



FOURTH COMMITTEE
26th meeting
held on
Friday, 7 November 1980
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 26th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana)

later: Mr. PEŇAŽKA (Czechoslovakia) JAN 25 1981

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 27: QUESTION OF NAMIBIA (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 86: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.4/35/SR.26
14 November 1980

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.10 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 27: QUESTION OF NAMIBIA (continued)

1. Mr. MUESHIHANGE (Observer, South West Africa People's Organization) (SWAPO) said he wished to make a statement in connexion with the hearing of petitioners on the question of Namibia held at the previous meeting.
2. The Fourth Committee was concluding its consideration of the question of Namibia at a time when ominous political developments were taking place which were indicative of the re-emergence of Fascist forces of reaction and counter-revolution on the world scene. The racist Boers were celebrating the latest election victories in the United States; they had been assured that their military-industrial and economic needs would be increasingly met and that they could count on the next administration in Washington as a reliable ally in the so-called struggle against communist expansion in southern Africa. The agents of monopoly capitalism and transnational corporations would further intensify their acts of sabotage and destabilization in southern Africa, which was regarded as an indispensable source of minerals for the strategic interests of the imperialists and their racist managers in South Africa and Namibia. It was to be expected that the attitude of the Boer junta in Pretoria towards the United Nations would become even more defiant.
3. The challenges to the United Nations would multiply and the Organization should therefore take developments inside Namibia seriously. The only correct and logical course of action was for the Security Council to meet as a matter of urgency to impose sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter against the racist, illegal régime of South Africa. The Secretary-General was making his best efforts to hasten Namibia's independence in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It was clear however that Pretoria had no intention of making the commitment that would create the necessary conditions for the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) to proceed to Namibia. All the evidence suggested that the recent United Nations mission to Pretoria had been fruitless. The Security Council must therefore assume its responsibility.
4. It was the responsibility and duty of the people of Namibia to continue to intensify the war of national liberation on all fronts: military, political and diplomatic. Resistance was being directed against the physical presence in the country of foreign colonial forces of repression and exploitation. The struggle must continue until such elements were forced to leave. The Namibian patriots and militants were prepared to prosecute the struggle which succeeding generations of the people had been waging for almost 100 years. SWAPO was the only patriotic liberation force which had been waging that struggle and was accordingly recognized as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people.
5. In conclusion, he thanked the petitioners who had spoken at previous meetings for their support as individuals and as representatives of organizations and urged them to continue their valuable work.

/...

AGENDA ITEM 86: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued) (A/C.4/35/L.17*)

6. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the text of the draft resolution before the Committee had been reissued as document A/C.4/35/L.17* to take account of the fact that Senegal should not have been included among the list of sponsors of that draft resolution.

7. Mr. KAMARA (Senegal) said that, as the result of an unfortunate error, Senegal had been included among the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17. He had noted that an amended text had been issued. His delegation regretted the error and asked that its views should be included in the record of the meeting.

8. Mr. NABHAN (Iraq) said that his country had itself waged a long struggle against colonialism and the activities of foreign economic interests as well as those of the hegemonic Zionists. Those interests continued to impede the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Namibia and of other United Nations resolutions including General Assembly resolutions 2621 (XXV), S-9/2 and 34/41 as well as Security Council resolutions 431 (1978) and 435 (1978). Iraq fully supported the people of Namibia in their struggle to achieve independence and self-determination and to throw off the colonialist yoke. In particular, the provisions of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia in 1974, must be fully implemented. The position on Namibia taken by the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries was also relevant in that connexion.

9. Foreign monopolies were nevertheless intensifying their activities in Namibia in collusion with the illegal South African administration, particularly in the military field. Their continued collaboration with the Zionist entity in nuclear development represented a grave threat to the peace and security of the Middle East.

10. The forthcoming twentieth anniversary of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) should encourage the international community to support all peoples struggling for their freedom and independence; such support should in particular be given to the people of Namibia, under the direction of SWAPO. The South African régime continued to make mass arrests of all who struggled for freedom and independence and, by their hegemonic attempts, did everything possible to detract from the noble goals of the United Nations and to weaken the Organization. The vetoes cast by the United States had made it impossible for the Security Council to intervene.

