30 and Corr.1, L.32 and L.36. Indeed, we joined in sponsoring draft resolution L.36 on the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, whose efforts we value highly. As for draft resolution L.32 on "Concerted international action for the elimination of apartheid", my delegation will support it as a positive effort to achieve unity in the international community, although we have some difficulty with some of the wording.

At the same time, my delegation believes that comprehensive mandatory sanctions must be considered with the utmost care, and despite the difficulties we have with the wording of certain paragraphs in A/42/L.28 and Corr.1, my delegation will not oppose this draft resolution. We take this position as an expression of my country's indignation at the Government of South Africa for refusing to heed the voice of the international community and to show our concern over the deteriorating situation in and around South Africa.

As for the remaining draft resolutions, although my delegation fully supports those elements contained in them that are common to those in draft resolution A/42/L.32, they also contain certain formulations to which we cannot subscribe, such as those commending armed struggle and those singling out for accusation a country or a group of countries. Hence my delegation's vote on them will be cast accordingly.

Mr. NTAKHWANA (Botswana): Botswana will cast an affirmative vote on draft resolutions A/42/L.27 and Corr.1 and L.32. But we wish to state our incapacity to implement those paragraphs which call for the imposition of economic sanctions against South Africa.

Mr. TILLETT (Belize): The Belize delegation will support all eight draft resolutions on apartheid in documents A/42/L.26 to L.32, and A/42/L.36.

Apartheid is such a primary issue and needs such immediate action and consensus by the international community that other issues which are raised in these draft resolutions fade in their urgency to eradicate apartheid. The Belize delegation would like, however, to make a few points on draft resolution A/42/L.29 and Corr.1, "Relations between Israel and South Africa."*

*The President returned to the Chair.

(Mr. Tillet, Belize)

We should like to point out that Israel is not the only nation that has relations with South Africa. We believe that it is an unfair practice to single out Israel in this case. In operative paragraph 1, the Assembly calls upon Israel to desist from and terminate forthwith all forms of military, nuclear, intelligence, economic and other collaboration, particularly its long-term contracts for military supplies to South Africa. We support that call, but the Belize delegation believes that all nations that have relations with South Africa should be included in this paragraph. To single out Israel in this way is an unfair practice. While it is unfair to Israel, the injustice being done to the blacks in South Africa is a greater injustice or unfairness, and so we support this draft resolution.

The Belize delegation notes that, in operative paragraph 4, the Special Committee is further requested to keep the matter under constant review and to report to the General Assembly and the Security Council, as appropriate. That being the situation, the Belize delegation appeals to the sponsors of this draft resolution to include the names of all States with relations with South Africa. That would put an end to the unfair practice of singling out a nation in this context. If, in the future, the sponsors are not prepared to list all States having relations with South Africa, the draft resolution should not be submitted to the General Assembly at its forty-third session. Either solution offers an alternative to this unfair practice of singling out a nation and would make it more acceptable to those of us who, on principle, oppose this unfair practice.

In the light of the foregoing, the Government of Belize continues to keep this matter under consideration. Our support for this draft resolution should be interpreted not as a vote against Israel, but as a vote against the support for apartheid.

Mr. MIJOSO (Malawi): Malawi reserves its position with regard to all paragraphs in sections which call for sanctions against South Africa. Furthermore, Malawi, as before, is against name-calling, because it alienates those who otherwise would have supported the draft resolutions concerned.

Mr. MOEKETSI (Lesotho): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/42/L.26 and Corr.1, L.30 and Corr.1 and L.36, because of Lesotho's strong support for and solidarity with the total eradication of apartheid. Lesotho's abhorrence of apartheid is well known by the international community, and it has made a consistent appeal that peaceful efforts should be sought quickly to eliminate it before it is too late.

My delegation will abstain on draft resolutions A/42/L.28 and Corr.1, L.31 and L.32, because of Lesotho's unique geographic position in southern Africa.

We shall also abstain on draft resolution A/42/L.29 and Corr.1 and Add.1, because we do not support the singling out of any country, when we believe other in this Assembly still maintain similar relations with South Africa.

Mr. ENGO (Cameroon): The attitudes and the emotions of the Cameroonian nation with regard to the problems in southern Africa are well known. We continue to ask the international community to seek new venues to bring home to Pretoria the seriousness of the situation. This process involves the encouragement of those who seek to demonstrate their indignation by withdrawal or dissociation from the clique in Pretoria - not their rebuke - especially when we understand, as many delegations have pointed out, that some parties, some Governments represented here, have been selectively chosen, while no special draft resolution addresses the follies of many other countries that continue to make it a matter of their national policies to support the régime in Pretoria directly or indirectly.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

We all know of the long list of countries that openly or secretly encourage Pretoria through trade and exchanges which induce an illusion of continuing support. Here we would exclude those nations that are bullied by the facts of history and proximity into trading with South Africa, because it is the design of the colonial system that brought that predicament on them. But we consider that it borders on immorality to be silent about the countries that have contacts with Pretoria, some of which make brilliant statements against apartheid, but directly or indirectly sustain the system each day. We should have preferred to find in draft resolution A/42/L.29 and Corr.1 and Add.1 a document constituting a clear appeal not only to Israel, but to all other countries to hasten the execution of the new policies they have declared with regard to South Africa. Israel, as is shown in the report, made a commitment during a visit to my nation's capital. We look forward to witnessing the results of the efforts made pursuant to that commitment.

Let us address the devil. That devil is the Pretoria régime. We cannot encourage by direct or indirect condemnation those whose declared policies coincide with our aspirations. Let us not debauch our struggle by concentrating on so-called friends of South Africa, who have little or nothing to do with the changing of the minds of the desperate bigots in Pretoria and who are blinded and consumed by racism or fear or both.

In the circumstances, it is our intention to support all the other draft resolutions that have been submitted with regard to South Africa, but we shall not be in a position to support draft resolution A/42/L.29 and Corr.1 and Add.1.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): There are no other representatives wishing to speak in explanation of vote before the vote.

(The President)

I have been asked to announce that Viet Nam has become a sponsor of draft resolutions A/42/L.31 and L.32, and that Mozambique has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/42/L.36.

The Assembly will now proceed to take decisions on the various draft resolutions before it. The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of these draft resolutions has been issued as document A/42/785.

