



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/43/PV.68
7 December 1988

ENGLISH

Forty-third session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SIXTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 5 December 1988, at 9.30 a.m.President:

later:

later:

Mr. CAPUTO

Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Vice-President)

Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vice-President)

(Argentina)

(Cyprus)

(Vanuatu)

- Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa [36] (continued)
- (a) Report of the Special Committee against Apartheid
 - (b) Report of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa
 - (c) 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.

- The situation in the Middle East [40]
 - (a) Reports of the Secretary-General
 - (b) Draft resolutions
- Report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the strengthening of the role of the Organization: Report of Sixth Committee [135]
- Fortieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights [38] (continued)

The meeting was called to order at 9.45 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 36 (continued)

POLICIES OF APARTHEID OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA

- (a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID (A/43/22)
- (b) REPORT OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL GROUP TO MONITOR THE SUPPLY AND SHIPPING OF OIL AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS TO SOUTH AFRICA (A/43/44 and Corr.1)
- (c) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/43/682, A/43/699, A/43/786)
- (d) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/43/802)
- (e) DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/43/L.30/Rev.1, A/43/L.31 and Corr.1, A/43/L.32 and Corr.1, A/43/L.33 and Corr.1, A/43/L.34 and Corr.1, A/43/L.35 and Corr.1, A/43/L.36 and Corr.1, A/43/L.37 and Corr.1, A/43/L.38, A/43/L.41 and A/43/L.42)
- (f) REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/43/901 and Corr.1)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will now begin its consideration of the 11 draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 36.

I shall first call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting on any or all of the 11 draft resolutions.

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 delegations from their seats. Representatives will also have an opportunity to explain their vote after all the votes have been taken.

Mr. KARINEN (Finland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the five Nordic countries, Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Finland.

The Nordic countries have consistently condemned the apartheid policy of the South African Government as a violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms as laid down in the Charter of the United Nations and in 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

(Mr. Karinen, Finland)

Council should, as soon as possible, adopt effective sanctions against South Africa as a means of achieving the peaceful abolition of apartheid. Comprehensive and mandatory sanctions are the most effective instrument to this end. Pending the adoption of such sanctions, the Nordic countries have adopted a wide range of unilateral measures against apartheid, including a trade embargo. The position of the Nordic countries in this regard was recorded in the revised Nordic Programme of Action against Apartheid adopted in March 1988.

The Nordic countries consequently strongly agree with the main thrust of the draft resolutions before us. However, some of them continue to raise difficulties with regard to questions of principle that are important to the Nordic countries. I shall describe them briefly.

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

Secondly, the peaceful solution of conflicts is a fundamental principle enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations itself. Therefore we cannot accept that the United Nations endorse the use of armed struggle.

(Mr. Karinen, Finland)

Thirdly, the Nordic countries deplore the continued practice of selectively singling out individual countries or groups of 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.

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 for the Prevention of Apartheid in Sports. In view of the strict and active policy of the Nordic countries against sports contacts with South Africa, the Nordic countries regret that they cannot fully endorse the Convention.

Fifthly, because of the strict adherence of the Nordic countries to the provisions of the Charter we must reserve our positions 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 Nordic Countries will this year vote in favour of draft resolution A/43/L.33 and Corr.1 on the imposition, co-ordination and strict monitoring of measures against racist South Africa, in spite of the fact that the text creates a number of difficulties for us. It is well-known that the Nordic countries have imposed one of the most comprehensive packages of sanctions against South Africa and Namibia. We do, however, have reservations on some of the selective sanctions listed in the operative paragraph 1, in particular subparagraphs (d), (e) and (f). We also have reservations on some of the operative paragraphs of draft resolution A/43/L.37 and Corr.1, especially operative paragraph 1 (d). We whole-heartedly support the efforts to reorganize and rationalize the Department of Public

(Mr. Karinen, Finland)

Information and its activities aimed at an increasingly efficient and economic performance. Therefore, everything should be done to avoid increasing the personnel of the specific programmes.

The situation in southern Africa has further 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 by adopting effective sanctions against the apartheid régime. Moreover, 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 that are victims of South Africa's aggressive policy. We must all not only voice our strongest condemnation of apartheid but also strive to agree on concerted international action and take effective concrete steps rapidly to achieve the abolition of apartheid.

Mr DIKTAKIS (Greece): The 12 States members of the European community made clear once again during the debate their utter revulsion of apartheid. They have repeatedly and unequivocally condemned it and demanded that it be abolished. There should be no doubt either about our objective, which is quite simply the complete eradication of this pernicious system, or of our determination to contribute to the abolition of apartheid. The United Nations has a primary role to play in this endeavour.

Unfortunately, the trend towards moderation shown in the drafting of last year's draft resolutions has not been sustained. We regret that some of the draft resolutions now before us continue to contain elements which cause us well-known problems of principle. First, the Twelve believe that the division of competence

(Mr. Diktakis, Greece)

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 wish to reiterate our commitment to the principle of universality of membership of the United Nations. We cannot support calls for the total isolation of South Africa. This, in our view, would be of no benefit to the goal we all share, the total abolition of apartheid. We believe that channels of communication 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 discrimination.

The Twelve have stated during the debate their grave concern about the continuation of violence and repression in South Africa. However, we remain convinced that the process of peaceful change is still possible and that the United Nations must promote change by peaceful means, as provided in the Charter. Although we share the frustration felt by the majority of the people of South Africa, owing to the continuation of the unacceptable system of apartheid, we cannot agree that the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly should endorse the use of force or armed struggle.

We reject all forms of apartheid in sports and continue firmly to discourage all sporting contacts that may have any implication of racial discrimination. Sports activities are organized in our respective countries at private initiative. Sports organizations within our countries are aware of the position of their Governments on sports competitions that violate the Olympic ideal of non-discrimination.

The Twelve reiterate their firm opposition to all arbitrary, selective and unjustified singling out of Member States or groups of countries. The Twelve understand and support the wish of the sponsors of draft resolution A/43/L.37 and

(Mr. Diktakis, Greece)

Corr.1 to ensure wide dissemination of information on the system of apartheid and to counteract the restrictions on freedom of the press imposed by the South African Government. However, we have serious difficulties with certain of its aspects. We find operative paragraph 1 (e) difficult to reconcile with the prerogatives of the Secretary-General as Chief Administrative Officer of the Organization, as laid down in Chapter XV of the Charter. It also contains too broad an interpretation of what may properly constitute the expenses of the Organization and has serious implications for the reform process, whose outcome should not be pre-empted here.

The Twelve regret that for these and other reasons we are unable to vote in favour of all the draft resolutions before us today. However, we remain firm and constant with 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.

Mr. KAGAMI (Japan): The Japanese delegation has actively participated in the debate on agenda item 36, the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa. It has carefully taken note of the views expressed by other representatives.

My delegation will be voting on the 11 draft resolutions, bearing in mind the firm unequivocal stance of Japan against apartheid. The Japanese delegation, however, is obliged to request a separate vote on that part of draft resolution A/43/L.32 and Corr.1, entitled "Comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa", which reads:

"... and, particularly, Japan, which recently emerged as the most important trading partner of South Africa",
in operative paragraph 3.

(Mr. Kagami, Japan)

It is obliged to do so because, as a matter of principle, Japan is opposed to the practice of name-calling in the resolutions of the United Nations. Furthermore, that part of operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution conveys a wrong impression that Japan has increased its trade with South Africa and has thus deviated from the concerted efforts of the international community to oppose apartheid. This is contrary to the facts, however, and also gives a distorted picture of my country's intentions. Japan's trade with South Africa certainly increased in dollar terms during the previous two-year period, but if measured in yen, that trade has shown a consistent decline every year since 1984, resulting in a 27-per-cent decrease from 1984 to 1987. This situation is due mainly to the dramatic appreciation of the yen against major currencies.

(Mr. Kagami, Japan)

The Japanese Government, in fact, has taken additional steps this year further to discourage Japanese business ties with South Africa. The Foreign and Trade Ministers have personally appealed for the exercise of maximum restraint. As a result, there are clear indications that Japanese trade with South Africa is decreasing in both yen and dollar terms.

I might also mention that the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid points out that the statistics available to the Committee on individual countries' trade with South Africa are quite inadequate. This is an additional reason why my delegation is obliged to vote against the draft resolution which, on insufficient ground, refers specifically to certain countries.

Sir Crispin TICKELL (United Kingdom): My delegation wholeheartedly endorses the statement made a few moments ago by the permanent representative of Greece on behalf of the 12 States Members of the European Community. But I should like to add a brief national explanation of vote.

I emphasize, as I have done on many previous occasions, that the British Government shares the international community's total abhorrence of apartheid. As my Prime Minister, Mrs. Thatcher, said in a recent interview with a South African newspaper published in South Africa,

"Apartheid is contrary to my whole philosophy, which is that people should be able to live where they like in their own country, exercise their full democratic rights and advance according to merit, not the colour of their skin."

Britain has repeatedly condemned apartheid as cruel, morally unacceptable and degrading. We shall continue to work for an end to apartheid, which is a violation of basic human rights and human dignity. Once again we urge the South African Government to look to the future and accept the necessity and inevitability of fundamental change.

(Sir Crispin Tickell, United Kingdom)

Thus we share the same goal as the sponsors of the draft resolutions before us today; but we differ with them on how best to achieve it. Events elsewhere in the world this year have shown that dialogue is the only certain road to peace. In South Africa, too, peace and security can be achieved only through genuine dialogue and fundamental change. We do not believe that the imposition of punitive and other measures in an attempt to isolate South Africa will help to dismantle apartheid. For that reason and others we shall vote against several of the draft resolutions.

We shall, as we did last year, abstain in the vote 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.

Our abstention and our participation in the consensus on draft resolution A/43/L.36 and Corr.1, which calls for the convening of a special session of the General Assembly on apartheid next year, should be seen as recognition of our shared goal of securing the elimination of apartheid. But we are disappointed that it fails to take account of favourable developments over the last few months which should contribute to stability in southern Africa. The special session should be held in New York and should be considered as one of the five special conferences for which provision has already been made in the regular budget.

Similar considerations apply to our abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/43/L.37 and Corr.1, on the dissemination of information on apartheid. Our vote on this draft resolution should not be seen as diminishing our commitment to the reform process, which is being discussed in the Fifth Committee, nor should it pre-empt the outcome of that discussion in any way. Our reservations are strengthened by the decision on the financial implications which was adopted by the Fifth Committee on 2 December. In our view the draft resolution also takes too

(Sir Crispin Tickell, United Kingdom)

broad a view of what may properly be considered as expenses of the Organization. We also consider that the language on the structure and staffing of the Department of Public Information is impossible to reconcile with the provisions of Chapter XV of the Charter.

Mr. FORTIER (Canada): There can be no doubt about Canada's strong opposition to South Africa's repugnant apartheid policies. As my delegation stated in the Third Committee earlier at this session, Prime Minister Mulroney has called apartheid a massive and institutionalized violation of human rights. It should have been reduced long before now to a shameful chapter of history. Instead, it remains the most pressing moral issue of our time. The whole world rejects apartheid, and the whole world must join in the effort to end it.

On behalf of the Canadian delegation, I will explain how Canada will vote on the draft resolutions before us. Some of them are noticeably improved, as was also the case last year, and I hope that this welcome trend will continue as it enables Canada and others to respond more positively and brings our overall message closer to the strength of unanimity.

In draft resolution A/43/L.30/Rev.1, which deals with the situation in South Africa, there is much that Canada can support. We have consistently pressed the South African Government to release political prisoners, including Nelson Mandela, and we welcome the latest response in the freeing of some prominent, long-imprisoned individuals, as well as the commuting of the death sentences on the Sharpeville Six. We urge South Africa now to go further: to release all political prisoners, to lift the ban on political organizations opposed to apartheid and to make a start on dismantling the fundamental structures of apartheid. We have ourselves taken concrete action to help to counter Pretoria's propaganda and press censorship because what South Africa and the world need is more, not less, information on apartheid.