11. It was essential that Security Council resolutions 385 (1976), 431 (1978) and 439 (1978) should be implemented and sanctions imposed immediately against the racist régime of South Africa.

/...

12. The CHAIRMAN said that Afghanistan, the German Democratic Republic, Iran, Jordan, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia, Uganda and Viet Nam had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17*. He invited those delegations that so wished to explain their vote before the vote on that draft resolution.

13. Mr. SEZAKI (Japan) said that his Government had consistently adhered to the position that the activities of foreign economic and other interests must in no way impede the achievement of self-determination and independence by Non-Self-Governing Territories, nor prejudice the economic, social and cultural development of the peoples in those Territories. Any activities which might be detrimental in that regard should be properly regulated and controlled.

14. Nevertheless, his delegation deeply regretted that it could not support draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17. It acknowledged that the phrasing of the draft resolution differed somewhat from the corresponding draft resolution of the previous session in that, instead of condemning some countries, including Japan, for their maintenance of relations with South Africa, it merely called upon them to terminate all collaboration with that country. However, modification of the wording did not alter the basic implication, which his delegation resolutely opposed. His delegation could not accept any resolution which did not reflect Japan's honest and extensive efforts to co-operate in solving problems in southern Africa.

15. Japan's steadfast position against apartheid was well documented. Firstly, Japan had no diplomatic relations with South Africa. Secondly, in the field of economic relations, Japan had not permitted direct investment in South Africa by Japanese nationals or corporate bodies under its jurisdiction. Further, the Government of Japan had called upon Japanese foreign exchange banks and their branches abroad to refrain from extending any loans to South Africa and had strictly adhered to that policy. Japan confined its economic relations with South Africa to normal trade and, even so, was making every effort to reduce its dependence on imports, particularly of natural resources, from South Africa by, inter alia, rapidly expanding its economic and technical co-operation with other African countries. Thirdly, there was absolutely no military co-operation with South Africa. In its reply to the Secretary-General (S/14188), his Government had described the detailed measures which it had taken for the strict implementation of Security Council resolution 418 (1977). Fourthly, in the field of nuclear collaboration, Japan did not possess, manufacture or permit the entry into Japan of nuclear weapons and accordingly was unable to co-operate with South Africa in nuclear weapons development. With regard to the peaceful use of nuclear energy, Japan had not exported nuclear reactors or any related materials, nor had it extended any technical assistance to South Africa in nuclear technology development. Lastly, in order to comply with United Nations resolutions, his Government had decided to issue, in principle, no visas to South Africans for the purpose of cultural and educational exchanges or sporting activities.

16. The assumptions contained in draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17 clearly contradicted the facts which he had just described. The reference to his country was arbitrary and lacked any objective criteria. Such an approach

/...

(Mr. Sezaki, Japan)

was counter-productive when the maximum concerted efforts of the international community were urgently required to foster change in South Africa and the abolition of apartheid.

17. His delegation was therefore once again unable to support the draft resolution, although it shared most of the views expressed in it. It was his hope that the Committee, taking his delegation's views into account, would in the future adopt a more productive approach.

18. Mr. FLITTNER (Germany, Federal Republic of) said that his delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17.

19. During the debate, many speakers had expressed regret that, owing to their sterile condemnation and sweeping language, resolutions adopted on the item in recent years had had a divisive effect and had lacked credibility. Nevertheless, the text of draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17 was once again full of distorting simplifications and was characterized by language which clearly had polemics and propaganda as its major objective. By once again pronouncing an indiscriminate condemnation of all foreign economic and other activities in Namibia and South Africa, the sponsors of the draft resolution had deliberately closed their eyes to the complexity of the situation in those countries.

20. His delegation did not believe in a policy of ostracism. Its aim was to help in achieving independence for Namibia without further delay on the basis of free and fair elections supervised by the United Nations and to facilitate peaceful, rapid and fundamental change in South Africa towards a truly democratic society in which all groups of the population could participate without discrimination, racial or otherwise, in the determination of their country's future. It did not believe that those aims would be served by the imposition of comprehensive sanctions against South Africa and by cutting off all relations with that country.

21. His Government rejected in the strongest terms the accusation of military collaboration and the condemnation for alleged nuclear collusion which was once again levelled against it in paragraphs 9 and 10 of the draft resolution. He could state without any qualification that there was no nuclear or military co-operation between the Federal Republic of Germany and South Africa.