The General Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/42/L.26 and Corr.1, entitled "International solidarity with the liberation struggle in South Africa".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, 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, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, 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 Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden

Draft resolution A/42/L.26 and Corr.1 was adopted by 129 votes to 3, with 22 abstentions (resolution 42/23 A).*

*Subsequently the delegation of Vanuatu advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): The Assembly will next take a decision on draft resolution A/42/L.27 and Corr.1, entitled "Application of co-ordinated and strictly monitored measures against South Africa".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, 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, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, 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 Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden

Draft resolution A/42/L.27 and Corr.1 was adopted by 128 votes to 3, with 24 abstentions (resolution 42/23 B).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): We turn now to draft resolution A/42/L.28 and Corr.1, entitled "Comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa".

(The President)

A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the words "the Governments of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and" in the third, fourth and fifth lines of operative paragraph 3.

If there is no objection, we shall proceed accordingly and the Assembly will vote on the retention of those words.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

Abstaining: Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Gambia, Guatemala, Guinea, Lesotho, Malawi, Maldives, Mauritius, Morocco, Niger, Qatar, Rwanda, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Uruguay

It was decided by 78 votes to 38, with 27 abstentions to retain the words "the Governments of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and".

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I now put to the vote draft resolution A/42/L.28 and Corr.1 as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, 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, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, 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 Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Lesotho, Malawi, Malta, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden

Draft resolution A/42/L.28 and Corr.1, as a whole, was adopted by 126 votes to 11, with 17 abstentions (resolution 42/23 C).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): Next we turn to draft resolution A/42/L.29 and Corr.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, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, 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 Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

Abstaining: Bahamas, Barbados, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Grenada, Jamaica, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Malta, Panama, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Swaziland, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/42/L.29 and Corr.1 was adopted by 103 votes to 29, with 23 abstentions (resolution 42/23 D).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): We come now to draft resolution A/42/L.30 and Corr.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, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, 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 (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, 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 Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/42/L.30 and Corr.1 was adopted by 145 votes to 1, with 1 abstention (resolution 42/23 E).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): The Assembly will next take a decision on draft resolution A/42/L.31, entitled "Oil embargo against South Africa".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, 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, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, 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 Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, 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, Côte d'Ivoire, Greece, Israel, Japan, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, Portugal, Swaziland

Draft resolution A/42/L.31 was adopted by 138 votes to 4, with 12 abstentions (resolution 42/23 F).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): We now turn to draft resolution A/42/L.32, entitled "Concerted international action for the elimination of apartheid".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, 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, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, 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, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, 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 Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Côte d'Ivoire, Germany, Federal Republic of, Lesotho, Malawi

Draft resolution A/42/L.32 was adopted by 149 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions (resolution 42/23 G).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): Lastly, we turn to draft resolution A/42/L.36, entitled "United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa".

Since there is no request for a vote, may I take it that the Assembly decides to adopt draft resolution A/42/L.36?

Draft resolution A/42/L.36 was adopted (resolution 42/23 H).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes on positions.

Mr. McDONAGH (Ireland): Ireland shares the views expressed by the representative of Denmark in his statement earlier today on behalf of the 12 member States of the European Community.

The Irish Government's condemnation of the policy of apartheid was most recently expressed in the statement which we delivered in the debate yesterday. In keeping with the views set out in that statement, Ireland supported four of the draft resolutions before us today, two of which we were pleased to sponsor.

As a general comment, we are happy to see that some of the contentious language which characterized last year's resolutions was deleted from those submitted this year.

However, this year's texts did contain a number of formulations and ideas which are not consistent with my Government's approach to apartheid. Accordingly, we found it necessary to abstain on three of the texts and to vote against a fourth.

I turn first to the draft resolutions which Ireland supported.

Ireland voted in favour of draft resolution A/42/L.30 and Corr.1 on the programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid. We strongly support the work of the Special Committee in drawing attention to the appalling situation which exists in South Africa and in promoting international action against apartheid. Of course, our attitude to the recommendations contained in the report of the Special Committee must be understood in accordance with the general policy of my Government on apartheid, outlined in this and previous statements of our position.*

*Mr. Caffete (Paraguay) Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. McDonagh, Ireland)

Ireland voted in favour of draft resolution A/42/L.31, which deals with an oil embargo against South Africa. My Government has been on record for a number of years now as favouring the imposition by the Security Council of a mandatory oil embargo against South Africa.

Ireland sponsored draft resolution L.32, on concerted international action against apartheid, which, inter alia, urges the Security Council to consider the adoption of effective mandatory sanctions against South Africa. We also sponsored draft resolution L.36 on the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa.

Ireland abstained on draft resolution L.26, which called for international solidarity with the liberation struggle in South Africa. My delegation would have liked to be able to vote in favour of that draft resolution, which contains many provisions that we support. However, we cannot accept the reference to armed resistance in the draft resolution. My delegation has made it clear in the past that we do not wish to see the Assembly endorse violence. Even if we understand the sense of growing hopelessness and bitter frustration from which violence may spring, my Government would not wish to condone it.

Ireland abstained on draft resolution L.27, on the application of co-ordinate and strictly monitored measures against South Africa. While we have no difficulty with the broad thrust of that draft resolution, the encouragement given to States to ratify the International Convention against Apartheid in Sports is problematic for us. The International Convention, unfortunately, contains a number of provisions that are incompatible with Ireland's Constitution.

Ireland decided to abstain in the vote on draft resolution L.28, this year's resolution dealing with comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa. We note with satisfaction that the draft resolution contains fewer objectionable elements than the corresponding text adopted last year.

(Mr. McDonagh, Ireland)

However, the approach it takes in the matter of sanctions is not consistent with the policy of the Irish Government. As we made clear in our statement in the debate yesterday, Ireland supports the application by the Security Council of mandatory sanctions against South Africa. We continue to have doubts, however, about the wisdom of calls for comprehensive sanctions at the present juncture. We believe that the right policy for the international community is one of steady and graduated pressure for change through carefully chosen, selective, graduated sanctions, such sanctions to be mandatory - that is, properly imposed by the Security Council and fully implemented by all.

As in the case of similar resolutions in previous years, Ireland voted against draft resolution L.29, on relations between Israel and South Africa, in view of its selective singling-out of one Member State for condemnation.