(Mr. Fortier, Canada)

Apartheid breeds violence and is maintained by violence. Canada believes that violence must end. There must be effective pressure from the international community for peaceful change and reconciliation if Pretoria and its adversaries are to begin a real dialogue on peaceful transition towards a non-racial, democratic future. Violence makes the realization of this hope more distant, not closer. Thus, Canada cannot support language that seeks to justify armed struggle.

In the vote on draft resolution A/43/L.31 and Corr.1 Canada will abstain. It is unfortunate that this new text detracts from universal support for the arms embargo by gratuitous and largely unsubstantiated name-calling, rather than by looking for ways to make the embargo more effective.

For reasons that are well known, Canada will once again vote against comprehensive and mandatory sanctions as provided for in draft resolution A/43/L.32 and Corr.1. We believe that sanctions have a real impact and that the South African Government is beginning to feel their effect. Canada has implemented many important sanctions against South Africa. At their Vancouver summit last year, Canada and its Commonwealth partners undertook to widen, tighten and intensify sanctions. This is a task that my Government takes seriously. The Secretary of State for External Affairs announced further steps in this direction in September, and the Commonwealth Committee of Foreign Ministers, which he chairs, gives high priority to this issue. I am happy to say, therefore, that Canada will support draft resolution A/43/L.33 and Corr.1 on co-ordinated measures. The list of measures includes many that Canada and the Commonwealth have put in place over the last three years. While the list includes some measures we have not implemented, clearly the overall thrust of this draft resolution is effective pressure for peaceful change.

(Mr. Fortier, Canada)

Draft resolution A/43/L.34 and Corr.1, on relations between South Africa and Israel, really has no place in this agenda item and Canada will oppose it for well-known reasons.

On the Apartheid Committee's work programme, I have pleasure in saying that Canada will support draft resolution A/43/L.35 and Corr.1, as we did the draft resolution on this subject last year, because we support much of what the Committee does. In that regard, however, I must emphasize Canada's understanding of operative paragraph 2. What the General Assembly is endorsing, in its own words, are those recommendations contained in paragraph 194 of the report relating to its programme of work, and only those recommendations. Among them, subparagraph N deserves particular attention. Canada cannot support some other subparagraphs not related to the work programme.

In supporting draft resolution A/43/L.36 and Corr.1, Canada urges that the special session on apartheid be of moderate length as the best way to attract high-level attendance and public attention while avoiding the unnecessary and unproductive cost of a longer session. We hope the proposals then considered will form a message that is unanimous as well as unambiguous.

Canada unfortunately is unable to support the new draft resolution A/43/L.37 and Corr.1, on dissemination of information. While parts of it closely parallel what Canada and the Commonwealth are doing to counter South African propaganda and censorship, in our view other parts undermine the difficult and necessary reforms taking place in the United Nations Department of Public Information. Canada regrets that those elements detract from what could and should have been a consensus text.

Once again, Canada is proud to have been a sponsor of draft resolution A/43/L.38, on the Trust Fund for South Africa. May I note Canada's substantial direct support for, in addition to the Fund itself, the International Defence and

(Mr. Fortier, Canada)

Aid Fund for Southern Africa, lawyers' groups and the union movement, as envisaged in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

Canada, with some regret, is unable to support draft resolution A/43/L.41, on an oil embargo. Our own voluntary embargo on supply is effective, and we recognize improvements in the draft resolution. None the less, a mandatory embargo on both supply and shipping raises the problem of extraterritoriality of laws and other issues of longstanding concern to and particular sensitivity for Canada.

The draft resolution on concerted action for the elimination of apartheid - this year draft resolution A/43/L.42 - is traditionally supported by Canada and will be again. Canada has implemented all the measures in paragraph 7, and in addition provides substantial assistance to the front-line States, as urged in paragraph 8.

We must all do our part to encourage peaceful change in South Africa. The statements we have heard in the debate and the draft resolutions before us are, taken together, a clear message to the Government of South Africa that it must take more concrete action. South Africa itself knows what it has to do. While maintaining effective pressure, we must also be ready to recognize progress when it comes, and to assist in overcoming difficulties when that would be appropriate. As Prime Minister Mulroney said recently in the General Assembly:

"There can be no doubt that fundamental change will come to South Africa. The only questions are when and how and at what cost in human life.

We must make sure the answers come soon, and peacefully". (A/43/PV.11, p.57)

Ms. DITLHABI-OLIPHANT (Botswana): The Botswana delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/43/L.33 and Corr.1 and A/43/L.42. However, we wish to declare our incapacity to implement paragraphs in those draft resolutions that call for sanctions against South Africa, due to obvious reasons.

My delegation will not stand in the way of those who can and wish to impose sanctions against South Africa.

Mr. MATNAI (Israel): Israel is continuously singled out for criticism on an unwarranted and unjustified basis, in spite of the statement of the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid on the steps taken by Israel against apartheid.

Israel will therefore vote against draft resolutions A/43/L.34 and Corr.1 and A/43/L.31 and Corr.1. We call on objective Member States not to lend their support to those draft resolutions. At the same time, Israel cannot support draft resolution A/43/L.32 because the total isolation of South Africa would worsen the plight of the majority of the population and increase tension in the area.

Israel, however, will vote in favour of draft resolution A/43/L.42, despite the problems inherent in the operative paragraphs, as mentioned regarding draft resolution A/43/L.32 and Corr.1.

Mr. COOLS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): It goes without saying that Belgium fully concurs with the statement just made by the permanent representative of Greece on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community. My delegation should like to add a few more specific comments.

Last year, Belgium welcomed the improvements made in the draft resolutions through the adoption of more precise and factual language and through the elimination of certain individual criticisms. We very much regret that that trend was not pursued this year.

In that respect, we especially deplore the retention of the draft resolution relating to relations between South Africa and Israel, which by its discriminatory character is unacceptable to my delegation.

Belgium feels obliged once again to express reservations prompted by some of the texts before us, inasmuch as they run counter to longstanding principles of my country's foreign policy.

(Mr. Cools, Belgium)

Belgium regrets that the concept of a call to armed struggle, which had been moderated last year, was reintroduced into draft resolution A/43/L.30/Rev.1, which will compel my delegation to abstain on that draft resolution.

Similarly, Belgium will abstain on draft resolution A/43/L.31 and Corr.1 because of selective references and the appeal to the Security Council. My country stresses that the division of powers provided for under the Charter should be strictly respected. That is why we cannot join in a direct or indirect appeal for mandatory comprehensive sanctions, which fall within the exclusive purview of the Security Council. For that reason, we shall vote against draft resolution A/43/L.32 and Corr.1 and abstain on draft resolutions A/43/L.35 and Corr.1 and A/43/L.33 and Corr.1. With regard to the latter, concerning the imposition, co-ordination and strict monitoring of measures against South Africa, our reservations are further strengthened by the insertion of a paragraph relating to the severance of all communications with South Africa.

As to draft resolution A/43/L.41, on the oil embargo, my delegation will abstain - recalling, however, that Belgium observes the embargo on crude oil deliveries to South Africa implemented within the framework of the European Community.

Regarding draft resolution A/43/L.37 and Corr.1, on which we shall abstain, Belgium can only recall the reservations clearly expressed just now by the representative of Greece.

Finally, Belgium will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/43/L.36 and Corr.1 and A/43/L.38, relating respectively to the special session of the General Assembly and the special Trust Fund. Similarly, Belgium's commitment within the framework of action by our Organisation to abolish apartheid will prompt it to vote in favour of draft resolution A/43/L.42, relating to concerted international action for the

(Mr. Cools, Belgium)

elimination of apartheid, despite the reservations we maintain on the ninth preambular paragraph, whose terms are too categorical.

Through its votes, my country will reaffirm its intention to encourage a solution to the serious situation prevailing in South Africa, a solution which should be in conformity with the principles of our policy. Belgium wishes wholeheartedly to see a peaceful and rapid transition towards the total elimination of apartheid.

Count YORK von WARTENBURG (Federal Republic of Germany): The representative of Greece, in a statement on behalf of the 12 member States of the European Community, has already commented on the draft resolutions before us. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany fully subscribes to that statement and shares in particular the essential political principles set out therein. The Twelve have made clear their unequivocal rejection of apartheid and their determination to contribute to its a total eradication.

My delegation would like to add the following observations.

My Government shares the conviction of this Assembly that apartheid constitutes a flagrant violation of the fundamental human rights laid down in the Charter of United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The position of the Federal Republic of Germany is clear: the system of apartheid cannot be reformed but must be eradicated to create a democratic society in which all South Africans enjoy equal human, political and civil rights.

My Government shares the increasing concern of the whole international community over the lack of significant progress towards the abolition of apartheid in South Africa. Massive repression has continued unabated, censorship has been tightened, the state of emergency has again been extended. The prohibition by the South African Government in February 1988 of 17 South African organizations and the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU), which peacefully oppose apartheid, from engaging in political activities is a further manifestation of the political suppression.

A dialogue between the black and the white population has to be established immediately. My Government welcomes in this connection the meeting between members of the African National Congress (ANC) and white South Africans held in Leverkusen, in the Federal Republic of Germany, in October this year. Such meetings in our view can help increase the level of confidence between blacks and whites in South

(Count York von Wartenburg, Federal
Republic of Germany)

Africa. For this dialogue it is essential that Nelson Mandela and the other political prisoners be released and that the ban on the ANC and the other organizations of the black majority be lifted. My Government welcomes the recent release by the South African Government for humanitarian reasons of the President of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC), Mr. Zeph Mothopeng, and of Mr. Harry Gwala and the announcement that Mr. Mandela will not be sent back to prison once he has left the hospital in which he is recovering. In this context my Government notes with satisfaction the decision by the South African President to commute the death sentences inflicted on the Sharpeville Six.

My Government uses political and diplomatic pressure against the Government of South Africa and will continue to do so. Together with our partners we have adopted certain restrictive economic measures. Through a programme of positive measures my Government expresses its solidarity with and support for the victims of apartheid.

We continue to attach great importance to our co-operation with the front-line States. The visit by the President of my country to Zimbabwe in March this year, together with the earlier visits by Chancellor Kohl to Mozambique and by Foreign Minister Genscher to Angola, is a clear signal in this connection.

The Federal Republic of Germany is in favour of the essence of most of the 11 draft resolutions submitted to the Assembly. Unfortunately the wording of some of the draft resolutions is not in agreement with my Government's well-known position regarding economic sanctions, the use of force in political disputes and name-calling, so my Government cannot endorse the justification of armed struggle in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/43/L.30 and Corr.1. We regret the singling-out of individual countries in draft resolutions A/43/L.31 and Corr.1, L.32 and Corr.1 and L.34 and Corr.1.

(Count York von Wartenburg, Federal Republic of Germany)

This year, rather than vote against, we shall abstain in the voting on the draft resolution entitled "Oil embargo against South Africa" - that is, draft resolution A/43/L.41. My Government adheres to the decision taken by the Foreign Ministers of the European Community on 10 September 1985 to suspend all oil exports to South Africa. No crude oil shipments to South Africa are being carried out either directly or in transit from ports in the Federal Republic of Germany or by vessels flying its flag. The fact that we abstain this year does not reflect a change in my Government's position of principle with regard to comprehensive mandatory sanctions.

In spite of differences regarding ways and methods we are all united in our goal: the ending of apartheid must end. My Government will continue to work for this goal to the best of its ability.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): The people and Government of the United States stand second to none in their total rejection of racism and apartheid. It has been and will continue to be the policy of my Government to promote a peaceful transition to non-racial democracy and justice for all in South Africa. We continue to believe that carefully targeted political, diplomatic and economic pressure is the best means to achieve these objectives.

The fact remains, moreover, that a solution to South Africa's problems cannot be imposed from outside, by any one nation or by the entire United Nations. Only South Africans themselves can develop such a solution. Yet, while we oppose apartheid and wish to see it pass from the earth, this year's package of draft resolutions, as in previous years, contains language and prescriptions with which the United States must again disagree. The draft resolutions again call for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa. We oppose the

(Miss Byrne, United States)

imposition by the United Nations of such sanctions, as members know, because we believe sweeping, world-wide sanctions simply will not work.