22. The comprehensive report on South Africa's nuclear plans and capability, prepared in compliance with General Assembly resolution 34/76 B, had been reproduced in document A/35/402. The Group of Experts that had drawn up the report had made a commendable effort to separate fact from allegations and speculation and the report represented a serious attempt to study and evaluate the whole problem of South Africa's nuclear development. He questioned whether the authors of draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17 had taken that report into consideration when they had drafted paragraph 9.

/...

(Mr. Flittner, Germany
Federal Republic of)

23. The debate and the draft resolution on the item had once again concentrated on the cases of Namibia and South Africa. However, the question of Namibia and the policies of apartheid of South Africa would, during the following few weeks, be the subject of debates in the plenary Assembly which would also cover the question of foreign economic interests in those two countries. The question therefore arose as to whether the Fourth Committee should continue to consider the subject of foreign economic interests.

24. Mr. LINDAHL (Sweden) said that his Government opposed any action that worked against the interests of the indigenous peoples in dependent Territories and against their endeavours to free themselves from economic and social misery, colonial oppression and the indignities of apartheid. His delegation had therefore never hesitated to join in condemning the activities of foreign economic interests where those interests had been shown to have harmful effects.

25. Draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17 dealt with one of the most important aspects of the decolonization process, namely the protection and defence of the rights of the peoples in the colonized Territories, in particular in South Africa. His delegation agreed that investments in South Africa or in Namibia, illegally occupied by South Africa, were harmful and short-sighted, and it had repeatedly advocated that the Security Council should take a binding decision on such investments. However, the draft resolution contained paragraphs that caused his delegation difficulties. The language of the draft resolution was in some respects rather sweeping and the naming of certain countries in paragraphs 9 and 10 suggested an arbitrary selection based on insufficient proof. Furthermore, the language of some of the paragraphs touched upon the division of competence between the main organs of the United Nations, an area on which his delegation had previously expressed its reservations. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote on the draft resolution, although it shared the deep concern about the conditions in southern Africa and supported the general political objective behind the text.

26. Mr. MIKAYA (Malawi) said that his delegation was in general agreement with the thrust of draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17. His Government opposed activities by States or their agencies, whether private or official, in colonial Territories that impeded the attainment of independence by the peoples of those Territories. Similarly, his Government had never accepted the right claimed by some colonizing Powers to exploit, for their own benefit but to the detriment of the interests of the indigenous peoples, the resources of Territories still under colonial domination.

27. His delegation had noted with encouragement that some colonial Powers had in the past year begun to respond positively to the General Assembly's calls for a termination of the activities of foreign economic interests and transnational corporations in the Territories under their control and they had begun to take the necessary steps to implement the Assembly's programme for the granting of independence to the people of those Territories. However, the decolonization work of the United Nations was not finished; much still needed to be done to eliminate the remaining vestiges of colonialism.

/...

(Mr. Mikaya, Malawi)

28. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17. However, in view of realities imposed by historical factors and his country's geographical situation, his delegation would abstain on paragraph 10.

29. Mr. HUTCHINSON (Ireland) said that his delegation had on many occasions reiterated its condemnation of the exploitation of the human and natural resources in Non-Self-Governing Territories. His delegation would therefore have welcomed a fair and balanced resolution on those foreign economic and other interests which impeded the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. His delegation regretted that it had not been consulted on the text of draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17, which failed to deal in a constructive and realistic manner with the serious issue in question.

30. His delegation objected to the selective condemnation of particular countries, especially when, in some cases, the countries concerned had denied the allegations in question. Furthermore, foreign economic activities, when properly conducted, did not necessarily have detrimental effects in Non-Self-Governing Territories, as had been recognized in other resolutions adopted by the Fourth Committee. It was rather the obligation of the administering Powers to ensure that those economic activities were geared to the long-term interests of the colonial Territories in question.

31. Although his delegation could not support draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17, it recognized that the text represented a slight improvement over that of General Assembly resolution 34/41 and wished to commend those whose efforts had made that improvement possible.