Mr. RAMALHO ORTIGAO (Portugal): The Permanent Representative of Denmark has already expressed the common views of the 12 Member States of the European Community on the draft resolutions regarding the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa. However, my delegation would like to make some further brief remarks on the matter.

The Portuguese delegation has repeatedly emphasized here, as in other forums, that it firmly condemns the system of apartheid. Once again it reaffirms its strong objection and opposition to this aberrant society based upon institutionalized racism and racial inequality, which is designed to maintain the privileges of a minority.

Only the elimination of the repressive system of apartheid will make possible the climate of confidence which southern Africa needs to establish the genuine political stability so essential to the normal development of all the countries of the region.

(Mr. Ramalho Ortigao, Portugal)

The South African authorities must undertake once and for all a sincere effort to establish a dialogue with all the different communities in their country, thus creating the necessary conditions for all its inhabitants to have equal access to political rights, freedom, work and social justice.

My delegation regrets not having been able to support all the draft resolutions on this item, even if we recognize that this year they have been more carefully drafted. Although we concur with the thrust of many of their essential proposals, we still have reservations of principle on certain aspects.

For example, we do not agree that General Assembly resolutions should endorse violence, whatever its form, as the only choice in redressing situations of injustice. On the contrary, they should, rather, encourage dialogue and the preservation of the principle of peaceful settlement of conflicts. Furthermore, we believe that the total isolation of South Africa will only hamper the initiatives of all those who are fighting inside the country for fundamental reforms to the present system. Similarly, the delegation of Portugal cannot support verbal violence and certain discriminatory references in the resolutions we have just adopted, since they do not contribute to the formation of a consensus, which could be the basis for effective international pressure to restore to the majority of the South African population their legitimate rights.

As we did in the case of a similar resolution last year, my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution on concerted international action for the elimination of apartheid. However, we stress that we have reservations on certain formulations in the operative part.

Mr. HAJNOCZI (Austria): Austria is on record as having consistently condemned and opposed the policies of apartheid as a particularly serious violation of human rights, depriving the majority of South Africa's population of their civil and political rights. We therefore hold the view that the eradication of this

(Mr. Hajnoczi, Austria)

system of institutionalized racial discrimination remains one of the most important challenges confronting the United Nations.

For these reasons, we find ourselves in agreement with the general thrust of the texts submitted under this item. We appreciate the improvement in the texts just approved, for it is our firm conviction that the international community must stand united in the struggle against the evil of apartheid. We therefore regret that a few provisions which Austria cannot support prevented us from voting in favour of some of the draft resolutions.

In particular, Austria has always held the view that the United Nations should concentrate all its efforts on bringing about political and social change by peaceful means, and therefore cannot support the concept of armed struggle, since we firmly believe in the resolution of conflicts by exclusively peaceful means. Let me also reiterate that Austria, as a matter of principle, is against singling out Member States in General Assembly resolutions, and believes that this practice does not promote the cause of the oppressed people of South Africa. Finally, Austria believes that the General Assembly should respect the prerogatives of the Security Council with regard to comprehensive mandatory sanctions.

In the light of these considerations Austria sponsored draft resolutions A/42/L.32 and L.36. Furthermore, the Austrian delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions L.30 and Corr.1 and L.31. Although my Government welcomes most parts of the new draft resolution L.27 and Corr.1 and has taken many of the measures called for in it, we had to abstain on it owing to our position on certain formulations. We have, inter alia, reservations concerning the encouragement of early ratification of the International Convention against Apartheid in Sports, a Convention that Austria will not accede to for legal reasons. Moreover, Austria abstained on draft resolutions L.26 and Corr.1 and L.28 and Corr.1 and cast a negative vote on L.29 and Corr.1 for the reasons I have stated.

(Mr. Hajnoczi, Austria)

Our positive attitude to the main thrust of the resolutions just adopted reflects our support for a free, democratic and non-racial society in a united South Africa, based on the free exercise of universal suffrage.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (New Zealand): The debate that has taken place over the last week has reaffirmed my delegation's view that firmer action needs to be taken by the international community in order to bring about the eradication of apartheid. The measures that need to be taken should - if, indeed, it is not already too late - be designed to ensure that negotiation between the parties in South Africa is the chosen path.

My delegation agrees with a good deal in the draft resolutions, two of which we were pleased to sponsor. While the changes that have been made to others do not address all our concerns, we are pleased to note that they contain many improvements on those presented to the Assembly in previous years.

(Mr. Armstrong, New Zealand)

While welcoming and recognizing that, I wish to put on record my delegation's continued reservations about some remaining aspects of the texts. As we have noted in previous sessions, we do not go along with the endorsement of the use of force in a manner inconsistent with the United Nations Charter, or the implication that there is no alternative to such a course. We also hold that measures applied by the international community against South Africa must be carefully selected and targeted. The numerous practical measures that New Zealand has already taken reflect that approach, for example the firm steps taken to give effect to measures recommended by the Commonwealth Heads of Government and by the Security Council.

In the interests of maintaining to the degree possible a united international front, we regret the singling out of individual countries in such texts. Although the New Zealand Government has actively taken steps to discourage sporting contacts with South Africa, it continues to have reservations about some aspects of the Convention referred to in paragraph 3 of resolution A/42/L.27, much of the text of which we can otherwise support.

It was because of those factors, and by no means because of any lessening of our commitment to the struggle of the people of South Africa, that we abstained in the voting on the three texts of draft resolutions A/42/L.26, L.27 and L.28 and voted against draft resolution A/42/L.29.

We supported draft resolution A/42/L.30. We did so on the understanding that operative paragraph 2 of the draft endorses only the recommendations of the Special Committee contained in subparagraph (m) of paragraph 150 of the Committee's report.

South Africa must be brought to recognize the error of its ways through the implementation of effective measures by a united international community. New Zealand, for one, is prepared to play its part. That is demonstrated by our sponsorship of the text on concerted international action for the elimination of

(Mr. Armstrong, New Zealand)

apartheid and that on the oil embargo against South Africa, as well as our support for the resolutions on the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and the useful programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid.