The United States has the oldest and the broadest sanctions against South Africa. We implemented an arms embargo against South Africa long before the United Nations approved one. We continue to implement and enforce rigorous economic sanctions under our Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986. The sad fact is, however, that the arms embargo has been only partially effective and the economic sanctions have probably done more harm than good. Although the United Nations arms embargo has made South Africa's access to major new weapons systems difficult, South Africa has nevertheless continued to import arms clandestinely, long after our and others' embargoes went into effect. In addition it has developed its own significant arms industry.

As far as our economic sanctions are concerned, their net impact has been a decline in positive United States economic and political influence in South Africa, a strengthening of reactionary political forces there and a narrowing of opportunities for economic and political empowerment by black South Africans - the people we are all trying most to help.

Those countries which call for such sanctions make the mistake of confusing the Government and its policies of apartheid with the people and economy of the country. By attempting to have a positive influence on the former they will surely have a negative effect on the latter.

The United States likewise cannot accept using United Nations resolutions to legitimize armed conflict, as is proposed in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/43/L.30 and Corr.1. Support for such language is wholly contrary to the dedicated search for peaceful resolution of the world's problems, in southern Africa and elsewhere, which members of this body profess to espouse. A call to violence only increases the chance of greater violence.

(Miss Byrne, United States)

We note with pleasure the continued decline in the number of explicit critical references to the United States, but we regret that the practice has not yet wholly disappeared. We shall continue to oppose it wherever it surfaces.

(Miss Byrne, United States)

As similar resolutions in past years, draft resolution A/43/L.34 and Corr.1 criticizes a single country for actions which many have committed, including some of those who protest most loudly. We are again unable to support such a disingenuous resolution.

The United States is also concerned about the financial implications of several sections of these draft resolutions, especially draft resolution A/43/L.37 and Corr.1 on dissemination of information, and operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/43/L.41, on the oil embargo, which imply increased expenses without regard to contrary earlier decisions by this body and its subsidiary committees.

The United States wishes to stress its continued belief that proven, positive results on apartheid will be best assured through patient negotiations, as has been the case recently in Afghanistan, Iran and Iraq and, most recently, Namibia, rather than rhetorical flourishes in sterile debates. We will join the consensus on the call for a special session of the General Assembly on apartheid. We trust that the session will be brief and to the point.

Inasmuch as there will be a special session of the General Assembly to debate the question of apartheid, the United States assumes that the Assembly will not hold further discussion on the issue during its forty-fourth regular session.

Finally, we shall again support, and join the consensus on, the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, the worthy goals of which we support with significant financial contributions.

Mr. DLAMINI (Swaziland): Swaziland will support the draft resolutions under agenda item 36, entitled "Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa", with the exception of draft resolutions A/43/L.32 and Corr.1 and A/43/L.41, on which it will abstain as it is not in a position to implement comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa. Swaziland's abstention

(Mr. Dlamini, Swaziland)

on the two draft resolutions must not be seen as indicating that Swaziland is a stumbling block to the elimination of the policies of apartheid in South Africa.

It is regrettable, however, that the reputable Special Committee against Apartheid, in paragraph 100 of document A/43/22, has branded Swaziland, together with a few other neighbouring countries in the subregion, as helping South Africa to evade sanctions. As a peace-loving country committed to the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations and positively involved in the furtherance of the aims and objectives of the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference, Swaziland is greatly disturbed to learn about this naked allegation by the Special Committee against Apartheid.

What is particularly disappointing is that the Special Committee has not bothered, inter alia, to contact Swaziland with a view to ascertaining the truth or falsity of such a damaging allegation. In that regard, we appeal to the Special Committee to adopt a constructive approach to this issue by first gathering solid evidence before issuing a report of that nature as an official document of the United Nations General Assembly.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation fully subscribes to what has been said on behalf of the 12 member States of the European Community by the representative of Greece, both during the debate and by way of explanation of vote.

France has taken several initiatives, not only at the national level but also on a multilateral basis, to translate into action the unreserved condemnation of the apartheid system which it has often expressed. Indeed, my country believes that all appropriate measures should be taken with a view to the abolition of that unacceptable system.

In that spirit my delegation will this year again vote in favour of the draft resolution on concerted international action for the elimination of

(Mr. Blanc, France)

apartheid (A/43/L.42), despite its reservations on the seventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7.

My country, which in 1967 voted against General Assembly resolution 42/23 F on the oil embargo against South Africa, will abstain this year in the vote on draft resolution A/43/L.41, which deals with the same question. Although it still has reservations on the text, particularly in respect of mandatory sanctions and the division of competence between the General Assembly and the Security Council, the French Government is in favour of measures focusing on the question of oil and, for its part, has already taken such measures.

With regard to the draft resolutions submitted to the General Assembly this year for the first time, my delegation supports draft resolution A/43/L.36 and Corr.1, on a special session of the General Assembly on apartheid and its destructive consequences in southern Africa, and is pleased that this text can be adopted by consensus. However, France will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/43/L.31 and Corr.1 on military collaboration with South Africa, especially because of the wording of operative paragraph 1. For the reasons given by the presidency of the Council of the European Communities, we are unable to support draft resolution A/43/L.37 and Corr.1 on the dissemination of information against the policy of apartheid of the racist régime of South Africa, and we shall therefore abstain in the vote on that draft resolution.

I wish to emphasize that my country would very much have liked to have been able to support all the draft resolutions before the General Assembly. We regret that we are unable to do so, because of the drafting of some of the passages in the texts. My delegation continues to believe that a unanimous vote by the General Assembly would further strengthen the international community's urgent appeal to the Government of South Africa for the complete and definitive elimination of the system of apartheid.

Mr. KACHIFANDE (Malawi): My delegation will vote in support of draft resolution A/43/L.42, on concerted international action for the elimination of apartheid, as well as five of the 11 other draft resolutions that have been presented to the General Assembly under agenda item 36, on the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa. We shall do so because Malawi supports the aspirations of the majority black people of South Africa for a multiracial society based on equality of social, economic and political opportunity under a government representative of all the different communities comprising their nation.

Malawi has always maintained, as have others, that only with the eradication of apartheid can the vision of a democratic and just South Africa be realized, because we have never accepted - indeed, who could - the argument of the South African authorities for so-called equal but separate development. It is for that reason that Malawi does not recognize as independent the homelands that have been created in pursuance of the so-called multinational South Africa.

(Mr. Kachipande, Malawi)

In pressing the case in support of the aspirations of the black majority, Malawi has always sought, as the rest of the international community also has, to make the South African authorities realize that the solution to their country's problems cannot be found through the approach they have so far opted for: that of force and silencing opposition. For force only produces counter-force, as events in recent years have shown; restrictions and states of emergency, as we have seen, only build up frustration and lead to desperation, which, in turn, give rise to force. The forced removal and silencing of the people's chosen leaders has denied legitimacy to any other leaders with whom the Government has sought to establish alternate political arrangements and has, in fact, rendered unacceptable, and therefore null and void, any arrangements so agreed.

Malawi has also insisted that the solution will never be found through internationalization of South Africa's domestic problems - for instance, through the campaign of destabilization and other means of coercion conducted against other countries in the region. Instead, we have always argued that the solution lies in the total eradication of apartheid, the release of all political detainees and the initiation of a genuine national dialogue involving the chosen representatives of all the various sections of South African society.

We thus welcome the reprieve of the Sharpeville Six and the release of Mr. Motohopeng and Mr. Gwala last week, as well as the reportedly imminent release of others, including Mr. Sisulu. Unfortunately, such apparently positive moves must lose all meaning in the face of the South African Government's decision to send yet more representatives of the black majority to prison, as it has done in the case of members of the United Democratic Front sentenced last week to long prison terms on doubtful charges of treason. We believe that such actions not only

(Mr. Kachipande, Malawi)

deepen mistrust of the South African Government abroad, but also contribute to a worsening of the situation inside South Africa.

It is for that reason that Malawi has supported international efforts towards the elimination of apartheid. Malawi has not, however, been in agreement with all means proposed or adopted to that end. That is why, although the Malawi delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/43/L.42, we would wish to state that this does not in any way imply Malawi's support for actions such as those called for in paragraphs 5 and 6, and also in a number of sections of paragraph 7 of this draft resolution. Similarly, we shall reserve our position with respect to operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/43/L.30/Rev.1.

Malawi has yet to be persuaded of the efficacy of such measures as the use of force, boycotts and isolation, imposition of sanctions - economic and other - and other such measures as a means of achieving lasting, genuinely peaceful solutions. Our observation of other recent situations would persuade us to conclude otherwise. It has never been Malawi's policy or desire to campaign against the use of sanctions. However, the more we have observed how, by whom and on whom these have been applied, the more we have been saddened by the apparent lack of honesty that seems to be attendant on such matters.

Neither do we believe in the usefulness or fairness of selective condemnation, such as is contained in operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/43/L.32 and Corr.1, as a way of persuading others to accept points of view.

It is for those reasons, among others, that my delegation finds itself compelled to abstain on draft resolutions A/43/L.31 and Corr.1, A/43/L.32 and Corr.1, A/43/L.33 and Corr.1, A/43/L.34 and Corr.1 and A/43/L.41.

Mr. MUDENGE (Zimbabwe): I wish to start by expressing the condolences and deep sympathy of the Government and people of Zimbabwe as well as of my whole delegation to the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), the people of South Africa and the family of our late friend, Comrade and combatant of the ANC, Johnny Makatini, who passed away over the weekend.

Johnny Makatini died in exile, in a foreign country, away from his home and the love and comfort of his people and family, a martyr to the struggle and a victim of apartheid. Many in the General Assembly were touched and moved by his sincerity, energy and determination.

Each time I shall press the green button this morning to vote in favour of all the draft resolutions before us, I shall say in my heart, "This one is for you, Johnny. Amadlha, Mbuye Africa".

The draft resolutions before us are factual and balanced. There is no name-calling in regard to any country. We are all opposed to name-calling. What the draft resolutions do is, on occasion, mention the names of some countries - but only for the sake of identifying them. And each time a country is mentioned, it is not done in a condemnatory context but mainly by way of identification, and often only in order to appeal to that country to co-operate with the international community in putting pressure on apartheid South Africa. That is not name-calling but the mentioning of names for the purpose of identification. Surely, if mere mortals can mention the exalted names of and appeal to Allah or Jehovah in their prayers, it should be proper and right to appeal to nations by mentioning their names. We are all proud of our names, are we not?

Those who would nourish their economies with the bloodstained profits of apartheid should remember that this can leave a bitter aftertaste in their mouths; and, if taken over a long time or in large enough doses, it can be morally lethal.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

To those who have been pleading that this is no time to exert pressure on Pretoria, we say this: we hope that the régime's weekend antics at Brazzaville will have persuaded them to our point of view - that Pretoria will move forward only provided we keep up the pressure.

Zimbabwe will vote "yes" on all the draft resolutions, as they are, unamended.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the voting.

Before we proceed, however, I shall call on the representative of Ghana, who wishes to speak with reference to the death of Mr. Makatini.

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): I apologize to the Assembly for speaking at this time but I hope that the urgency and gravity of the reason for my intervention will justify my imposing on its patience and tolerance.

I wish to speak on behalf of the Chairman of the African Group, who is unable to be with us at this time.

It is with a heavy heart that the African Group has received the sad news of the untimely death of Mr. Johnstone Mfanafuthi Makatini, a member of the National Executive Committee of the African National Congress (ANC). The sad event occurred on Saturday, 3 December 1988, at the Government Hospital in Lusaka, Zambia, after a short illness.

Mr. Johnny Makatini, as he was affectionately known to his numerous friends, colleagues and admirers, was also at the time of his death the Director of the Department of International Affairs of the African National Congress. Many will of course remember him as the former chief delegate of the Observer Mission of the ANC to the United Nations, an individual who consulted and walked the corridors of the United Nations almost every single day that he was with us. Mr. Makatini was a victim of apartheid in the sense that he was forced into exile by the South African Government for about a quarter of a century only because he refused to bow to the injustice, racism and humiliation of that unacceptable system. He began his struggle against apartheid from the time he entered school and, because of his commitment, dedication and industry, soon gained the attention, confidence and acceptance of the leaders of the anti-apartheid struggle in South Africa - men like Nelson Mandela and Oliver Tambo. In his work as an ANC functionary abroad, Johnny Makatini travelled the world educating, informing and pleading with leaders, Governments and peoples to help put an end to the system that had enslaved and

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

exploited the overwhelming majority of his countrymen and women. Although he was persistent, he was not unpleasant. Although he spoke his mind, fearlessly and with conviction, he did not fail to persuade. Many of us will miss him and the leadership he represented.

