



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 18: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples ( <i>continued</i> ):	
(a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;	
(b) Report of the Secretary-General .....	1827
Agenda item 24: Question of Palestine: report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People ( <i>concluded</i> ) .....	1829
Agenda item 27: Question of Namibia ( <i>continued</i> ):	
(a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;	
(b) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;	
(c) Report of the Secretary-General .....	1832
Agenda item 28: Policies of <i>apartheid</i> of the Government of South Africa ( <i>continued</i> ):	
(a) Report of the Special Committee against <i>Apartheid</i> ;	
(b) Report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against <i>Apartheid</i> in Sports;	
(c) Report of the Secretary-General .....	1841

**President: Mr. Salim Ahmed SALIM**  
 (United Republic of Tanzania)

**AGENDA ITEM 18**

**Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (*continued*):**

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

1. Mr. NIKULIN (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): We are on the eve of the twentieth anniversary of the historic General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), which was adopted on the initiative of the Soviet Union<sup>1</sup> and which contains the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

2. That Declaration has become not only one of the fundamental instruments of the United Nations in

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 87, document A/4502.

the sphere of decolonization, but also a set of guidelines for concrete measures to be adopted by the international community in order completely to eradicate colonialism from the world. A brief period of time has elapsed since the adoption of the Declaration by the Assembly, but the events that have taken place in the world during that brief period of time have markedly transformed the political situation. Millions of people have broken the chains of colonialism, new States have emerged and many States have broken with the colonial system of the past and have started along the path of building free and independent nations and making social progress.

3. However, we note that there are hotbeds of colonialism, racism and *apartheid*, mainly located in southern Africa. However, the legitimate struggle being waged by the African people, with the support of the progressive forces of the world, in order completely and definitively to eradicate the last vestiges of colonialism and racism, has already reached its final stage.

4. That struggle is given an impetus by the strengthening of détente throughout the world. The aspirations of the African peoples can be fulfilled only in an atmosphere of stable international peace and security. To achieve that goal, it is necessary for all peace-loving peoples and countries to unite their efforts.

5. However, the colonizers will not willingly give up their positions. The creation of a free Africa is occurring in an atmosphere of sharp contention between the forces of national liberation and progress and the forces of imperialism and reaction, which are endeavouring to impede this irreversible process and even to mount a counter-attack.

6. The extremely serious situation which has arisen, particularly recently in southern Africa, in Rhodesia and Namibia, is the result of manoeuvres which are constantly undertaken with the connivance and virtual support of Western imperialist circles, by the illegal racist régime in Salisbury and the occupying South African régime in order to perpetuate their domination in these Territories and to foist neo-colonialist puppet régimes on the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia.

7. The actions of the colonial racist régimes in Namibia and in Southern Rhodesia, like the régime in South Africa itself, the very existence of these régimes and their puppets are possible only because of the interest which they share with the local and the Western imperialist circles and their monopolies in continuing the colonialist and neo-colonialist exploitation of the human and natural resources of southern Africa and extracting from them fabulous profits, and also to protect the military and strategic interests of the imperialist

Powers members of the North Atlantic bloc in this region.

8. The actions of the imperialist Western circles are in blatant contradiction of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and other relevant resolutions of the United Nations. The General Assembly, in its resolution 33/44, once again stated that

“... the continuation of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations—including racism, *apartheid*, the exploitation by foreign and other interests of economic and human resources, and the waging of colonial wars to suppress the national liberation movements of the colonial Territories in Africa—is incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and poses a serious threat to international peace and security”.

9. In order to maintain and to expand the interests of imperialist monopolies, there is a continuance in southern Africa of the merciless exploitation of peoples and the depredation of their natural resources. Such is the case above all in South Africa itself, the bulwark of colonialism, racism and *apartheid* on African soil, into which the investments flow from the principal Western Powers. Foreign capital investments in South Africa amount to tens of billions of dollars, half of them belonging to the United Kingdom.

10. According to an article published in *The Daily World* of 3 May of this year, in South Africa at the present time there are 480 American companies in operation, and United States investments in that country are in excess of \$1,670 billion.