Mr. BORG OLIVIER (Malta): At the outset I should like to state that my delegation appreciates very much the efforts that have been made with a view to improving formulations which in the past have caused difficulties for delegations and also to making the draft resolutions under this item more concise. We commend those efforts and encourage that trend. We believe it will increase even more support for the objectives we are all seeking.

Malta voted in favour of draft resolutions A/42/L.27, L.30, L.31 and L.32; and we are also very proud to be listed among the sponsors of draft resolution A/42/L.36, which was adopted without a vote.

I should like now to explain my Government's position on draft resolutions A/42/L.26, L.28 and L.29.

Malta abstained in the vote on the resolution entitled "International solidarity with the liberation struggle in South Africa" (A/42/L.26). In this regard I wish to state that the Government of Malta is unequivocally against the abhorrent policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa and is determined to support effective measures, including moral pressure, to bring about the elimination of those policies, which are universally condemned. We also give our full support to the front-line States. We understand that people may have no choice but to become freedom fighters when they do not have the democratic means to achieve their legitimate aims. In my Government's view, however, this resolution may imply more than that and, in line with the policy indicated by our Prime Minister in his address to the General Assembly last month, when he stated

(Mr. Borg Olivier, Malta)

"Our aim is to contribute to a peaceful solution of international disputes, renouncing violence and war as an instrument of policy", (A/42/PV.32, p. 72) it was with great reluctance that we had to abstain on resolution A/42/L.26, even though we agree with and support most of the provisions contained in it.

My delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution entitled "Comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa" (A/42/L.28). The reason for our abstention is the singling out of individual States by name in the draft resolution. We do not support that practice and had it not been resorted to we would have voted in favour of the resolution.

Finally the delegation of Malta abstained in the vote on the draft resolution entitled "Relations between Israel and South Africa" (A/42/L.29). I wish to stress again Malta's unequivocal opposition to the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa and our determination to support action aimed at the elimination of those policies. In view, however, of the selective singling out of one State in connection with its relations with South Africa, we were left with no option but to abstain in the vote on that draft resolution.

Mr. SVOBODA (Canada): There should be no doubt about our strong opposition to the repugnant apartheid policies of the South African Government. However, I do not wish to repeat the views of my Government, which were set out in this Assembly yesterday. On behalf of the Canadian delegation I shall explain Canada's vote on the various resolutions under this agenda item.

First, by way of a general comment, I commend the drafters of this year's resolutions for the shorter form and more moderate tone of the texts placed before us. This is an improvement over last year and one which I hope marks the beginning of a continuing trend.

(Mr. Svoboda, Canada)

On draft resolution A/42/L.26, dealing with the situation in South Africa and assistance to the liberation movements, Canada can support much that is in the resolution. We have consistently voiced our condemnation of the current state of emergency and have joined with other Member States in taking concrete action to press the South African Government to dismantle apartheid, release political prisoners such as Nelson Mandela and lift the ban on political parties. Canada has been in the forefront of nations calling on the Government of South Africa to enter into a dialogue with the authentic black leaders. In conformity with the United Nations Charter we have consistently called for and encouraged peaceful change and reconciliation in South Africa. To that end we have in particular condemned the circle of violence that has existed in southern Africa in recent years.

However, it is also for those very reasons that we were unable to support a draft resolution which includes language which appears to favour armed resistance.

In the same vein, Canada also abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/42/L.30, concerning the programme of the Special Committee against Apartheid, which we have supported in the past, because of the recommendations contained in paragraph 150 of the Committee's report, referred to in paragraph 2 of the resolution, which includes specific support for armed struggle.

On draft resolution A/42/L.27 Canada abstained. Our position on effective measures is well known. Canada has indeed imposed sanctions against South Africa, but does not agree with all the measures called for in that draft resolution.

With respect to draft resolution A/42/L.28, we have great difficulty with the name-calling in paragraph 3 of that resolution. We have consistently voted against the inclusion of what we see to be gratuitous citations of individual countries in

(Mr. Svoboda, Canada)

the context of resolutions such as these. Our negative vote on this draft resolution stems from our positions of principle on name-calling and on mandatory sanctions.

With respect to draft resolution A/42/L.29, my delegation voted against this text which, while purporting to take note of the measures taken by the Government of Israel concerning South Africa, nevertheless retains its essential bias.

Canada abstained, as it did last year, on the draft resolution on the imposition of an oil embargo against South Africa (A/42/L.31). Canada has already imposed an effective voluntary embargo on the sale of petroleum and petroleum products to South Africa.

Canada voted in favour of draft resolution A/42/L.32, on concerted action for the elimination of apartheid. I have already referred to Canada's strong opposition to apartheid; and it should also be noted for the record that Canada has implemented all the measures in paragraph 7. However, Canada does not consider that the time is right for mandatory sanctions, which would in any case be a question for further and careful review by the Security Council. Our reservations in this respect apply to this resolution as well as to draft resolution A/42/L.30 and, as already noted, A/42/L.28.

We were pleased to sponsor and join in the consensus on draft resolution A/42/L.36.

We must all play our part to encourage and promote peaceful change in South Africa. The statements we have heard in this debate and the resolutions adopted today, taken together, are a clear message to the Government of South Africa that it must take concrete action. Canada, for its part, intends to work, in concert with others, to maintain unrelenting pressure on Pretoria to dismantle apartheid.

Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire) (interpretation from French): Zaire reaffirms the condemnation expressed in the Assembly by the head of its delegation, who called unambiguously on the entire international community to increase its pressure by means of mandatory sanctions against South Africa so that apartheid, that crime against humanity, may be abolished. The draft resolutions which the General Assembly has just adopted are aimed at the achievement of the objective we all seek, the abolition of apartheid.

Nevertheless, Zaire, on the basis of the consistent principle of its foreign policy, refuses to single out the relations between one State, Israel, and South Africa. Many countries which maintain with South Africa diplomatic, economic and trade relations and co-operation of all kinds are mentioned in many reports, but, with the exception of Israel in draft resolution A/42/L.29 and Corr.1, they have not been named. Therefore, Zaire, consistent with its policy, felt compelled to vote against that draft resolution because, as I have said, it deliberately singles out relations between Israel and South Africa and fails to mention all the other countries which maintain the same kind of relations.