But perhaps this is not the time for tears and the beating of breasts although Johnny is irreplaceable in our hearts and minds, but rather, as the elders say, it is time to contemplate his love, industry, commitment and struggle against injustice and to commit ourselves to the cause to which he devoted his energies and for which he was martyred.

It is an irony of fate that Johnny should die in the middle of the Assembly's consideration of the agenda item on the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa. To the African National Congress, to his family in South Africa, and to the overwhelming majority of South Africans, who saw eye to eye with Johnny Makatini, all members of the African Group, as indeed I trust all Members of the Assembly, would like today to extend their condolences and to ask that all of us follow in the footsteps of Johnny Makatini until the hateful system of apartheid is eradicated thus guaranteeing that people like Johnstone Mfanafuthi Makatini will no longer die because of apartheid.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Allow me, Sir, to express my concurrence with the words you have just spoken in memory of one who was a friend of all of us in the General Assembly and of peoples struggling for peace.

The Assembly will now take action on the various draft resolutions before it. We have a long list of countries that have added their names as sponsors of the various draft resolutions that we are considering. They are: A/43/L.30/Rev.1, Bangladesh, the Philippines, Senegal, Somalia, Trinidad and Tobago; A/43/L.31

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

and Corr.1, the Philippines, Somalia, Trinidad and Tobago and Viet Nam; A/43/L.32 and Corr.1, Somalia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; A/43/L.33 and Corr.1, the Philippines, Somalia, Trinidad and Tobago and Viet Nam; A/43/L.34 and Corr.1, Somalia and Viet Nam; A/43/L.35 and Corr.1, the Philippines, Somalia, Trinidad and Tobago and Viet Nam; A/43/L.36 and Corr.1, the Philippines, Somalia, Trinidad and Tobago and Viet Nam; A/43/L.37 and Corr.1, the Philippines, Trinidad and Tobago and Zaire; A/43/L.38, Antigua and Barbuda, Bangladesh, the Philippines, Senegal and Somalia; A/43/L.41, Albania, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia, the Syrian Arab Republic, Senegal, Somalia, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela and Viet Nam; A/43/L.42, Cuba, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Philippines, Senegal, Somalia and Trinidad and Tobago.

(The President)

The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of these draft resolutions has been issued in document A/43/901 and Corr.1. I have been informed that, in adopting draft resolutions A/43/L.30/Rev.1, L.32 and Corr.1 to L.36 and Corr.1 and L.41 on the basis of the report of the Fifth Committee (A/43/901 and Corr.1), the General Assembly would authorize the Secretary-General to fulfil the mandate contained in those draft resolutions.

The Secretary-General has informed me that he would make every effort to absorb the expenditures of \$57,000 and \$88,700 in sections 3 and 27 respectively of the 1988-1989 programme budget, on the understanding that the actual financial requirements for implementing those resolutions would be contained in the implementation report.

The General Assembly will now begin the voting process. We shall first take a decision on draft resolution A/43/L.30/Rev.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, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, 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, 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, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden

Draft resolution A/43/L.30/Rev.1 was adopted by 131 votes to 3, with 21 abstentions (resolution 43/50 A).*

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): We turn now to draft resolution A/43/L.31 and Corr.1, entitled "Military collaboration with South Africa".

A recorded vote has been requested.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, 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, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, 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, 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: Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/43/L.31 and Corr.1 was adopted by 123 votes to 2, with 29 abstentions (resolution 43/50 B).*

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): We shall now take up draft resolution A/43/L.32 and Corr.1, entitled "Comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa".

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

A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the words

"and, particularly, Japan, which recently emerged as the most important trading partner of South Africa"

in operative paragraph 3. If there is no objection to that request I shall put those words to the vote first.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bhutan, Burma, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Gambia, Guyana, Jamaica, Lebanon, Malawi, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire

The words "and, particularly, Japan, which recently emerged as the most important trading partner of South Africa" were retained by 50 votes to 41, with 43 abstentions.*

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): A separate, recorded vote has also been requested on operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/43/L.32 and Corr.1. If there is no objection we shall proceed accordingly.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Fiji, Honduras, Lebanon, Lesotho, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Mauritius, Niger, Oman, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Singapore, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Uruguay

Operative paragraph 6 was retained by 82 votes to 27, with 31 abstentions.*

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

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I now put to the vote draft resolution A/43/L.32 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, 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, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, 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, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bhutan, Botswana, Denmark, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Lesotho, Malawi, Malta, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden

Draft resolution A/43/L.32 and Corr.1, as a whole, was adopted by 123 votes to 12, with 19 abstentions (resolution 43/50 C).*

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

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will take a decision next on draft resolution A/43/L.33 and Corr.1, entitled "Imposition, co-ordination and strict monitoring of measures against racist South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, 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, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, 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, 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, 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, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Equatorial Guinea, France, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, Spain

Draft resolution A/43/L.33 and Corr.1 was adopted by 136 votes to 4, with 14 abstentions (resolution 43/50 D).*

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

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): We turn next to draft resolution A/43/L.34 and Corr.1, entitled "Relations between South Africa and Israel". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, 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, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, 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, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, 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, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Belize, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Grenada, Honduras, Japan, Lesotho, Malawi, Malta, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Uruguay, Zaire

Draft resolution A/43/L.34 and Corr.1 was adopted by 106 votes to 23, with 26 abstentions (resolution 43/50 E).*

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

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/43/L.35 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, Canada, 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, 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, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

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

Draft resolution A/43/L.35 and Corr.1 was adopted by 144 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions (resolution 43/50 F).*

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

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will next take a decision on draft resolution A/43/L.36 and Corr.1, entitled "Special session of the General Assembly on apartheid and its destructive consequences in southern Africa".

May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt that draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/43/L.36 and Corr.1 was adopted (resolution 43/50 G).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): We turn now to draft resolution A/43/L.37 and Corr.1, entitled "Dissemination of information against the policies of apartheid of the régime of racist 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, Côte d'Ivoire, 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, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, 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:

United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/43/L.37 and Corr.1 was adopted by 132 votes to 1, with 21 abstentions (resolution 43/50 H).*

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): We turn next to draft resolution A/43/L.38, entitled "United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa".

May I take it that the General Assembly decides to adopt this draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/43/L.38 was adopted (resolution 43/50 I).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will next take a decision on draft resolution A/43/L.41, 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, 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, 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,

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

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

Abstaining: Belgium, Botswana, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Israel, Japan, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, Portugal, Swaziland

Draft resolution A/43/L.41 was adopted by 138 votes to 2, with 14 abstentions (resolution 43/50 J)*.

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

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/43/L.42, 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, Côte d'Ivoire, 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, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, 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, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Germany, Federal Republic of, Portugal

Draft resolution A/43/L.42 was adopted by 149 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions (resolution 43/50 K).*

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

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Dame Ann HERCUS (New Zealand): The New Zealand Government agrees with a good deal in the draft resolutions brought before the Assembly today. We were pleased to be able to co-sponsor two of the texts and to support six in all. I must, however, place on record our continued reservations with some aspects of the texts just adopted.

My delegation was pleased to support draft resolution A/43/L.33 and Corr.1 as a result of amendments made to the text this year. In respect of operative paragraphs 1 and 2, I wish however to note my Government's position that it is for individual Governments alone to determine the nature of the "appropriate measures" which should be undertaken consistent with this resolution. These need not necessarily be of a legislative nature.

My delegation was not able to support draft resolution A/43/L.30/Rev.1. As we have noted at previous sessions, we are unable to accept an endorsement of the use of force in a manner inconsistent with the United Nations Charter. Accordingly, the reference to armed struggle in operative paragraph 2 prevented us from supporting this draft resolution. New Zealand abhors the use of violence and fervently hopes that an end to apartheid will come about without resort to armed struggle. We understand and sympathize, however, with the frustration of those who themselves face violent repression in pursuit of their struggle for a just and democratic South Africa. The South African Government itself has encouraged violence in that country by making virtually all peaceful protest illegal. We consider the repressive policies of the South African Government beyond justification.

Mr. THEPPITAK (Thailand): My delegation would like to explain its vote on the part of operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/43/L.32 and Corr.1 that was put to a separate vote. Our abstention was based on a matter of principle. We cannot support the singling out of Japan in this connection when several other countries could be cited as well. Our abstention does not mean that we oppose the call for all those countries that have trade relations with South Africa to sever their trade relations, as called for in operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/43/L.32 and Corr.1. In fact, we share the view of the international community that trade relations with South Africa, direct or indirect, prolong the inhuman apartheid system.

Mr. BORG OLIVIER (Malta): Malta supported seven of the draft resolutions relating to item 36. My delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A/43/L.33 and Corr.1, A/43/L.35 and Corr.1, A/43/L.36 and Corr.1, A/43/L.37 and Corr.1, A/43/L.41 and A/43/L.42, and we are proud to be listed among the sponsors of draft resolution A/43/L.38, which was adopted without a vote.

I should now like to explain my Government's position on draft resolutions A/43/L.30/Rev.1, A/43/L.31 and Corr.1, A/43/L.32 and Corr.1 and A/43/L.34 and Corr.1.

Malta abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/43/L.30/Rev.1, entitled "International solidarity with the liberation struggle in South Africa". 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 fully committed to their total and immediate eradication. We are determined to support effective measures, including increasing international pressure to bring about the elimination of these policies, which are universally condemned. We also give our full support to the front-line States. We understand that people may have no

(Mr. Borg Olivier, Malta)

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 this. In line with its declared policy of contributing to peaceful solutions of international disputes, renouncing violence and war as instruments of policy, we have with great reluctance abstained on draft resolution A/43/L.30/Rev.1 even though we agree with most of the provisions contained in it.

My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/43/L.31 and Corr.1, entitled "Military collaboration with South Africa", and on draft resolution A/43/L.32 and Corr.1, entitled "Comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa". The reason for our abstention is the singling out of individual States by name in these texts. As we have stated on many occasions, Malta does not support this practice.

Finally, the delegation of Malta abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/43/L.34 and Corr.1, entitled "Relations between South Africa and Israel. 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 these 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 this draft resolution.

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

(Mr. Freudenschuss, Austria)

For these reasons, we find ourselves in agreement with the general thrust of the texts submitted under this item. 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.

(Mr. Freudenschuss, Austria)

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. Therefore, we cannot support the concept of armed struggle since we firmly believe in the resolution of conflicts exclusively by peaceful means. We should also like to reiterate that, as a matter of principle, Austria is against singling out Member States in General Assembly resolutions. In our view this practice does not promote the cause of the oppressed people in 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 those considerations Austria has sponsored draft resolutions A/43/L.38 and L.42. Furthermore, we have voted in favour of A/43/L.35 and Corr.1, L.36 and Corr.1 and L.41. Austria has abstained on A/43/L.30/Rev.1, L.31 and Corr.1, L.32 and Corr.1, L.33 and Corr.1 and L.37 and Corr.1, and has cast a negative vote on A/43/L.34 and Corr.1 for the reasons stated.

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.

Ms. WICKES (Australia): The Australian Government's continued and implacable opposition to apartheid was made abundantly clear in our statement in the plenary meeting last Wednesday. We have sponsored two of the resolutions before us and have endeavoured to be as forthcoming as possible on others. While we support the broad thrust of most of the texts, our support should not be construed as an agreement to all the elements contained in them. For example, we retain our well-known reservations with respect to the legitimacy of armed

*Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Ms. Wickes, Australia)

struggle, the Convention against Apartheid in Sport and the selective singling out of particular Member States in resolutions.