11. Foreign investment is directed primarily to the petroleum processing, mining and steel-founding industries, to the machinery manufacturing and chemical industries, and other basic branches of the economy of South Africa.

12. Obviously, there is no particular point in quoting detailed facts about the comprehensive co-operation of the imperialists and Western countries with the *apartheid* régimes; they are well known.

13. It is precisely with the support and the assistance of the Western countries that modern industry has been built up, as has the repressive military and political apparatus of racist South Africa and its nuclear potential.

14. The tremendous profits which have been made by the imperialist monopolies through the merciless exploitation of the Africans are extensively utilized in order to support the colonialist, racist régimes in Pretoria and Salisbury, in suppressing the indigenous African population, organizing interventions against sovereign African States, implementing coups d'état, paying for mercenaries and consolidating puppet neo-colonialist régimes.

15. The Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, which met at

Havana from 3 to 9 September 1979, emphasized in its political declaration that:

“... the main reasons for the survival of colonialism and racism—in open defiance of the decisions of the international community, the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations—was the military, technological, economic, political, diplomatic and other forms of aid that imperialism gives the racist régimes” [A/34/542, annex, sect. I, para. 42].

16. All these actions should be halted. The colonialists and the neo-colonialists and their Western protectors should be severely condemned. Mandatory sanctions should be imposed by the Security Council against the racist régime of South Africa, in conformity with Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

17. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic always supported and will continue to support the immediate exercise of the inalienable rights of the peoples of southern Africa to self-determination and independence and the transfer of full authority to the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, whose legitimate representatives are the Patriotic Front and the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO] respectively. We also support the elimination of the shameful system of *apartheid* in South Africa, and we resolutely condemn the manoeuvres of the neo-colonialists in southern Africa, and the aggressive actions of the racists against the national liberation forces and against the neighbouring independent African States.

18. At this session of the General Assembly, as at previous sessions, concern has quite rightly been expressed about the obstacles which have been erected by certain imperialist Powers to the decolonization of so-called small Territories. Among the most important of these obstacles we must include, I think, first and foremost, the fact that these Powers maintain their own military bases and installations in those Territories and continue to exploit their natural and human resources through both local and transnational monopolies.

19. All this is directly applicable in particular to Micronesia, which is the last remaining Trust Territory and is under the administration of the United States.

20. The General Assembly has frequently taken note of the irrefutable fact that the administering Power, completely ignoring the legitimate rights, interests and will of the people of Micronesia, pursues a policy which is aimed at perpetuating its domination in that Territory. Military bases have been set up in Micronesia, representing a serious threat to the peoples and countries of Asia and Oceania, as well as to universal peace and security.

21. The delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic would like to emphasize once again that a decision on the future of Micronesia is an integral part of the settlement of the over-all problem of decolonization in accordance with the principle that colonial countries and peoples should be given the right

to self-determination and independence. Any alteration of the status of Micronesia as a Trust Territory, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, can only be carried out on the basis of a decision taken by the Security Council. No unilateral action on the part of the administering Power in the case of the entire Trust Territory or integral parts of it could be regarded as correct or having any legal force.

22. In the process of implementing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples a great deal has been done, but the United Nations should not relax its efforts to ensure the speedy and complete attainment of the goals of decolonization. The international community should not only strengthen its solidarity with those colonial and dependent peoples which are struggling for independence but also increase genuine assistance to the national liberation movements, particularly those in southern Africa.

23. The United Nations should fix a specific timetable for the ending of colonial domination in all colonial Territories, whether they be large or small. A worthy contribution of the international community to the celebration of the twentieth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples would be the final and complete elimination of the vestiges of colonialism from the earth.

24. It is the direct duty of the United Nations to intensify and unify the joint efforts to achieve without delay the final goals of this Declaration.