32. Mr. MANSFIELD (United Kingdom) said that draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17, like similar resolutions in previous years, was irrelevant to the decolonization process. Much of it dealt with matters that were not on the Committee's agenda, and relations with South Africa were presented as if they were a colonial question, which was not the case. Furthermore, the resolution, full of useless rhetoric, did not begin to address the very real problems of the remaining colonial Territories.

33. The main requirement of those Territories was economic development. The Governments of the Territories controlled the amount of investment and the form it took. The Special Committee of 24 regularly exhorted administering Powers to promote economic development and to invest in the infrastructure, commerce and industry in the dependent Territories. However, the thrust of draft resolutions on the item adopted by the Fourth Committee in successive sessions was still to condemn the colonial Powers for "exploitation, plundering of natural resources and depriving dependent peoples of their rights". The United Kingdom had decolonized some 42 Territories in the life of the United Nations, with a population of about 1.4 billion people. The economic development of those Territories had always been considered a priority in preparing them for independence. The United Nations was, or should be, familiar with the special efforts that were made to provide aid and technical assistance for the creation of appropriate infrastructure.

/...

(Mr. Mansfield, United Kingdom)

34. Finally, the draft resolution seemed to miss the point about self-determination, namely that peoples should be allowed to choose the constitutional status they preferred. If they wished to retain their dependent status, it was not for the Fourth Committee or the United Nations to tell them otherwise. If, however, they wished to proceed to independence, economic development was indispensable to provide a secure basis for an autonomous economy. His Government would therefore continue, in constant consultation with the elected representatives of the Territories concerned, to work for a speedy but balanced economic development in all Territories remaining under United Kingdom administration. For all the reasons stated, his delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

35. Mr. FEITH (Netherlands) said that his Government attached great importance to the early implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Recent positive developments indicated that the process of decolonization was nearly complete. His delegation was confident that the administering Powers would continue to co-operate with the United Nations in allowing the populations of the Non-Self-Governing Territories the full enjoyment of their right to determine their own future.

36. The conflict over Namibia, and its disruptive implications for the development and well-being of southern Africa, remained a cause of the greatest concern to his Government. It was regrettable that the ongoing diplomatic negotiations aimed at the early implementation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) had thus far remained inconclusive. His Government would continue to support the efforts of the Secretary-General and five Western nations to enable Namibia to achieve its independence.

37. His delegation therefore had reservations about the consideration by the Committee, of the question of Namibia - in that it was to be discussed in the plenary Assembly - and about the wording of draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17. It was regrettable that consultations had not been held on the draft resolution, especially since there was such a large measure of agreement in the Committee on the course that Non-Self-Governing Territories should follow in order to decide their future status.

38. Although the text of the draft resolution was somewhat improved over similar resolutions in previous years, his delegation's previous objections continued to apply. His delegation could not accept the inference that all foreign economic activities were per se detrimental to the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). For example, it seemed to his delegation that the adherence by private firms to the code of conduct of the European Economic Community and similar codes illustrated that foreign economic activities could and did play a useful role in realizing a more just wage and employment system for black workers in South Africa. Furthermore, his delegation could not accept the unwarranted and selective accusations levelled against friendly Governments mentioned by name. Lastly, formulations in which the situation in South Africa was equated with a colonial situation were unacceptable.

39. Although his delegation did not reject all of the provisions in the draft resolution, it would be forced to vote against the draft resolution as a whole. That position should not be taken as calling into question his Government's recognition of Decree No. 1 adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

/...

40. Mr. CHAN (Australia) said that his delegation had urged the desirability of continuing the more balanced approach to the item on foreign economic interests that had been noticeable at the previous session, but draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17 did not, unfortunately, reflect such an approach. He agreed that the question should be considered by the Fourth Committee, but that should be done seriously and dispassionately, without the injection of ideology and the petty desire to score points. The sweeping condemnation and highly selective criticism of certain States could not be helpful to the decolonization process.