Australia's support for, and current application of, sanctions was set out in our statement last Wednesday. We believe that for such sanctions to be effective they must be broadly applied by the whole international community, including South Africa's major trading partners. Pending such sanctions, Australia has taken a range of measures which include most of those set out in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/43/L.33 and Corr.1, a resolution which we have just supported, but I should point out that the Australian Government is not at this stage considering extending its measures to include bans on the import of all minerals or to include sea links or other transport connections with South Africa.

My delegation found itself unable to vote in favour of draft resolution A/43/L.37 and Corr.1. While we fully support the aim of disseminating information about apartheid, we are concerned with the thrust of the resolution which criticizes the running of the Department of Public Information and calls, without any consideration of priority-setting, for more resources for programmes to combat apartheid. These issues run to the heart of efforts to encourage administrative reform and priority-setting.

Our continuing support for the broad thrust of the resolutions just adopted reflects my Government's belief that we must continue to send a clear and unmistakable message to South Africa that its apartheid policies cannot and will not be tolerated by the international community.

Mr. YORO (Côte d'Ivoire) (interpretation from French): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/43/L.34 and Corr.1, relating to relations between South Africa and Israel, because of the selective nature of its

(Mr. Yoro, Côte d'Ivoire)

content, but we voted in support of all the other draft resolutions under agenda item 36, because those resolutions are geared to the objective to which we all aspire, namely, the dismantling of apartheid in South Africa.

However, we should like to emphasize that the votes that we have just cast should in no circumstances be interpreted as challenging the policy of dialogue defined and practised by President Felix Houphouët-Boigny, President of Côte d'Ivoire for some 20 years.

Mr. INSANALLY (Guyana): The Government of Guyana is fully committed to all endeavours by the United Nations to bring maximum pressure to bear on South Africa. We are convinced that it is only through such concerned international action that the racist régime in Pretoria will be forced from its fortress of apartheid and made to relinquish its cruel rule over the South African people. We have accordingly supported all the resolutions before us, including draft resolution A/43/L.32 and Corr.1, dealing with comprehensive mandatory sanctions.

However, I should like to explain why we abstained in the recorded vote on paragraph 3 of the last-mentioned resolution. As a member of the Commonwealth Committee of Foreign Ministers on South Africa, Guyana is actively involved, along with the other members, in the task of promoting the widening, tightening and intensification of economic and other sanctions against South Africa. An interim report submitted to the Committee at its last meeting in Toronto concluded that trade sanctions are having a discernible impact on South Africa, that its economy is coming under pressure, and that the impact of sanctions will be enhanced if the sanctions themselves are more widely adopted and their application intensified and tightened.

In the light of that conclusion, the Committee agreed that a serious diplomatic campaign should be mounted to persuade those countries which are still engaged in significant trade with South Africa that such unhelpful relations must

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

be completely severed. To that end, an action plan was agreed upon for individual and concerted démarches on States which have so far not adopted Commonwealth measures or whose trade practices in relation to South Africa are diminishing the impact of Commonwealth sanctions.

As far as we know, that diplomatic dialogue is currently in progress, offering hope of a positive response from the Governments concerned. At this stage, therefore, my delegation would not wish to do anything which might prejudice that effort by discouraging the prospects of expanded co-operation. We should therefore prefer to refrain, at least on this occasion, from singling out a particular State for dishonourable mention.

Our abstention is therefore no more than a gesture of encouragement to those Governments which profess their intention to heed the call for stricter measures against the Pretoria régime to do so as quickly as possible. The international community will not be satisfied with anything less than a total prohibition of trade with South Africa. A clear message must be given to those who exploit apartheid that they will receive no comfort from civilized nations, which are opposed to their policies. We have conveyed this by voting for all the draft resolutions, and particularly for draft resolution A/43/L.32 and Corr.1.

I should like to conclude by saying how sad we are to have learned this morning of the untimely death of John Makatini, a valiant and untiring soldier in the fight against apartheid. We shall certainly miss his familiar face here at the United Nations.

Mr. McDONAGH (Ireland): Ireland shares the views expressed by the representative of Greece in his statement on behalf of the 12 Member States of the European Community.

(Mr. McDonagh, Ireland)

Ireland's condemnation of the policy of apartheid was most recently expressed in the statement which we delivered during the debate. In keeping with the views set out in that statement, Ireland supported five of the resolutions before us today, two of which we sponsored.

(Mr. McDonagh, Ireland)

We abstained on five of the draft resolutions and voted against one.

We voted in favour of A/43/L.35, on the programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid. We strongly support the work of the Special Committee. I should add, of course, that 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, outlined in our statements made in this Assembly.

Ireland voted in favour of A/43/L.41, which deals with the question of an oil embargo against South Africa. My Government has for many years favoured the imposition by the Security Council of a mandatory oil embargo against South Africa.

Ireland sponsored draft resolution A/43/L.42, 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 A/43/L.38, on the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa.

Ireland abstained on draft resolution A/43/L.30, which calls for international solidarity with the liberation struggle in South Africa. We should have liked to vote in favour of that draft resolution as it contains many provisions which we support. However, we cannot accept the reference to armed struggle. My delegation has made it clear in the past that we do not wish to see this Assembly endorse violence.

Ireland abstained on draft resolution A/43/L.31, on military collaboration with South Africa. We fully support the Security Council arms embargo but none the less do not believe it appropriate to single out in a selective way the names of certain States as is done in this draft resolution.

(Mr. McDonagh, Ireland)

Ireland decided to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/43/L.32, which calls for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa. We support the application by the Security Council of a range of mandatory sanctions against South Africa. We believe, however, 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 should be mandatory - that is, imposed by the Security Council and fully implemented by all. I should also add that the encouragement given in this draft resolution to States to ratify the International Convention against Apartheid in Sports poses difficulties for us. The International Convention unfortunately contains a number of provisions which are incompatible with Ireland's Constitution.

Ireland abstained on draft resolution A/43/L.33, on the imposition and co-ordination of measures against South Africa. We agree with the broad thrust of the draft resolution but certain of its formulations and elements cause us difficulties.

We abstained on draft resolution A/43/L.37, on the dissemination of information against the policies of apartheid. We believe that the prerogatives of the Secretary-General regarding staff recruitment must be respected. We cannot accept an undermining of the consensus agreed earlier this year in the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination regarding restructuring and staffing levels.

As in previous years, Ireland voted against draft resolution A/43/L.34, on relations between Israel and South Africa, in view of its selective singling out of one member State of this Assembly for condemnation.

Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish):

Costa Rica joins in the expressions of sympathy at the death of Mr. Johnny Makatini, who, as we have heard from the representative of Ghana, was a

(Mrs. Castro de Barish, Costa Rica)

signal defender of the South African people and a tireless worker for the eradication of apartheid.

The firm position of Costa Rica against the policies of apartheid of the South African Government goes back to the beginning of the consideration of this important item. Our delegation has participated from the outset - for eight years, in the Special Committee against Apartheid, of which Costa Rica was for several years a Vice-Chairman.

Our rejection of the pernicious system of apartheid has been reiterated in every forum where that harmful and hateful policy has been considered, and we have supported the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter as an appropriate, effective and peaceful means of putting an end to apartheid. My delegation lent its support to draft resolution A/43/L.30/Rev.1 with the same interest and solidarity with which it has supported other draft resolutions on agenda item 36. Nevertheless, Costa Rica reiterates what it has said many times in other forums and in this Assembly: that we cannot support a reference to armed struggle in a General Assembly resolution. Costa Rica prefers the peaceful means provided by the United Nations Charter for the attainment of goals of such deep interest to all Members of the Organization. Time is increasingly teaching us that those means are much more effective than armed struggle.

My delegation also supported draft resolution A/43.L.31, on military collaboration with South Africa, and we concur that full implementation of an arms embargo against South Africa is an essential element of international action against apartheid. Nevertheless we regret the following selective wording in paragraph 1: "in particular, certain Western States and Israel". We expressly reserve our position on that phrase because, as we have said, we do not subscribe

(Mrs. Castro de Barish, Costa Rica)

to selective references to Member States, which are discriminatory and do not strengthen but rather weaken the effect of texts, since it is clear that without such selective references draft resolutions would receive much broader and more significant support from the General Assembly and thus send a stronger, more effective message to the Pretoria régime.

With regard to draft resolution A/43/L.32, we have supported this draft as a whole again this year because we agree with what it says on comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa. However, we have reservations on paragraph 3, which singles out one country, Japan. We do not agree that resolutions should selectively refer to certain countries. For that reason we voted against the phrase "and, particularly, Japan, which recently emerged as the most important trading partner of South Africa". We believe that without that phrase paragraph 3 might have been more effective in calling upon those States which have increased their trade with South Africa to sever trade relations with that country. We regret the retention of the phrase. We voted in favour of the draft resolution to reaffirm that apartheid is a crime of lèse-humanité and a threat to international peace and security. We share the view that it is the responsibility of the international community to contribute to the efforts of the United Nations to eliminate apartheid without further delay.

Finally, we were obliged to abstain on draft resolution A/43/L.34, entitled "Relations between South Africa and Israel", which also expresses a selective point of view, because we do not believe Israel to be the only country that maintains relations with South Africa and we feel that the adoption of a draft resolution singling out that country is unjustified.

As always, we voted in favour of the other draft resolutions on this item. We shall continue supporting all efforts by the United Nations to eradicate apartheid.

Mr. DA COSTA PEREIRA (Portugal): The Permanent Representative of Greece has already expressed the common views of the 12 member States of the European Community on the draft resolutions just adopted regarding the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa.

(Mr. Da Costa Pereira, Portugal)

Portugal has denounced and condemned, not only in the United Nations but also in other forums the immorality and injustice which are the main features of the apartheid and bantustanization systems aimed at the perpetuation of political, economic, social and cultural discrimination, which is at the root of the continuing worsening of the internal situation in that country. The South African Government must embark once and for all on a sincere effort to establish a dialogue with all the different communities in its country, in order to make the Republic of South Africa a multiracial and democratic society. Only the elimination of the oppressive system of apartheid will make possible the climate of confidence which South Africa needs in order to establish genuine political stability, so essential to the normal development of all the countries of the region.

My delegation was not able to support all the draft resolutions. Although we concur with the thrust of many of their essential proposals, we still have reservations of principle regarding certain aspects of them. For instance, we do not agree that United Nations draft resolutions, such as draft resolution A/43/L.30 and Corr.1, should endorse violence, whatever its form, as being the only choice in redressing situations of injustice. On the contrary, they should rather encourage the preservation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations for the peaceful settlement of conflicts.

Furthermore, we believe that the isolation of South Africa would only hamper the initiatives of all those who are fighting inside the country for fundamental reforms in the prison system. We also cannot support verbal violence and certain discriminatory references for the total isolation of South Africa, including provisions to sever all air, sea and other transport links with South Africa, as contained in draft resolution A/43/L.33 and Corr.1.

(Mr. Da Costa Pereira, Portugal)

My delegation abstained on the draft resolution on concerted international action for the elimination of apartheid. We would like to stress that we cannot endorse some of the formulations in its preambular and operative parts, such as, the introduction of the ninth preambular paragraph. We do not believe that the most effective way to dismantle apartheid and help the people of South Africa is to impose comprehensive economic sanctions. We sincerely believe that only world-wide consensus can be the basis for effective international pressure to restore to the majority of the South African population its legitimate rights.

Mr. AMORIN (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/43/L.31 and Corr.1, on military collaboration with South Africa, because we share the view that a closely co-ordinated effort is needed to apply the arms embargo on South Africa under Security Council resolution 418 (1977).

However, my delegation wishes once again to express our opposition to the practice of singling out States for their conduct as being discriminatory and not contributing to our aims in this case, the strict implementation of the arms embargo imposed on South Africa. This singling out of countries does not promote the kind of international consensus necessary for the co-ordinated action needed to bring about the elimination of apartheid. Accordingly, we believe that all Member States have a responsibility to implement the measures provided for.

In conformity with this position, had there been a separate vote on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/43/L.31 and Corr.1, my delegation would have abstained.

Mr. GARBA (Nigeria): Once again the member States of the Organization have cast their votes on the draft resolutions just adopted. I believe that the people of South Africa now know, if they did not know before, who their true friends are.