#### AGENDA ITEM 24

##### Question of Palestine: Report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (*concluded*)\*

25. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the two remaining draft resolutions under this agenda item, draft resolutions A/34/L.41/Rev.1 and A/34/L.42. First, I shall call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

26. Mr. BLUM (Israel): As I observed when the General Assembly was about to vote on draft resolutions A/34/L.43 and A/34/L.44 [83rd meeting], all four draft resolutions on the present item, including those about to be voted on now, are calculated to impede the peaceful solution of the Arab-Israel conflict, and particularly the settlement of the problem of the Palestinian Arabs. To that end they are specifically designed to step up the manipulation of the United Nations as an instrument in the hands of the Arab rejectionist States and their collaborators. These draft resolutions are detrimental to the cause of peace, and they are detrimental to the cause of the United Nations.

27. Today the General Assembly is being asked to adopt draft resolutions A/34/L.41/Rev.1 and A/34/L.42, aimed at keeping the so-called Palestine Committee in business, even though it completed its Mandate in 1976 when it produced a report with a series

of recommendations calling for the dismantlement of Israel in stages.

28. Moreover, not content with having abused the General Assembly for their political warfare against Israel, certain Arab States have systematically proceeded to try to subvert every organ and body of this Organization, including the Secretariat. Thus, in the wake of the Palestine Committee, they established as part of their design a special Palestinian Unit within the Secretariat. In so doing, they compromised the Secretariat's integrity and misappropriated international funds. Over the last 12 months that Unit, under the "close guidance" of the Palestine Committee, has published a series of pseudo-scientific "studies" replete with distortions and falsifications of historical facts. It produced an absolutely one-sided propagandistic film, and has now begun to issue a series of popular pamphlets, which are equally propagandist in style and slanted in context.

29. In accordance with Parkinson's Law, the General Assembly is now being asked to give its consent to the expansion of the Special Unit into a new division in the Secretariat that will need increased manpower for new posts and additional functions. And as if the confines of the Secretariat were not enough, the draft resolution envisages numerous travel junkets, mainly at the expense of taxpayers in countries which contribute the bulk of the United Nations budget and have consistently voted against the activities of the Special Unit as a waste of money. Moreover, the General Assembly is being asked to agree to the holding of four seminars on different continents each of which is to be attended by, among others, five members of the Palestine Committee and two members of the division to be established. It would seem that it is the inalienable right of members of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People to be rewarded with inalienable travel facilities on the most dubious of pretexts. And that is by no means the end of the story. The authors of these draft resolutions intend to infiltrate not only other subsidiary bodies of the United Nations, including the regional commissions, but also non-governmental organizations and thus to contaminate them with their partisan views. This can only have an adverse effect on the proper functions of the bodies in question, especially those concerned with the problems of developing countries.

30. The General Assembly should be aware that the sum required to finance these vicious activities is expected to reach a total of over \$2 million in the course of the next two years, as we see from paragraph 13 of document A/C.5/34/71. The same document indicates that additional financial allocations may be required.

31. It should be recalled that the Palestine Committee in all its works represents only one facet of the network of special committees, special units, special missions, special reports and special groups of experts, all created and exploited to serve the same purpose, namely, to pursue the political warfare against Israel, as well as to hamper the ongoing peace process in the Middle East.

32. Thus, for example, the activities of the Committee which goes under the name of the Special Commit-

\* Resumed from the 83rd meeting.

tee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, for which well over \$600,000 have been appropriated—or rather misappropriated—to a great extent overlap and duplicate the activities of the Palestine Committee. This is not to mention the costs of different missions, groups of experts and so-called studies, all on the same question, which have been foisted upon such United Nations agencies as the ILO, WHO, and others.