With regard to operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/42/L.28 and Corr.1, since it was put to the vote and my delegation considers that the naming of States therein is not complete, it abstained. As regards the substance of draft resolution A/42/L.28 and Corr.1, my delegation, which is in favour of mandatory sanctions against South Africa, voted in favour of the sanctions.

We trust that in the next draft resolutions that are submitted to us the selective naming of certain States will be avoided.

Ms. DASENT (Saint Kitts and Nevis): The Prime Minister of Saint Kitts and Nevis, in his statement to the General Assembly just over a month ago, clearly expressed the unwavering position of the Government of Saint Kitts and Nevis on the system of apartheid. Our position is firm and clearcut. We abhor the racist

(Ms. Dasent, Saint Kitts and Nevis)

system of apartheid and share the view that comprehensive mandatory sanctions will play a vital role in the eventual total eradication of this crime against humanity in South Africa. In keeping with our stance against apartheid, my delegation supported all but one of the draft resolutions voted on today. My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/42/L.29 and Corr.1, since we have our reservations on the usefulness of name-calling in draft resolutions. Besides, we take into consideration the recent efforts made by the Government of Israel to review its relations with South Africa.

Mr. VERGARA (Panama) (interpretation from Spanish): Panama adheres to its policy against the apartheid system of the Government of South Africa. This was clearly indicated in our statement in the plenary Assembly. Nevertheless, we should like to explain our abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/42/L.29 and Corr.1. Basically, we agree with the text, but, since Panama abstained in the voting on 10 November 1986 on draft resolution A/41/L.45 - that is, resolution 41/35 C - on which the present draft resolution is based, we felt compelled to abstain this year too.

Mr. ANGGO (Papua New Guinea): My delegation has voted in favour of all the draft resolutions aimed at eradicating the evils of apartheid. We wish to explain our affirmative vote on draft resolution A/42/L.29 and Corr.1, regarding relations between Israel and South Africa. We would not ordinarily support any draft resolution which singles out any Member State in connection with the problem of apartheid. Our affirmative vote today on that draft resolution demonstrates our frustration at the lack of progress thus far emanating from the Organization and is not a vote against Israel.

My delegation hopes that other States will also be named in future draft resolutions for their continued co-operation with the racist South African régime.

(Mr. Anggo, Papua New Guinea)

All avenues must be explored to bring about the abolition of the evils of apartheid. If the international community feels that there is a need to expose those which collaborate with South Africa, maybe it is now time to do so.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I call now on representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

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

Mr. MUNTASSER (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): As is his wont, the representative of the racist Zionist régime has tried again to distract the attention of the General Assembly and its Committees from items under consideration. Once again, yesterday, he tried to divert attention from the important item being discussed by the General Assembly, namely, the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa. To do this, he resorted to fabrications and lies which have no foundation in fact. The guilty criminal always tries to hide his guilt by accusing others.

The Zionist entity, the natural ally of the racist South African régime and the enemy of peoples, tries to justify its alliance with its twin racist régime. Both régimes have risen on the ruins of other peoples. The racist Zionist régime, with its racist Zionist ideology, knows very well that its illegitimate representative here has been telling us lies. Everyone knows of the suffering endured by the Arabs under occupation. Everyone knows that even the black American Jews were expelled from Palestine simply because they were black.

(Mr. Muntasser, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

The organic alliance between the Arab nation and Africa cannot be affected by anything that the Zionist representative has said. Half the inhabitants of Africa are Arab. They have a common past, they have a common present, and they have a common enemy: the racist entity in South Africa and the racist entity in occupied Palestine.

We in Africa have been able to put paid to another racist régime - that in Rhodesia, which has become Zimbabwe. We look forward to the day when Palestine regains its name and Azania regains its name. The most telling answer to the representative of the Zionist régime is the condemnation he has received from the delegations of 103 countries.

Count YORK von WARTENBURG (Federal Republic of Germany): Yesterday, in his contribution to the debate on this item, the Ambassador of Ghana alluded to my Government with an attack and with reproaches that we can only deeply regret. The impression has been created that the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany violates the mandatory arms embargo measures against South Africa adopted by the Security Council. Those allegations and insinuations are untrue and we categorically refute them.

The subject-matter of this debate is the inhuman system of apartheid in South Africa, which denies the black population of that country their human and civil rights. That situation is no less intolerable to us than to all other members of the international community of States. We support all peaceful efforts contributing to the elimination of apartheid and racism in South Africa. We do not supply weapons or military equipment to South Africa. We strictly adhere to the mandatory embargo adopted by the Security Council. The Luxembourg decisions of 10 September 1985, taken by the Foreign Ministers of the European Community, banning the export of sensitive equipment destined for the police and armed forces

(Count York von Wartenburg, Federal
Republic of Germany)

of the Republic of South Africa, were implemented by the Federal Government a considerable time ago. Unjustified accusations and false representations can only detract from the firmly established solidarity of the United Nations in condemning apartheid and racism in South Africa.

It is not by unjustified accusations and false representations, but by solidarity and actions of solidarity that we will further our goal of putting an end to apartheid in South Africa.

I should like to clarify the following. The supply of blueprints for submarine components by private enterprises to South Africa was undertaken without the knowledge and consent of the Federal Government. Permits for these transactions had neither been applied for nor been issued. After those unauthorized supplies to South Africa came to the knowledge of the competent authorities in the Federal Republic of Germany, these authorities instituted an investigation procedure. Moreover, the Bundestag, our parliament, set up a special committee for a parliamentary inquiry. That committee has been reconstituted following our recent national elections, and it is actively carrying on its investigative work.

Any assertion that current investigations have been delayed with a view to the anti-apartheid debate of the General Assembly in New York are devoid of foundation. We informed the Chairman of the Arms Embargo Committee to the effect that we shall advise that body of the results of the investigation into the blueprint supplies once those investigations have been completed, and we intend to do so.

(Count York von Wartenburg, Federal
Republic of Germany)

The charge that the Federal Government is endeavouring to suppress criticism by threatening to suspend its development aid is not only untrue, but contradicts the close and trustful co-operation with our African partner countries. The Federal Government is sending, especially through the support it lends to the front-line States - that is, through the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC) - clear signals in the region endangered by South African attempts at destabilization.