41. His delegation had always emphasized the need to draw a distinction between the reprehensible situation in southern Africa and the situation in the small Territories in the Pacific and the Caribbean. The general thrust of the draft resolution as it applied to South Africa was acceptable, but the notion that all foreign economic activity in the other small Territories was ipso facto detrimental to their peoples was entirely unacceptable. Adoption of the draft resolution would have the effect of negating other draft resolutions recently adopted by the Committee in which the administering Powers had been called upon to promote the economic well-being of the peoples in Non-Self-Governing Territories by taking all possible steps to strengthen and diversify the economies of those Territories and work out concrete programmes of assistance and economic development for them. For all of those reasons, his delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

42. Mrs. ÜNAYDIN (Turkey) said that her delegation would abstain on draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17, despite its full endorsement of the draft resolution in its essence and spirit. Her Government opposed the activities of foreign economic and other interests which impeded the implementation of the Declaration in Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism and apartheid in southern Africa, and believed that putting an end to such activities was of vital importance for promoting the political solution of the questions relating to southern Africa. Turkey had no relations whatsoever with South Africa and none of the provisions of the draft resolution directly concerned Turkey.

43. Although the draft resolution continued the improvement shown in the corresponding resolution of the previous session, the positive changes it embodied were insufficient in themselves to gain her delegation's acceptance. In particular, paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 singled out specific countries by name for selective condemnation and made sweeping generalizations which her delegation could not accept and without which the draft resolution could have been adopted by consensus. Nevertheless, Turkey remained unswervingly committed to the full implementation of the Declaration, and continued its staunch support for all efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination.

44. Mr. LØVALD (Norway) said that his Government had traditionally supported resolutions on foreign economic and other interests in colonial Territories, including southern Africa. In recent years, however, there had been a tendency in the Committee to polarize views on the question. Although his delegation welcomed efforts by African countries and others to draw up a more balanced draft resolution, draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17 remained unbalanced and contained unsubstantiated claims. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote.

/...

45. Mr. LESSARD (Canada) said that his delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17, as it contained, like resolutions on the item submitted at previous sessions, a number of propositions with which his delegation disagreed. Paragraph 6 indiscriminately condemned all activities of foreign economic interests in Namibia and South Africa and insinuated that their activities were necessarily detrimental to the peoples of those countries. Paragraph 7, which alluded to some of the positive aspects of economic activities, seemed to contradict portions of paragraph 6. Paragraph 10 named several countries and called upon them to terminate all collaboration with South Africa, yet the General Assembly had often called upon those countries and others to work for the promotion of vitally needed change in South Africa.

46. Paragraph 11 seemed to contradict one of the basic tenets of international trade and investment standards and the position adopted by the Group of 77 in the Commission on Transnational Corporations, namely that States in which transnational corporations were based should not exercise their national laws in an extraterritorial manner. In addition, his Government could not support references to positions taken by other bodies, such as that in paragraph 15.

47. His delegation felt that efforts to solve the problems in southern Africa must be practical in design and sound in principle. It was regrettable, therefore, that the level of rhetoric in the draft resolution and its broad generalizations detracted from the serious intent of the sponsors. It would be more useful in the future if the drafters of the reports on which such draft resolutions were based and the sponsors of future draft resolutions on the item gave careful consideration to focusing on some specific aspect, such as conditions of employment and access to training, in an effort to achieve practical results. The focus could be changed each year to cover a different aspect of the item; such an approach would be more likely to attract the attention and co-operation of the individuals, Governments and enterprises concerned. While his Government could not accept all of the provisions of the draft resolution before the Committee, it unquestionably supported efforts to achieve economic and human justice in southern Africa.

48. Mr. TUROT (France) said that the debate on item 86 each year became further divorced from the objectives of the United Nations, and the remaining justification for the debate was disappearing. All the Organization's work in the development field indicated that more investment was required in newly independent countries. His delegation was convinced of the benefits of international economic co-operation.

49. Many of the provisions of draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17 were devoid of meaning. In an attempt to prolong the life of an initiative that had lost its *raison d'être*, the sponsors of the resolutions on the item had, over the years, deliberately confounded two matters - Namibia and apartheid - which were covered by two separate items to be debated in the plenary Assembly. The draft resolution contained baseless accusations and discriminatory condemnations aimed at tarnishing the image of a certain group of countries. His delegation opposed such a campaign, which did not even serve the interests of those behind it.

(Mr. Turot, France)

50. Paragraph 9 of the draft resolution merely confused matters. In addition, the sponsors appeared to be unaware of the findings of the Group of Experts established under General Assembly resolution 34/76 B, contained in document A/35/402, in which a distinction had been drawn between nuclear installations under the supervision of the International Atomic Energy Agency and those which were not. The former were used solely for peaceful purposes, and were the only ones in respect of which his country might engage in co-operation.