33. The irony and the tragedy of this scandal is twofold.

34. First, the Secretary-General in his opening statement to the Fifth Committee,<sup>2</sup> announced his intention to apply a decisive financial policy of restraint and economy, including a commitment to contain the real growth of the budgetary proposals for the next biennium to as close to zero as possible. The financial implications of the draft resolutions we are now considering, and others like them, contradict and nullify this commitment. Secondly, these draft resolutions originate in Arab States, with their own vast diplomatic and propaganda machinery and with their enormous and still rapidly growing financial resources. Every penny misappropriated from the United Nations to subsidize their campaign, as required in the draft resolutions under discussion, will be at the expense of the meagre resources that the United Nations can allocate to satisfying genuine needs and justified demands, such as those of the poor and depressed countries, particularly in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

35. It will not have escaped notice that very few of the sponsors of the draft resolutions before us, or indeed of the members of the Palestine Committee, contributed a thing to the Secretary-General's campaign for emergency humanitarian relief to the people of Kampuchea. However, they are not embarrassed to lay hands on international funds for their own benefit and selfish ends.

36. In simple terms, these draft resolutions are anti-theoretical and inimical to peace. They are also harmful and wasteful to a degree that is virtually profligate.

37. Israel will vote against them and urges all States having the interests of peace and of the United Nations at heart, not to speak of their own interests, to cast dissenting votes.

38. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): The draft resolutions before us represent the least that this General Assembly can do for a whole people that has been uprooted from its homeland as a result of a resolution that emanated from none other than this Assembly, before it acquired the universality or the humanity that prevail here today.

39. I cannot see how the General Assembly can in good conscience refrain from at least disseminating information about the plight, the tragedy and the catastrophe of the Palestinian people who are now dis-

persed in every land and under every sky. Of course, Israel does not wish the truth to be disseminated; it wants public opinion to be manipulated by its own gigantic apparatus which dishes out only what it wishes world opinion to know. The Israelis are frightened of the truth and therefore they are attacking the very integrity of documents which I have read very carefully and which do nothing but reprint what the major actors in this tragedy have said or done; that is, the British, the Zionist and American leaders, the neutrals and everybody else in the world who knows anything about this problem.

40. Whatever money it costs—whether 1 million dollars or even 2 million—will be an insignificant fraction of the tens, if not hundreds, of billions of dollars which Israeli aggression has stolen from the Palestinian people when Israelis took over their homes, their farms, their means of livelihood and threw them into the wilderness. Is it too much if the United Nations, which created Israel and accepted its membership on condition that it implemented the Palestinian right to create their own State and for every Palestinian to return to his or her own home, is now parsimoniously spending a small sum at least to enlighten world public opinion about the sufferings of a whole people? Have we all lost our humanity? Are we so totally insensitive to what has happened that we now count the cents and the dollars, when the Palestinian people have been literally plundered of tens and hundreds of billions of dollars and continue to be so plundered?

41. Israel says that all this is warfare against the peace process. I want to ask: to what peace process is he referring? What kind of peace process? We have done everything in our power to bring about a peaceful resolution of the problem. As a matter of fact, in 1949 the entire conflict could have been finally and conclusively terminated, had Israel only honoured its signature on the Lausanne Protocol.<sup>3</sup> That document would have resolved the whole issue, including the problem of the refugees. All the Arab States concerned and the Palestinian people had agreed to it. But Israel, of course, was not interested in peace. It was interested in implementing what came to be known as the *daleth* plan, namely to expand in order to take over the whole country.

42. The real problem for peace here is: does Israel want to maintain a monolithic presence in Palestine and to throw the entire Palestinian people out or does it want to coexist with the Palestinians in conditions of peace and equity? This is the moral issue which is facing the United Nations.

43. Attempting to hide the truth from the world is, in my opinion, not only absurd but self-defeating and it shows that the guilty ones are trying to cover up the crimes they have committed against the Palestinian people. I believe that those units and those committees which have investigated the problem have revealed to this Assembly and, consequently, to the entire world, the brutal facts about what has happened and what is still happening in the land of Palestine: about the suffering of the Palestinian people.

<sup>2</sup> The complete text of the statement made at the 8th meeting of the Fifth Committee was published as document A/C.5/34/12.

<sup>3</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Ad Hoc Political Committee, Annex, vol. II, document A/927, annexes A and B.*

44. Money spent on redeeming the fault in fairness and justice in a cause in which the Assembly itself is primarily responsible would be money well spent. We are not against peace, we are in favour of it; but it should be a just peace which takes into account the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, which should enjoy such rights like any other people in the world.

45. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to the vote and I shall put to the vote first draft resolution A/34/L.41/Rev.1. I call upon the representative of Madagascar, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

46. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): Before we proceed to the vote on the draft resolutions, I should like on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/34/L.42 to specify what we mean by the expression "under its guidance", which is to be found in operative paragraph 2. Some controversy has arisen over this but in the understanding of the sponsors this is just a matter of asking the proposed division for Palestinian rights to carry out its task with precision, not a matter of telling it how to do its job. I hope that this clarification might be useful to members of the Assembly and will put at rest any doubt to which this expression may have given rise.

47. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of Israel, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

48. Mr. BLUM (Israel): On a point of clarification, I should like to know what exactly the point of order of the previous speaker was.

49. The PRESIDENT: It is my understanding that the representative of Madagascar, speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, was trying to explain the interpretation of the phrase "under its guidance" for the benefit of the Assembly. That was the essence of the point of order raised by the representative of Madagascar.

50. The Assembly will now proceed to the vote. I shall put draft resolution A/34/L.41/Rev.1 to the vote first. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

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

ria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

*Abstaining:* Austria, Belgium, Fiji, Finland, France, Guatemala, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Sweden.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 118 votes to 10, with 12 abstentions (resolution 34/65 C).<sup>4</sup>*

51. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/34/L.42. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution is contained in document A/34/794. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

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

*Against:* Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel.

<sup>4</sup> The delegation of Mauritius subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as being in favour of the draft resolution.

Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Argentina, Austria, Chile, Finland, France, Guatemala, Honduras, Japan, Sweden.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 117 votes to 15, with 9 abstentions (resolution 34/65 D).<sup>5</sup>*

52. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Norway for an explanation of vote after the vote.

53. Mrs. KIRSTE (Norway): My delegation voted against the four draft resolutions on the question of Palestine contained in documents A/34/L.41 to A/34/L.44. Our vote on draft resolutions A/34/L.41 and A/34/L.42 reflects the reservations we have had with regard to the Committee on Palestine and the Special Unit in the Secretariat. Draft resolutions A/34/L.43 and A/34/L.44 do not, in our view, reflect in an adequate and balanced manner the main principles which must constitute the basis for a comprehensive peace settlement in the Middle East.

54. It remains the firm conviction of the Norwegian Government that a peaceful and just solution of the Middle East conflict must be based on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). Such a solution must be based on the principle that acquisition of territory by force is inadmissible, on respect for the sovereignty of all States in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries, as well as on recognition of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinians.

55. The Norwegian Government has supported the Camp David agreements<sup>6</sup> and the Peace Treaty between Egypt and Israel<sup>7</sup> as representing an important first step towards an over-all solution in the Middle East.

56. To further the peace process it is necessary to clarify the central and most difficult problem in the Middle East, that is, the question of the rights of the Palestinians and their participation in the negotiations and the peace process. It is necessary for all the parties concerned to be drawn into the peace process and to obtain a stake in its successful outcome. Such an outcome must involve safeguarding the right of States in the area to exist in peace within secure and recognized boundaries and the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

57. Norway attaches particular importance to the principle of reciprocity in the matter: Israel must recognize the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people and the Palestinians must recognize the right of Israel to exist within secure and recognized boundaries.

## AGENDA ITEM 27

### Question of Namibia: (continued)\*

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

58. The PRESIDENT: As representatives are aware, the General Assembly concluded its debate on this item at its 96th meeting on 10 December 1979. The Assembly now has before it draft resolutions A/34/L.45 to A/34/L.50/Rev.1 and A/34/L.56. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of draft resolutions A/34/L.45 to A/34/L.50/Rev.1 is to be found in document A/34/807.