Helicopters for commercial use fall neither within the arms embargo of the Security Council nor within the Luxembourg decision. The delivery of such helicopters therefore is not subject to control by the Federal Government.

In conclusion, permit me to state once again, as in the past, that the Federal Government will also in the future strictly observe the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa and strictly apply the decisions of the Foreign Ministers of the European Community of September 1985.

Mr. ARNOUSS (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic):

Yesterday, one of the speakers digressed from the item under discussion and rambled on to Chad, and the Libyan-Chadian dispute, which has nothing to do with this discussion. In the same vein, the speaker singled out a number of countries, including my own, in his now familiar ploy of distracting the Assembly by a number of distortions.

The reason for this is that, in his statement on what is taking place in South Africa and the excesses and transgressions we all know of, the speaker found himself at a loss. He could not rebut the contents of the special report on the relationship between his country and South Africa.

He did admit, from the word go, that his country is in league with that régime when he said that his country will now refrain from entering into any new contracts

(Mr. Arnouss, Syrian Arab Republic)

in the military field: that is to say, the existing military contracts between the two States will stand, but there will be no new contracts. However, he did not elaborate on the type and range of those contracts.

He also spoke of the lowering of the ongoing cultural, scientific and sports contacts between the two countries. In addition to all this, the special report, to which he referred in his statement, makes it clear, in paragraph 5, that Israel's decision to reduce its links with South Africa was not a serious political decision, but just a ploy to ward off the pressure of the United States Congress.

The Israeli representative, in his statement, urged opposition to the draft resolution on the relations between his country and South Africa, which was adopted only a while ago by the General Assembly. If we look at the resolution, we will not find in it anything that anyone could object to but a call upon Israel to discontinue its dealings with racist South Africa and implement the United Nations resolutions on apartheid. Still, he voted against the draft resolution. He also voted against the other draft resolutions put forward by the Special Committee, in the case of one draft resolution by voting no, and in the case of the other three by abstaining. This confirms the collaboration of his régime with the offspring of nazism in South Africa, the racist Pretoria régime, which has been condemned by the international community in its entirety.

(Mr. Arnouss, Syrian Arab Republic)

I am not going to speak about racist practices against the Arab people in the occupied Arab territories, because the delegations here keep abreast of the different aspects of this question, and they know the extent and nature of Israel's practices.

Co-operation between Africa and the Arab world is strong and cannot be questioned or distorted. We face one common enemy in the Middle East and in southern Africa. The will of the people will be victorious: the racist régimes will be eradicated in both areas.

Mr. ESSY (Côte d'Ivoire) (interpretation from French): In his statement the representative of Ghana attacked Côte d'Ivoire by name and said that in granting authorization to land at Abidjan to an aircraft of the French airline UTA, which links Paris and Johannesburg, it was participating in the destabilization of the West African subregion. Since at times, with some variations, history constantly repeats itself, Côte d'Ivoire and its President have in the past often been accused of Balkanizing Africa.

But everyone who knows the real history of decolonization and the formation of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), which is today the pride of our continent - for apart from Africa, no continent has succeeded in grouping within itself so large a number of independent States - knows what Côte d'Ivoire has done and the role of its President in the creation of that institution.

Its role in the building of that organization started at the Conference of Brazzaville and continued in those at Monrovia and Lagos, and, finally, at the Addis Ababa Conference, which finally saw the merger of two groups, the Brazzaville Group and the Casablanca Group, to create the OAU.

Côte d'Ivoire, it is alleged, is opening the door to the destabilization of West Africa. But, on the contrary, before and after independence all the actions of President Houphouët-Boigny have been part of an obstinate and tireless quest for

(Mr. Essy, Côte d'Ivoire)

means to stabilize not only Côte d'Ivoire but the entire subregion and all of Africa. As we have said, we do not wish to be an oasis of peace and prosperity in a desert of misery.

This policy is characterized by a stubborn determination to hold the line on the prices of the raw materials on which the economies of all the African States are based and by active participation in the setting up of many organizations for economic co-operation - the Council of Understanding, the Economic Commission for Western Asia, the Economic Community of West African States - intended to strengthen the economic bases of our countries, which are the true factors and which can contribute effectively to the political stability of our respective States. The presence of President Houphouët-Boigny at the economic summit in Lagos was proof of our desire to participate and to contribute to all that can promote the economic development of our continent and thus consolidate our political independence and stability.

Destabilization is a concept which does not exist in our political or economic vocabularies. Everywhere we seek political stability. We have had but one leader in office since 1944; and we also have stability as regards raw materials.

Concerning more specifically our policy towards South Africa, the bastion of apartheid, it is neither new nor ambiguous. It was in 1971, during a famous press conference, that President Houphouët-Boigny proposed a dialogue between all African States, including South Africa, saying that dialogue "is not the weapon of the weak but, on the contrary, of the strong".

This policy of dialogue is the result not of improvisation but of a great deal of thought based on intensive observation of certain historical and sociological phenomena. Since 1971 this policy of dialogue has not changed, and it will not change because Côte d'Ivoire is known for its constancy and its unshakable faith in its choice.

(Mr. Essy, Côte d'Ivoire)

Côte d'Ivoire's policy is not blemished by any hypocrisy because it proceeds from noble and sincere feelings in the struggle against apartheid, which Côte d'Ivoire forcefully condemns. How can we, black as we are, not revolt against and be outraged by the inhuman behaviour of the whites towards the blacks?

Côte d'Ivoire believes in negotiation and therefore in dialogue to settle all problems, including those posed by the need to eliminate apartheid, which is the objective of all Africans - indeed, of all peace-loving people. Certainly the results of this dialogue are not spectacular; the dialogue is slow, as we know, even very slow, but that does not discourage us at all; we shall persist.

Apartheid will disappear sooner or later, and history, we are certain, will give a proper accounting of the individual efforts of one and all in this multilateral struggle.

We do not condemn any single person; we simply respect the choice made by others in the struggle against apartheid. I would only hope that there will be equal respect for our most difficult choice in this common struggle against apartheid. We could have chosen the easy way and have been content with simply voting in favour of resolutions of condemnation, returning to our capitals with a clear conscience. But we have deliberately chosen the most difficult, most dangerous and most honourable way to prove that the accusation levelled against us is untrue.