51. For all those reasons, his delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

52. Mr. Peňázka (Czechoslovakia) took the Chair.

53. Mr. BEKALE (Gabon) said that all African countries should endorse the spirit of draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17. However, his delegation opposed paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 because of the selective references to certain countries. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

54. Ms. NEWSOM (United States of America) said that her delegation had hoped that after several years of harshly worded resolutions on the item and an increasingly negative reaction to them, a more acceptable resolution would be drafted after due consultation. Unfortunately, such had not been the case, and her delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17.

55. Mr. ERELL (Israel) said that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution. It was easy to identify those responsible for the hostile and unjustified references to Israel in the draft: they were guilty of unparalleled offences against Israel. It was well-known that Israel's trade with South Africa had become minute, and that there were many Member States, not cited in the draft resolution, whose trade with South Africa was far larger. Yet those States piously supported the draft resolution.

56. The Iraqi representative had given a further example of that kind of lack of integrity in his remarks on hegemonistic tendencies. Yet the President of Iraq had recently stated that conquest conferred new rights, and that war established new rights over and above existing rights. That clearly displayed a colonialist attitude.

57. The allegations in the draft resolution concerning nuclear co-operation between Israel and South Africa were absurd, being devoid of any foundation. Allegations concerning violations of the arms embargo were equally unfounded.

58. The cause of the United Nations was not advanced by grossly misleading resolutions, especially when there had been a deliberate intent to mislead. Nor was the cause of decolonization, which his delegation unreservedly supported, served by allowing it to become a vehicle for a totally unrelated purpose particularly when that purpose was none other than to deprive an ancient people of its right to self-determination.

/...

(Mr. Ereli, Israel)

59. The spirit underlying the draft resolution was that which had produced the unseemly procedural dispute in the Committee, in which every verbal weapon had been used without restraint, including unfair accusations levelled against the Chair. The countries belonging to a certain group were accustomed to employ public incitement and wild accusations and insults beyond civilized limits. They exchanged provocations and even advocated holy war against sister countries. It was regrettable that they had brought those same tactics to the United Nations, subverting its work and damaging its image.

60. Mr. TURINE (Belgium) said that, since many States had in recent years achieved independence and joined the United Nations, a development which his country welcomed, it was a moot point whether draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17 had any relevance. It also involved duplication, since the question of Namibia was being considered under agenda item 27 and that of apartheid under item 28.

61. Furthermore, the question of South Africa was a question not of decolonization but of a multiracial society. His Government condemned the South African Government's policy of apartheid, yet firmly believed that the international community would not obtain a peaceful end to that policy by seeking to ostracize South Africa. On the contrary, it was important to maintain relations with South Africa. Such an approach was undeniably proving successful; it offered the possibility of effective bilateral action complementing the roles of the Security Council and of the Secretary-General, and the pressure of world opinion. His country also rejected the baseless condemnation of certain States contained in paragraph 10. It would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

62. Mr. DZOGBEKLO (Burundi) said that his Government opposed racial discrimination and the apartheid régime, and had enacted legislation to prohibit any commercial links with South Africa. Furthermore, it believed that the activities of foreign interests impeded the decolonization of dependent Territories.

63. His delegation largely supported draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17, but had reservations on the incomplete list of countries contained in paragraph 9. It would therefore abstain in the vote.

64. Mr. FINDANO (Togo) said that his Government opposed racial discrimination and apartheid and supported the right of peoples to self-determination and independence. It agreed with the condemnation of countries which collaborated with South Africa, but could not endorse the discriminatory nature of paragraph 9 of the draft resolution. His delegation would therefore abstain.

65. Mrs. VANNO (Thailand) said that the draft resolution contained unacceptable references to countries with which her own country maintained diplomatic relations. Her delegation would therefore abstain.

66. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17.

67. A recorded vote was taken.

/...

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

68. Draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17 was adopted by 91 votes to 16, with 26 abstentions.*

69. Mrs. DAES (Greece) said that her delegation's abstention had not been recorded by the voting machine.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

* See para. 69 below.