Last year, the Special Committee against Apartheid took great pains to make both its report and its draft resolutions palatable. I now believe that the struggle in southern Africa is a universal struggle. It was heartening that many delegations took note of this and, indeed, praised the efforts of the Special Committee. This appreciation, however, was not translated into positive votes, with the exception of a few cases. This year the sponsors of the various draft resolutions tried to retain the same format and approach to the draft resolutions. We are therefore surprised and frustrated at some of the voting patterns we have noticed this year.

The Special Committee will study the results of the voting and the explanations proffered so far. At this stage, however, I feel that, speaking on behalf of the sponsors, we are rather disappointed, because some of the explanations had more to do with semantics than substance. I am, however, pleased to see the continued support of the Nordic countries, Canada, New Zealand and Australia for draft resolution A/43/L.33 and Corr.1. We appreciate their shift from last year's abstention to a positive vote on a draft resolution to which the Special Committee pays particular attention. We also note with satisfaction that the General Assembly has decided by consensus to hold a special session next September on apartheid. We similarly note the abstentions of France and the Federal Republic of Germany on the draft resolutions on an oil embargo.

We have noted also the explanation provided by the President of the General Assembly concerning the financial implications of draft resolutions A/43/L.30 and

(Mr. Garba, Nigeria)

Corr.1, L.32 and Corr.1 to L.36 and Corr.1, and L.41, according to which the Secretary-General will make every effort to absorb the expenditure of \$57,000 relating to the hearings on an oil embargo and \$88,000 relating to information activities of the Department of Public Information. According to the statement of the President, the Secretary-General, in accordance with standard practice, will report the actual financial requirements for the implementation of these draft resolutions in the final performance report.

At this point, let me say a few words on the question of name-calling, which we continue to hear about year after year. If the Special Committee has consistently mentioned various countries, particularly the United States and the United Kingdom, it is because of their stand in the Security Council on the question of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions. We have not in any way condemned them. On the contrary, we are appealing to them to change their policies and join the international community on the imposition of sanctions. Indeed, as the Committee did last year, we sent a copy of our report and the draft resolutions before their adoption to the permanent members of the Security Council with a view to obtaining their comments, if any, before a vote was taken.

(Mr. Garba, Nigeria)

Apart from the United Kingdom, none of them deigned even to acknowledge receipt of the report, so it is rather surprising to come here and be accused of using extravagant language and so on.

Let me say a few words about Japan's request for a separate vote on one of the paragraphs. Japan has become the primary trading partner of South Africa. That is why it is mentioned. We have not condemned Japan, and I hope that next year its name will not be mentioned, given the recent efforts of the Japanese Government. But let me make it clear that a slight reduction in trade figures - figures that are contestable - or the appreciation of a currency does not excuse any country doing business with South Africa. We will continue to point this out to the General Assembly and to ask it for support in trying to stop these dealings with South Africa.

Lastly, on behalf of the Special Committee, I should like to express our deepest condolences to the African National Congress and to the family of Mr. Johnny Makatini, who passed away at the weekend. Mr. Makatini, a dear comrade and friend, worked closely with the Special Committee against Apartheid in his capacity as Director of the Department of International Affairs of the ANC. We shall remember him as a colleague and friend whose convictions led him to work tirelessly for the freedom of his country and for the realization of the vision of a non-racial and democratic South Africa.

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken by the General Assembly at its third plenary meeting, held on 23 September 1988, I now call upon the representative of the African National Congress of South Africa.

Mr. MAFOLE (African National Congress of South Africa (ANC)): In its intervention during the debate on agenda item 36 - policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa - the delegation of the African National Congress (ANC) stated that for the ANC and for the people of South Africa the debate should not be

(Mr. Mafole, ANC)

seen as a purely routine General Assembly matter, that the oppressed people of South Africa were looking to these deliberations with high expectations, the question uppermost in their minds being whether the peoples of the world, gathered here, can match their proclaimed abhorrence of apartheid with serious and concerted action to eliminate apartheid.

We have now gone through the voting process, and I think there are very good lessons to be drawn from the exercise. We may say that to some extent the voting has vindicated the position of the international community - namely, wholesale condemnation of apartheid. We can say that the voting pattern has underlined general agreement in the international community on the need to eliminate apartheid. We think that this is very important, particularly at a time when the Pretoria régime has been making serious efforts to project itself as a reformer and is thereby seeking to divert the attention of the international community from its actions inside South Africa. We therefore wish to thank very sincerely all those delegations that have voted for these resolutions. We want to register our deepest appreciation of this act of solidarity.

We should like, however, to note with grave concern that some countries have not seen their way to vote in favour of all the draft resolutions presented to the Assembly. We note that in a number of cases the negative vote was prompted by the desire to continue to profit from apartheid. We think that this is highly unfortunate. It is unfortunate because it is likely to give the wrong signals to the apartheid régime. But, more important, this reluctance by some Member States tends to weaken the efforts of the international community to act decisively in the struggle to destroy apartheid.

During the explanations of vote, a number of delegations expressed their reservations concerning the references to armed struggle. Permit me to address this question, even if very briefly. For many years the oppressed people of South

(Mr. Mafole, ANC)

Africa have been told to abandon armed struggle. We are told that the way forward, the way towards change in South Africa, is through dialogue. We should like to reiterate here that the ANC, as a matter of principle, has never been opposed to dialogue. Indeed, for almost 50 years of its history the ANC has not only advocated peaceful struggle against racial oppression but also, throughout this period, suffered tremendously at the hands of the régime's repressive machinery. It was only when the apartheid régime arbitrarily closed all avenues of peaceful agitation by declaring the ANC and other organizations illegal that the ANC turned to other means of struggle, including armed struggle.

We contend that this is not an exceptional case. Indeed, history abounds with evidence of countries that were born as a result of having embarked successfully on armed struggle. The history of the United States is a typical example. But as that is fairly deep in history, and as memories are inclined to fade, we should like to remind the Assembly that we are very proud that participating in this debate as members of the international community are a number of countries that embarked successfully on armed struggle for independence.

The South African régime has continued to slam the door on peaceful forms of struggle. Only in February this year a number of organizations - democratic, peaceful organizations - were outlawed. In this way the régime was stressing that it was prepared to sit down and have discussions with the oppressed majority of South Africa. In these circumstances the people of South Africa never cease to be amazed at the lectures that we continue to receive from some sectors about the virtues of peaceful struggle. It is beyond us to understand how we can be expected to use democratic methods when we as the majority have been excluded from the democratic process. This we cannot understand, and this we shall seek to explain each year, every year, at all times, to the members of the international community so that they may understand and empathize with the people of South Africa.

(Mr. Mafole, ANC)

Allow me, on behalf of the National Executive Committee of the ANC and on behalf of the bereaved family of Mr. Johnny Makatini, to place on record sincere gratitude for the words of condolence expressed by the Ambassador of Ghana, on behalf of the African Group, and also the words of encouragement from the Ambassador of Zimbabwe and from many others, including the President of the General Assembly. Allow me also to take this opportunity to thank the international community for all the assistance it has given to the people of South Africa and to pledge that we shall continue the struggle until victory is achieved. This, in our view, will be the best tribute that the African National Congress can pay to the memory of Mr. Johnny Makatini and all the fallen heroes in our struggle.

The PRESIDENT: I now call on those delegations wishing 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 intervention and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Count YORK von WARTENBURG (Federal Republic of Germany): Last Tuesday, in his statement on agenda item 36, the Ambassador of Ghana referred to the alleged sale of blueprints for submarines to South Africa and attacked my country's foreign policy directly, with allegations that we can only deeply regret and that surprise us all the more as the Federal Republic of Germany sees itself as in the fortunate position of maintaining friendly and excellent relations with Ghana.

In his statement, Ambassador Gbeho said:

"We regret to have to say that the transaction has called into question the credibility of the foreign policy of a country which is so close to us".

(A/43/PV.63, p. 11)

We are under the impression that Ghana generally does not have any problems with the credibility of our foreign policy and we have proceeded to date on the assumption that that also applies to the Ghanaian delegation in New York. We sincerely hope, therefore, that the Ghanaian delegation in New York will accord due importance to official information provided by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany instead of relying on other sources of information.

Once again, I should like to state that all allegations according to which the supply of blueprints for submarines to South Africa was approved by my Government are completely devoid of any foundation.

There can be no question that the authorities called upon to do so under the constitution of the Federal Republic of Germany are conducting intensive

(Count York von Wartenburg, Federal
Republic of Germany)

investigations into any alleged illegal transaction falling under the arms embargo. We can but hope that in other countries, too, allegations of illegal actions will be investigated in the same intensive and thorough manner.

Miss AL-MULLA (Kuwait): It was with deep sorrow that my delegation learned of the untimely death of our colleague, Johnny Makatini. Kuwait should like to express its condolences to the people of South Africa and to the African National Congress. We have known him in our midst to be an energetic personality ever struggling for justice, truth and freedom. We promise him our continued support and solidarity in that endeavour.

To borrow a description by the representative of Zimbabwe, the statement by the Israeli delegation last Wednesday is like "air pollution". The reference the Israeli delegation made to the question of an oil embargo lacks both accuracy and sincerity. That delegation alleges that its information on oil shipments to South Africa is based on data provided by the Shipping Research Bureau.

The last time the Israeli delegation prepared a report on the subject, the Shipping Research Bureau found fault with it. The Israeli delegation might explain to the Assembly why the Bureau concluded that the report "shows a large number of misrepresentations and inaccuracies". True to its distorted view of the struggle against apartheid, the position of the Israeli delegation lacks sincerity. If it is so concerned about the ability of South Africa to obtain oil, it might explain first the nature of mixed-cargo vessels, some of which call between South Africa and Israel. It might explain, secondly, why it chose to abstain on draft resolution A/43/L.41. It might explain why it is even trailing behind some Western countries that have adopted more effective measures against apartheid. It might explain why it chose to vote against three and to abstain on five of the 11 draft resolutions presented this morning.

(Miss Al-Mulla, Kuwait)

I shall now address the reference made by the Israeli delegation to the intergovernmental group that monitors the supply and shipment of oil to South Africa.

In its reference, the Israeli delegation said that the report of the group singles out Arab countries' complicity in oil shipments to South Africa. On behalf of the members of the group, I should like to state that, far from being true, the reference distorts the content of the report and the very nature of the group's work. The group communicates with Governments on the basis of information on alleged violations of the embargo. The alleged violation involves not only the exporter but the transporter and the trader. Investigation is then begun. It is the communication between the group and the delegations concerned that is reflected in the report. It is the co-operation of States with the group that is helping the enforcement of the oil embargo, rather than allegations of the sort that the Assembly was subjected to.

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): My delegation has listened with rapt attention to and taken note of the right of reply just exercised by the Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany. In his statement, the Ambassador asked me to accord importance to the official information provided by his Government on the delicate question of the supply of blueprints of a naval submarine to the Government of South Africa.

Of course, my delegation does accord importance to information given by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany. But I hope it is understood that we reserve the right to draw our own conclusions from the important pieces of information given.

In any case, if the Parliament of the Federal Republic of Germany finds it necessary to order an enquiry into the affair after the Government of the Federal

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

Republic of Germany's information was provided, perhaps it is not surprising that the Ghana delegation finds itself on the same side as the Bundestag.

While I am generally in sympathy with the statement made by my colleague from the Federal Republic of Germany, I wish to clarify to him and to his delegation that there is no difference in the perception and policies of the Government of Ghana and the Ghana delegation in New York, and that what I have said about the involvement of his Government in the transaction represents not only the conviction of my delegation and my Government, but also the conviction of the people of Ghana. It is therefore with the undisputed authority of the Ghana Government that my delegation speaks in this forum.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

We are not unimpressed by the continuation of intensive investigations with regard to the sale of blueprints, to the extent that it evinces a desire for absolution on the part of the Federal Government in what can only be described as an unfortunate event. From a country with such influence we can expect and demand only the highest standards of credence and forthrightness in matters as important as the arms embargo imposed against South Africa by no less a body than the Security Council. Of course we are hopeful that the assurances given as to thorough investigations being conducted are a statement reflecting not the sentiments of the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany but Federal Government policy in a matter of considerable importance to the Government of Ghana.