I would say to my brother of Ghana - I say "brother" because we are of the same ethnic group: my village is only two miles away from the Ghanaian border - that if it were simply a matter of preventing the landing at Abidjan of a long-range aircraft which links South Africa with Europe, and which could contribute to stabilizing our subregion or contribute to the demolition of apartheid, we would have hastened to follow his friendly advice.

(Mr. Essy, Côte d'Ivoire)

But given the present state of affairs, we would have liked even a South African aircraft to be forced to land at Accra, so that South Africans could admire the beautiful capital, Accra, and see how, in freedom and dignity, blacks, like whites, can manage their own countries - as the blacks will tomorrow in South Africa.

Such an event would perhaps be but a drop of water in the ocean, but, as the French author Edgar Quinet said,

"Drop by drop water eventually pierces the hardest rock, even though it is called apartheid".

Mr. HOSSEINI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Yesterday the representative of the defeated Iraqi régime again introduced extraneous issues and baseless allegations against my country, intending to divert the Assembly's attention from crimes committed by the racist Pretoria régime and the collaboration between the Zionist terrorist base and South Africa.

The Islamic Republic of Iran has always supported the just struggle of the people of South Africa against apartheid. We strongly condemn and oppose any collaboration with that abhorrent régime.

The Islamic Republic of Iran has set up special rules and regulations concerning the export and sale of oil. It is a standard condition for the sale of oil by Iran to purchasing companies that they undertake not to deliver it to prohibited destinations, including South Africa. In order to ensure effective implementation of that contract clause, discharge certificates on sold cargo are obtained and closely investigated.

(Mr. Hosseini, Islamic Republic
of Iran)

Naturally those companies which, in contravention of the said prohibition and the text of the contract, deliver Iranian oil to South Africa will be immediately placed on the black list of the National Iranian Oil Company.

This brief explanation clearly demonstrates that the allegation made by the Iraqi representative was totally baseless and misleading.

Mr. ABBAS (United Republic of Tanzania): In his statement yesterday the representative of Israel quoted from Reuters what is alleged to have been said by our former President, Mwalimu Julius K. Nyerere, on the question of re-establishing diplomatic relations between African countries and Israel. That specific reference created the false impression that Mwalimu was encouraging African countries to re-establish diplomatic relations with Israel. I should like, in clarification of this matter and for the record, to state the following.

First, Mwalimu Nyerere did not address any reporters during his stopover in Nairobi, where the Reuters report originated. Secondly, whatever may have been said by him on this matter has been taken completely out of context. Thirdly, this is affirmed by the fact that Tanzania's own position on the question of re-establishing diplomatic relations with Israel remains unchanged, because of Israel's denial of the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people, as well as the continued occupation of Arab lands in contravention of the United Nations Charter, international law and the relevant resolutions of both the Security Council and the General Assembly.

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): I wish to exercise the right of reply to the delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany and Côte d'Ivoire.

A debate in the plenary of the General Assembly is exactly that. It is an informed and sustained exchange of views on whatever issue is before the plenary

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

Assembly. It was specifically in that vein that my delegation made references to the delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany and Côte d'Ivoire for explanations which we are happy to receive. Any other motive ascribed to us is completely rejected.

As far as the statement made by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany is concerned, let me reiterate that, if he does not find any violation of the Security Council arms embargo in the actions of the two companies that supplied the blueprints for the building of a U-209 submarine to South Africa, we do. We disagree on that point.

The issue of the debate may be the practices and policies of apartheid, but it is equally true that those who strengthen the economy and the military might of South Africa do an injustice to the overwhelming majority of black South Africans in that hapless country. I am happy to note that the Federal Republic of Germany supports peaceful methods for the eradication of apartheid, but I hope that he will see my point when I state that the supply of submarines to the military forces of South Africa can hardly be consistent with peaceful methods of eradicating apartheid. It is indeed the Federal Republic of Germany that has broken solidarity with every one of us by allowing its State-owned enterprise to sell the blueprints to South Africa. The Federal Republic of Germany cannot disown the two companies, when the Government itself owns 75 per cent of the shares.

I am happy to know that the Federal Republic of Germany will pursue the matter to its logical conclusion and that the rumour to which I referred is not true. If it proves to be true, I hope that the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany will see to it that there is no travesty of justice.

Secondly, I welcome the words of my colleague, brother and dear friend, the Permanent Representative of the Côte d'Ivoire. Let me start by correcting a

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

portion of his statement. Never did my delegation imply that the Côte d'Ivoire was bringing destabilization to West Africa. I will read again the portion of my statement that deals with the Côte d'Ivoire. I stated yesterday, and I repeat:

"With that decision, Côte d'Ivoire is inviting South African destabilization into the West African subregion, and we fraternally request them to rethink this serious step." (A/42/PV.76, p. 151)

If my colleague does not believe that the actions they have taken can bring destabilization, caused by South Africa, they should ask other countries, like the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany, what members of South African offices in their countries have done in defence of apartheid and in destabilization of others. If necessary, I will go into further detail on that.

The issue here is not what contribution the President of the Côte d'Ivoire has brought to African unity or African independence. That is a matter of record and is acknowledged, and my delegation is in concurrence with all the representative has said on that, but the issue here is that the United Nations, both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly, has adopted a number of resolutions, and the Organization of African Unity has also adopted a number of resolutions, all of which recommend against such action as the Côte d'Ivoire has taken. The delegation of the Côte d'Ivoire knows that that country is a member of both the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity. Our question is: What kind of solidarity do we have?

Finally, we have a choice: to maintain dialogue with South Africa or not. Even if we choose dialogue, one must distinguish that from active co-operation with the racist régime of South Africa. Let me end by quoting from The Guardian an article on this subject that was published on 11 November of this year. It says:

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

"The West African State of Ivory Coast has broken ranks with African countries pushing for tougher sanctions against South Africa, by granting traffic rights to South African Airways. After months of protracted negotiations shrouded in secrecy, and believed to have been conducted at top Government level, SAA has been given permission to pick up and disembark passengers and cargo in Abidjan on flights between London and Johannesburg.