The PRESIDENT: In connection with this agenda item, I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Assembly to resolution 34/93 R of 17 December 1979, whereby the President, in consultation with the Chairmen of the regional groups, is requested to expand the membership of the Special Committee against Apartheid.

Pursuant to consultations with the Chairmen of regional groups I have appointed Zimbabwe a member of the Special Committee. May I take it that the Assembly takes note of the appointment?

It was so decided.

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

Mr. LUKABU KHABOUJI N'ZAJI (Zaire) (interpretation from French): It is not a point of order, Sir, but I wanted to make a statement in connection with the decision you have just announced to expand the Special Committee against Apartheid.

The PRESIDENT: I am sorry, but the Assembly has already taken a decision on that matter. I advise the representative of Zaire to find other ways of expressing his thoughts on this subject.

The Assembly has concluded its consideration of agenda item 36.

AGENDA ITEM 40

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

- (a) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/43/272, A/43/683, A/43/691, A/43/867)
- (b) DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/43/L.44 to A/43/L.46)

The PRESIDENT: In connection with the item entitled "The situation in the Middle East", three draft resolutions have been issued (A/43/L.44 to L.46).

I should like to propose that the list of speakers in the debate on this item be closed today at 4 p.m.

If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Assembly so decides.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I request those representatives wishing to participate in the debate to inscribe their names as soon as possible.

Mr. AL-SHAALI (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic): It is a privilege for me to speak today on behalf of the members of the League of Arab States.

The Assembly is meeting today to consider once again the problem of the Middle East in an international context which in the past year has undergone an important, qualitative change on account of the agreement reached between the two super-Powers and the peaceful settlement of a number of regional problems, including the Iraq-Iran problem, the Namibian problem and the problem of Afghanistan. There is no doubt that those significant positive developments would not have occurred had it not been for the genuine commitment of the two super-Powers to arriving at peaceful solutions to those acute crises. There is little need for me to say that the United Nations provided the required framework for mediation between the parties involved and the reconciliation of their points of view. In that connection I should like to pay tribute to the Secretary-General for his most sincere, sustained and commendable efforts. He played the part of a neutral

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

international mediator, bringing together conflicting parties, encouraging them to enter into dialogue and thereby creating an atmosphere of understanding conducive to trust and constructive negotiation.

I would say here that the United Nations alone cannot provide a solution to such regional conflicts unless two conditions are met: first, the parties to the conflict must be earnestly prepared to settle their differences through negotiation; secondly, there must be genuine co-ordination and understanding between the major Powers, especially the two super-Powers, on the need for a just solution taking into account the legitimate claims of the parties to the conflict. That is the philosophy underlying the Security Council. Indeed, the experience acquired by the founding fathers of the Organization led them to the conviction that peace and security could be achieved only if the two super-Powers sincerely co-operated to that end. That is also the philosophy underlying the theoretical framework of this international organization, which reaffirms the need for collective peace, because of interdependence between States, and which affirms that the subdivision of peace - in other words, the absence of peace in any given region - can only undermine world peace and stability.

That is why Article 1 of the United Nations Charter emphasizes the importance of adopting effective collective measures for the prevention of threats to the peace, including in particular acts of aggression and the denial of the right of peoples to self-determination. That is also why the Charter reaffirms principles such as justice, international legality and the settlement of conflicts by peaceful means such as negotiation, investigation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration and judicial settlement.*

*Mr. Van Lierop (Vanuatu), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab
Emirates)

Developments in international politics since 1945 indicate that the most serious threats to international peace and security have been posed by regional problems.

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

There are two reasons for this: first, the interests of the two super-Powers, which extend beyond their immediate zones of influence, and, secondly, the adverse impact of regional problems on international relations as a whole, particularly on East-West relations.

A source of concern to us, and to all those committed to international peace and security, is that the problem of the Middle East is the only problem still awaiting a solution despite the understanding between East and West and despite the progress made in respect of all other international problems. The main cause of this dangerous deadlock is Israel's rejection of the principle of peace and its denial of the principles of the Charter and international legalities as enshrined in the resolutions adopted by this international Organization and other regional bodies.

Israel can afford to behave in that manner, because it can count on unlimited military, moral, political and economic support from the United States. It is as though the destiny of that great Power were linked to Israeli expansionism and aggression; as though the entire world carried no weight against the exigencies of Israel's expansion and its aspiration to establish an empire without boundaries.

Israel is the enemy of peace, because of its doctrine of Zionism and the practices it carries on to further that doctrine, which embodies the worst elements of the colonialist settlement movements which afflicted the peoples of Asia and Africa, giving them an esoteric and metaphysical connotation derived from the Bible, and thus creating a policy firmly anchored in theology and not subject to discussion, change or negotiation.

After invading most of Palestine in 1948 and driving out the Palestinian people with the help of the colonial Powers, which promised it support and protection, Israel embarked upon its strategy of expansionism, domination and

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

political destabilization. That strategy extends beyond the borders of Palestine. It is aimed at establishing a broader zone of supremacy with a view to securing Zionist control over the Middle East and Africa, by strengthening the hold of Zionism in Palestine and broadening its zone of influence by military means and by lobbying in the major capitals.

Israel invaded the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, renaming them Judea and Samaria. It invaded the Syrian Golan Heights and annexed them. It invaded Lebanon several times and established it as a security belt. Israel attacks Lebanon on a daily basis, from sea, land and air, sowing discord there and destabilizing the country. In addition, it has carried out acts of aggression against Iraq, including the destruction of the nuclear power plant, and against Tunisia. Some Israeli leaders are threatening to seize the East Bank of the Jordan, which they regard as a part of the promised land.

Furthermore, Israel has become expert at piracy at sea. Its fleet intercepts commercial vessels and searches them in international waters. The department of air piracy in the Defence Ministry intercepts and hijacks civilian aircraft. Its secret services steal military secrets and spy even against its main ally, such as in the Pollard case.

In order to strengthen its domination, Israel has concluded an alliance with its ideological counterpart, the apartheid Government in South Africa. Together they have developed nuclear weapons and launchers; they have exchanged means and methods of repressing liberation movements and destabilizing neighbouring countries. This is not just a question of identity of views or military identity, but also of common strategic interests, because the apartheid régime regards Israel as a policeman who protects the northern part of Africa, and Israel regards the

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United
Arab Emirates)

apartheid régime as a policeman protecting the western side of Africa for the Zionists.

Last September Israel embarked upon the militarization of outer space when it launched the satellite OFUQ-I, which Youkan Nieman, the Director of the Israeli Space Agency said would strengthen the Israeli military system and its nuclear capacity, and supplement its long-range missiles, including its Jericho missiles, which are aimed at the Arab capitals and other parts of the world.

Israeli policy does not stop at that; Israel is also trying to prevent the development of the region by destroying civilizing influences. We should recall its attempt to paralyse Arab technological capability by killing Arab scientists, destroying Arab schools and institutes and indulging in an arms race which requires considerable resources, which the Arab countries could be using for development.

The neighbouring Arab countries are the primary victims of Zionism, but they are not the only ones, for Zionism, like Nazism, only feels secure when it is expanding and if all other States and peoples, near and far, live in insecurity and instability. It must be remembered that, as reported by Israel Shahak in the 18 November issue of Middle East International, Rabbim Ariel, one of the Yitshak Shamir's main advisers, had drawn up an Israeli atlas which included all of the islands of the Mediterranean, and that Shamir summoned him to his office to congratulate him. That was an example of Zionist mentality and its outlook as to the future.

An Arab strategy for peace was set forth in detail at the second Fez summit in 1982 and was reaffirmed by the subsequent Arab summits, notably at Algiers in November 1988. That strategy is based on the principle of a peaceful settlement through an international conference under the auspices of the United Nations, in

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United
Arab Emirates)

which all parties to the conflict would participate, including the PLO, with a view to arriving at a just and comprehensive solution based on Israeli withdrawal from all occupied Palestinian and Arab territories, which would give the Palestinian people their inalienable rights, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations.

Peace and security in the Middle East and in the world as a whole presuppose collective efforts and good faith. Unreserved support for one party to the detriment of another only strengthens the policy of invasion, violates the Charter and perpetuates the present unjust situation, which promises dangerous confrontation for the future.

Regrettably, another year has passed without a solution to the problem of the Middle East, a problem of missed opportunities. Dare we hope that 1989 will be the year of the solution of the Middle East problem? That will depend on many things, and primarily on the credibility of the policy that will be adopted by the new United States Administration.

Mr. SALAH (Jordan) (interpretation from Arabic): The General Assembly is today considering again, as has been its wont over the years, the agenda item entitled "The situation in the Middle East". As usual, that situation is fraught with tension and instability. The conflict in the region still awaits an appropriate peaceful solution.

Despite the many resolutions adopted by the United Nations on the Arab-Israeli conflict and the many plans and initiatives for peace and the settlement of the conflict, the situation in the Middle East continues to be dangerous. It is a situation that not only threatens the future of the region but also endangers the peace and security of the world.

Our having recourse again to the United Nations for a peaceful solution to this conflict is renewed proof that we are committed to the search for peace. It also bespeaks, on the one hand, our conviction that peace must be attained and, on the other, our confidence in the Organization and our belief that it will, as it must, shoulder its responsibilities in regard to the conflict.

The peoples and countries of the region have been deprived of peace and tranquillity for a long time. They have endured untold suffering and pain. It is high time that, like other peoples and countries of the world, they enjoyed peace, stability and security.

However, in order for them to exercise that right, a permanent and comprehensive peace settlement for the Arab-Israeli conflict, in all its aspects and dimensions, must be found.

Above all, the very core of the conflict - the question of Palestine - must be dealt with. The situation in the Middle East and the question of Palestine are so closely interrelated that it is extremely difficult to distinguish one from the other. Neither one nor the other can be solved separately. This is a major task and a grave responsibility, which calls for unrelenting, sincere efforts. It is no

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

exaggeration to say that such efforts must be made immediately. Each and every day that passes without bringing a peace settlement to the Middle East means a further complication of the situation and more suffering and tension.

The United Nations has had the situation in the Middle East before it for the past four decades. Indeed, the Palestinian cause was created in the Organization. As I have said, it is the core of the conflict in our region. In dealing with it, the General Assembly has established various subsidiary bodies to handle the question and its consequences - such as the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, investigating committees, observer groups and peace-keeping forces. It has also adopted many resolutions and exerted all kinds of efforts in the search for a settlement of the region's problems. Unfortunately, however, all this has not achieved the desired result: a permanent, peaceful and comprehensive solution. Unless we find such a solution, the Middle East will continue to be a threatened region and the United Nations will continue to be seized of the situation in the Middle East.

The United Nations and indeed the international community as a whole, particularly the major Powers, have a responsibility to work tirelessly and in concert to find a way out for the region from the vicious circle of violence and tension and put an end to its plight.

For a long time the Arab States have been expressing their desire for peace and their readiness to work for it. They formulated and proposed a practical peace plan through the Ara Fez Summit in 1982. That plan was reiterated by subsequent Arab Summits. Unfortunately, the peace plan was not implemented and the desired result was not achieved because of the intransigence of the other party to the Arab-Israeli conflict: Israel. There is no longer any need for proof of that. It is a clear enough fact. Israel has continued to challenge the will of the international community as reflected in United Nations resolutions. It persists in

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

its expansionist policies of aggression in an attempt to perpetuate its occupation of Arab territories. In so doing, it violates the rules of international law and flouts the resolutions of the United Nations. Israel is the party that adamantly opposes the international peace conference, which the international community unanimously regards as the appropriate means to reach a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Only one major Power condones Israel's rejection of the conference.

Israel's fears regarding the peace conference are unfounded. The aim of a conference that would be held under the auspices of the United Nations, and with the participation of the five permanent members of the Security Council, would be to achieve peace and guarantee security for all the States in the region.

It is neither possible nor practical for Israel to remain dependent on military might in response to Arab and international calls for peace. Weapons are no substitute for peace, nor can they guarantee the peace or tranquillity of Israel or any other State. Israel, by rejecting genuine peace within the framework of the international peace conference, which has gained the unanimous endorsement of the international community, proves that it has no desire for peace and no intention of accepting peace.

Israel's policies and practices over the past 21 years are proof enough of its intention to perpetuate its occupation and continue the subjugation of the population of the occupied Arab territories. It wants to ensure that Palestinian refugees remain dispersed as displaced persons in various parts of the world. Israel should not be allowed to achieve that goal.

We realize full well that Israel has broader ambitions in our region that exceed any of the gains it has achieved so far through military might derived from its privileged relationship with a major Power, the sympathy aroused by the

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

oppression suffered by the European Jews, and the attempts to exploit the conditions of the region in the worst possible way.

Israel believes, wrongly, that its present policy will eventually lead the international community to accept the fait accompli it wishes to impose. But that is absolutely contrary to human and international norms and will not be. It is an objective that cannot be achieved.

Our unwavering belief that the occupied territories must be recovered and the Palestinian people must be allowed to exercise their right to self-determination on their soil makes it imperative for us all to work constantly and in earnest towards that end.

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

The Palestinians have proved over the past year that the Israeli occupation, no matter how protracted, cannot be made acceptable in any shape or form. With their intifadah, the Palestinians have reaffirmed that their belief in their inalienable rights is solid and unshakeable and their determination to exercise those rights firm and justified. Through the media the world has been made aware of the intifadah and the real face of Israel and has thus been able to understand the tragic situation of the Palestinians under occupation. The conscience of the world has been reawakened and its awareness has become more intense. In that respect, we should like to commend the Secretary-General's report to the Security Council (S/19443) dated 21 January 1988.

We had hoped that the intifadah would provide an impetus to collective persevering and immediate efforts to put an end to the occupation and enable the Arab Palestinian people to exercise their rights, foremost among which is their right to self-determination on their national soil. We had hoped also that Israel would benefit from the lessons of the intifadah and realize that its occupation cannot continue and that it would be far better if it decided to make peace and learn to coexist with the Palestinians rather than continue to wage war against them and live at their expense. Unfortunately, Israel has so far failed to benefit from the lesson of the intifadah and has not seized the opportunity for peace that it has provided.

Through the resolutions of the Palestine National Council in Algiers last month the Palestinian people have expressed their genuine desire for peace and their readiness to work earnestly towards that end. They have also confirmed their commitment to the peaceful resolution of the problem on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) through an international conference. The Algiers resolutions were constructive and positive. In our view and that of

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

the majority of countries they represent a major step towards the achievement of peace.

Israel has yet to respond positively to those resolutions and address them with the same degree of rationality and goodwill evinced by the Palestinians. It is neither reasonable nor useful for Israel or anyone else to ossify Israel's stance regarding the Palestinian people. It is in no one's interest that Israel's position should remain static, showing no movement, or that its view of the Palestinian cause should remain narrow and shortsighted to the extent of denying the Palestinians their legitimate rights and denying the very existence of their cause.

As at previous sessions of the General Assembly, members may hear from the Israeli representative false allegations and flimsy fabrications with the aim of projecting a distorted image of the Palestinian cause. This is an image that Israel has tried persistently to implant in the minds of the people of the world. It invariably tries to deny the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, allege that the Arab States are responsible for the plight of the Palestinian refugees, pretend that the Palestine Liberation Organization is a terrorist organization and distort every peaceful intention on the part of the Palestinians. The Palestinian people, like any other people in the world, have the right to exist and to exercise their inalienable rights on their soil. The inhuman plight of the Palestinian refugees is the fruit of Israeli aggression and its inhuman practices.

Whether or not Israel recognizes it, the Palestine Liberation Organization is a national liberation movement recognized as such by the majority of countries, chosen by the Palestinian people and endorsed by the United Nations as the sole, legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. Israel must recognize that fact and face the reality as one that it can no longer ignore. The declaration on

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

15 November of the establishment of the independent Palestinian State has clarified the situation further and put Israel face to face with the realities of that situation. It has also contributed to defining the road that the process of peace in the Middle East must take.

Jordan has lived with the Palestinian question in all its aspects and dimensions and has sacrificed a great deal in that connection. It has tried to work earnestly and honestly for a peaceful solution to the question in all its aspects, the question that is, despite Israel's denial, the core of the conflict in the Middle East. Jordan's constant aim in all this has been to undo the historic injustice inflicted on the Palestinian people by enabling the refugees to return to their soil and those under occupation to achieve their freedom by the ending of the occupation, so that they may live in dignity and achieve their destiny like any other people in the world. That will never be possible without genuine peace.

Jordan's action in the service of the Palestinian cause stems from the organic link between the Jordanian and the Palestinian peoples. This link arises from the unity of the two banks of the Jordan and from numerous other close ties. It has always been based on the fact that Jordan is a major party to the Arab-Israeli conflict. Jordan has always wanted to serve the just Palestinian cause, and decided to do so by terminating all legal and administrative links with the West Bank, in line with the wishes of the Palestine Liberation Organization and Arab unanimity on the need to enhance the Palestinian identity. We did so out of a real and genuine desire to contribute qualitatively to the struggle of the Palestinian people. That decision does not in any way mean an abandonment of Jordan's national duties regarding the Palestinian cause or its basic role in the Arab-Israeli conflict.

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

The basic dilemma in dealing with the Palestinian cause is Israel's rejection of real peace with the Arabs because peace runs counter to Israel's objective of expanding its territory and widening its borders in order to attract the largest possible number of settlers. This would enable it, in its estimation, to become a major Power in the region, extend its hegemony over its neighbours and, consequently, deal with the world from such a position at the expense of the Palestinians' freedom and at the expense of the neighbouring Arab States.

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

In pursuance of this policy, Israel's Jewish settlements have proliferated in the Arab and Palestinian territories. It has annexed Arab Al-Quds and the Syrian Arab Golan. It has launched acts of aggression against the sovereignty of Lebanon and its territorial integrity. This is proof positive of its intention to continue its occupation and perpetuate its inhuman practices against the population of the occupied territories, in violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention and the relevant principles of international law.

It is Israel's view that there can be only one State in Palestine - that is, Israel. This runs counter to United Nations resolutions, foremost among which is resolution 181 (II). To this end, Israel depends entirely on its military might and imposes a fait accompli. It uses the situation in the area and the competitive relations between the super-Powers to arrogate to itself a strategic role that is not justified by the circumstances of the region or needed by the super-Power which supports Israel in almost all its policies and positions. That super-Power, in our view, does not really need this strategic role that Israel plays.

We believe in the importance of the role that the United States can play in restoring peace to the Middle East. To play that role a more objective attitude and greater attention to the Arab-Israeli conflict are required. We hope that the incoming United States Administration will contribute promptly to the solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict and its consequences, which have extended to Lebanon, and caused it untold suffering as a result of Israel's repeated acts of aggression, interference in its internal affairs and occupation of parts of its territory. This conflict, which has lasted long enough and caused great pain and suffering over the past 40 years, must be settled through an active approach that reactivates the peace process and gives it a new impetus towards the convening, as soon as possible, of the international peace conference, in order to achieve permanent,

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

just and comprehensive peace, thus enabling the peoples of the region to enjoy peace and tranquillity and devote their energies to economic development and prosperity, for the well-being of future generations.

AGENDA ITEM 135

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND ON THE STRENGTHENING OF THE ROLE OF THE ORGANIZATION: REPORT OF THE SIXTH COMMITTEE (A/43/886)

The PRESIDENT: I call on the Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee, Mr. Carlos Velasco Mendiola of Peru, to introduce the report of the Sixth Committee.

Mr. VELASCO MENDIOLA (Peru), Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee (interpretation from Spanish): I have the honour to introduce to the General Assembly the report of the Sixth Committee (A/43/886) under agenda item 135, entitled "Report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization".

As may be observed, the report of the Sixth Committee refers to two draft resolutions which it recommends to the General Assembly for adoption. However, as is indicated in the Journal, the General Assembly is today in a position to take a decision on the first draft resolution only, pending receipt of the necessary documents relating to the programme budget implications of the second draft resolution, which will therefore be submitted separately at a later time.

Draft resolution I, which the Sixth Committee recommends to the General Assembly for adoption, is to be found in paragraph 14 of the report.

The second and third preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution refer to the task carried out by the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization with regard to the final preparation of a draft declaration on the prevention and removal of disputes and situations which may threaten international peace and security and on the role of

(Mr. Velasco Mendiola, Rapporteur,
Sixth Committee)

the United Nations in this field, and express the conviction that the adoption of the declaration will contribute to strengthening the role of the United Nations and enhance its effectiveness in maintaining international peace and security.

By operative paragraph 1, the Assembly would approve the declaration, the text of which is annexed to the draft resolution, and by paragraph 4 it would urge that all efforts be made so that the declaration becomes generally known and fully implemented.

I should like to refer now to the declaration on the prevention and removal of disputes and situations which may threaten international peace and security and on the role of the United Nations in this field.

In the first, eleventh and twelfth preambular paragraphs the declaration addresses the question of the important role that the United Nations and its organs can play in the prevention and removal of international disputes and situations whose continuance may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security, and accordingly recalls the functions and responsibilities which the United Nations Charter entrusts to the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Secretary-General.

In the operative part, the General Assembly would solemnly declare that States should fulfil their obligations under international law in good faith and prevent the emergence or deterioration of disputes or situations. It would, inter alia, also declare that States involved in such international disputes or situations should conduct themselves in such a way as to strengthen the system of collective security envisaged in the Charter, and accordingly such States should consider approaching the relevant organs of the United Nations to obtain advice or recommendations on means of preventing a dispute or situation.

(Mr. Velasco Mendiola, Rapporteur,
Sixth Committee)

In the declaration a broad range of actions are envisaged that could be carried out by the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Secretary-General, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter, in order better to fulfil the responsibilities entrusted to them under the Charter.

The Sixth Committee adopted draft resolution I without a vote.

The PRESIDENT: If there is no proposal under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, I shall take it the General Assembly decides not to discuss the report of the Sixth Committee before the Assembly today.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote. The positions of delegations regarding the recommendations of the Sixth Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

I remind members that by paragraph 7 of decision 34/401 the General Assembly agreed that

"When the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, that is, either in the Committee or in plenary meeting unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting from its vote in the Committee."

I remind representatives that, as stated by the Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee in his introduction, the Assembly will today consider only the first draft resolution contained in paragraph 14 of the report of the Sixth Committee (A/43/886).

The Assembly will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution I, entitled "Declaration on the prevention and removal of disputes and situations which may threaten international peace and security and on the role of the United Nations in this field."

The Sixth Committee adopted draft resolution I without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 43/52).

AGENDA ITEM 38 (continued)

FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

The PRESIDENT: I should like to make an announcement with regard to agenda item 38, entitled "Fortieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights", which will be commemorated on Thursday morning, 8 December.

Members will recall that in order to limit the number of speakers on this item the Assembly decided to close the list of speakers on Friday, 2 December, at 4 p.m. As had been feared, the list of speakers is indeed very long and the President has no option but to limit the length of statements. Delegations are asked to help in this regard and to bear in mind that there is no possibility of extending our consideration of this item beyond Thursday morning.

In order, therefore, to accommodate in Thursday morning's meeting a programme which includes the award ceremony as well as the adoption of two draft resolutions, the President has proposed that all representatives speak from their seats, that speeches be limited to two to three minutes per delegation and that there be no explanations of vote.

Should, however, a substantial number of delegations decide to withdraw their names from the speakers' list, or should several groups - not necessarily regional groups - agree among themselves on a speaker on behalf of each group, the speakers' list could be shortened. With a reduced list of speakers, the duration of each speech could be longer.

The members of the Secretariat handling the speakers' list should be notified of any such arrangements by 6 p.m. tomorrow. If a longer time can be given to speakers, the Assembly will be advised accordingly on Wednesday. If no such arrangements materialize, the request for statements of only two to three minutes, to be made by delegations from their seats, will stand.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.