"Aircraft of SAA, one of the world's least welcomed airlines, will leave Abidjan at the curious flying time of 2.15 a.m. Travel agents have been asked not to publicize the flight, because of its political sensitivity, and Mr. Marcello Miao, the SAA representative in Abidjan, has refused to comment.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

"The airline has refuelled at Abidjan's international airport for years while continuing to put in a request for traffic rights. Senior Foreign Ministry officials yesterday expressed surprise over the Government's about-face 'We have always said that we do not believe that sanctions can work, but we have tried not to become isolated on the continent', a senior diplomat said."

And I say more.

Mr. AL-AMIN (Iraq): Because we are already so late, I shall be very brief. The reports that Iran is selling oil to South Africa were not brought up by Iraq. Those are not really allegations, they are facts given in the report of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa, in document A/42/45, paragraph 33. The other reports were printed in the newsletter, entitled Oil Embargo against South Africa. I have many copies with me of the latest issue, October 1987, and am ready to give a copy to any representative, including the Iranians, if they so wish. It proves that Iran has deals with South Africa in selling its oil.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany for his second statement in exercise of the right of reply. May I remind him that his second statement should be limited to five minutes.

Count YORK von WARTENBURG (Federal Republic of Germany): I welcome what my colleague from Ghana just said about the character of our debate, because that permits me to believe now that what he has been saying was not meant as an attack. Let me refer to what I said earlier. If blueprints of the kind that he mentioned have been delivered to South Africa, then indeed that would be a violation of the arms embargo. I can only conclude from the fact that investigation procedures on that matter have been introduced in my country that the respective authorities

(Count York von Wartenburg, Federal
Republic of Germany)

which watch over the compliance with the arms embargo share that view. I should not like to comment further on that subject until these investigations have been completed. As I said, we will then inform the anti-apartheid Committee and our colleague from Ghana.

He may perhaps understand that there is a distinction between saying that those things have been delivered with the knowledge of the Government and the fact that those companies are partially owned by the State, because in my country those firms are managed and run completely as private companies and the Government itself does not manage them. The allusion to the effect that the Government knew about that goes further and I wanted to correct that impression and hope that the Ambassador will accept that explanation.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I call now on the representative of the Côte d'Ivoire for his second statement in exercise of the right of reply, which is limited to five minutes.

Mr. ESSY (Côte d'Ivoire) (interpretation from French): I do not think I shall need the five minutes, because in reality there is no difference between my brother from Ghana and myself; it is merely a question of evaluation - we are all struggling towards the same goal, namely, the elimination of apartheid. The Côte d'Ivoire, as I said, has nothing to hide. It does not have representatives of South African Airlines, it has no economic ties with South Africa and so there is no hidden objective. The question of solidarity was raised. What kind of solidarity do we want to lend to the struggle in all these resolutions? Quite simply, we want to offer effective solidarity.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I now call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran for his second statement in exercise of the right of reply, which is limited to five minutes.

Mr. HOSSEINI (Islamic Republic of Iran): On different occasions my delegation has responded to the Iraqi representative. My delegation regrets that the representative of the Iraqi defeated régime still insists on his attempt to divert the attention of the Assembly from the very important issue of the struggle of the people in South Africa. The Iraqi representative purely for the purpose of self-interest and selfishness brought baseless allegations and is misusing the valuable and precious time, which has been devoted to the people of South Africa and to the struggle of our brothers in South Africa. The Iraqi representative is misusing that time, which is a sad fact. My delegation will not elaborate further.

Finally, I should like to emphasize that the Islamic Republic of Iran has always been one of the most ardent supporters of the struggle of the people in South Africa and for the annihilation of the apartheid régime.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the representative of Ghana for his second statement in exercise of the right of reply, which is limited to five minutes.

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): I shall try to exercise my right of reply against two delegations in five minutes. First, I thank my colleague from the Federal Republic of Germany most sincerely for the candour with which he has replied to our inquiries. Secondly, I wish to tell him, if it is of any comfort to him, that I am not alone in believing that the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany ought to have known about the sale of the blueprints to the South Africans. Let me quote from the Johannesburg Citizen of 12 March last year, which quoted its representative in Bonn as saying:

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

"At a news conference in Bonn, Opposition leader Hans Jochen Vogel said that if the Federal Government cannot prove it was not involved in the alleged sale, the Social Democrats will demand the establishment of a special investigating committee. 'It appears unlikely to me that a firm that is 75 per cent owned by the Government would do something without the political leadership at least indicating it was all right', Mr. Vogel told journalists. 'This makes us look once again like the last ally of the apartheid régime in South Africa', he said."

As I said, no less a person than a parliamentarian of the Federal Republic of Germany made that observation over a year ago. More than that, this whole affair came into the open a year ago. All I am asking is that my colleagues from the Federal Republic of Germany should do whatever is in their power to hasten and facilitate the investigation, so that we do not have a repetition in the future.

Secondly, as regards the right of reply of my brother from the Côte d'Ivoire, I wish merely to say that I hope that he also understands the legitimate concern of my Government when his Government decides to provide facilities for a Government that has a record of political assassinations, the bombing of innocent men, women and children and the destabilization of fellow African countries. To ask us not to speak is to deny us justice.

I do not quarrel with him over the leadership role his Government decides to play in this matter. But it is curious that the overwhelming majority of the international community should decide to show its leadership by denying collaboration and facilities to the South African régime. If he sees it otherwise, that is his Government's prerogative, but it impinges on the safety and the overall objective of our struggle against the most heinous of human crimes of this century - I refer to the system of apartheid.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the

representative of Iraq to speak in exercise of his second right of reply.

Mr. AL-AMIN (Iraq): The facts I stated earlier cannot merely be rejected

by the Iranian representative. If the Iranian régime, truly supports the struggle

of the black people of South Africa, it should cease all its relations and dealings

with South Africa and Israel. They should stop bartering Iranian oil for arms from

South Africa and Israel and, if they are truly honest in what they say, they should

also stop the aggressive war against Iraq, which supports the struggle of South

Africa, and turn their energies towards the struggle of the African people.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the

representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, who has asked to speak on a point

of order.

Mr. HOSSEINI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I think the last sentence of

the statement just made by the representative of Iraq was irrelevant to the point

under discussion.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The General Assembly has

thus completed consideration of agenda item 33.

The meeting rose at 2.45 p.m.