59. I call on the representative of Madagascar to introduce draft resolution A/34/L.56.

60. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): To complement draft resolutions A/34/L.45 to A/34/L.50/Rev.1, which were introduced at a previous meeting, I now have the honour of introducing for adoption by the Assembly draft resolution A/34/L.56, entitled "Situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa". The title of this draft resolution indicates its subject and scope. We have been called upon to express our views on a colonial situation and a case of illegal occupation which persists despite the many United Nations decisions and declarations on decolonization, despite the specific resolutions on the question which have been adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council, and despite the opinion of the International Court of Justice<sup>8</sup> which terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia.

61. Not content with continuing and intensifying its exploitation of the human and natural resources of that international Territory, the racist régime does not hesitate in the face of any difficulty to fasten its grip on Namibia and to crush the legitimate struggle being waged by the heroic Namibian people, headed by the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO], with a view to securing its right to self-determination and national independence.

62. Over the last few years it has become quite clear that measures of pressure and repression, imprisonment, arbitrary detention and arrest, torture, collective punishment and other means of intimidation are no longer sufficient to maintain in a state of subjugation a people that has become aware of its situation and aspires to independence, freedom, justice and social progress. Indeed, out of complicity and complacency certain imperialist Powers spare no effort to benefit from exploitation of the natural and human resources of southern Africa, and in connivance with them the racist régime of South Africa has tried to perpetuate its

<sup>5</sup> *Idem.*

<sup>6</sup> A Framework for Peace in the Middle East Agreed at Camp David, and Framework for the Conclusion of a Peace Treaty between Egypt and Israel, signed at Washington on 17 September 1978.

<sup>7</sup> Peace Treaty between the Arab Republic of Egypt and the State of Israel, signed at Washington on 26 March 1979.

\* Resumed from the 96th meeting.

<sup>8</sup> *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 16.*

grip by other means. It is developing its capacity in nuclear weaponry in order to increase its military power and thus set itself up as a valid partner in any discussion on the region. In this regard we can see that its legitimacy is being contested on all sides, and ethically it is in a very doubtful position.

63. The measures which the racist régime has taken are intended physically to eliminate members of SWAPO, to undermine its movement and to attempt to set up others as puppets who would follow in their footsteps.

64. Those measures are dealt with in draft resolution A/34/L.56 which, compared with previous resolutions on the same subject, contains nothing new in respect of the condemnation of racist and discriminatory policies or the reaffirmation of certain principles upon which our actions are based.

65. Thus we condemn the persistence of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. We also condemn South Africa for its constant refusal to comply with General Assembly resolutions and for the obstacles that it erects against implementation of the relevant Security Council resolutions. Thus we condemn its manoeuvres to try to impose in Namibia an internal settlement that would correspond neither to the provisions and instructions of our Organization nor to the wishes of SWAPO, which is the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people. Similarly, we condemn individual or collective repression, the increasing militarization of the Territory and the attempts that have been made to dismember the Territory, and in particular the annexation of Walvis Bay, which is an integral and inseparable part of Namibia. We condemn also those Western States which have helped South Africa to acquire a nuclear capability and armaments, and we urge all Member States to frustrate the attempts by South Africa to develop nuclear weapons. We also condemn foreign economic interests, which have always in one way or another prevented Namibia from attaining full independence.

66. The principles we wish to reaffirm concern first of all the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and to national independence within the context of a unified Namibia; they concern the legality of the armed struggle that is being waged against the illegal occupation of the international Territory. That is why we appeal to all countries to grant all necessary assistance whether political, diplomatic or material, in order to guarantee a successful outcome of the struggle.

67. The draft resolution also reaffirms that no solution would be considered valid if it were not acceptable to SWAPO, which is to participate in all endeavours designed to resolve this problem.

68. The draft resolution reiterates that Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations and that it is placed under the authority of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which has been charged with administering it legally until the achievement of national independence.

69. To refresh the Assembly's memory, I would recall the decisions concerning the non-recognition of any régime that might be imposed in defiance of Security Council resolution 385 (1976) and the need urgently to release political prisoners. I should like to emphasize two paragraphs. Operative paragraph 6 declares that the illegal occupation is an act of aggression against the Namibian people and the United Nations itself. Operative paragraph 18 declares that South Africa's consistent defiance of the United Nations, its illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia and its war of repression against the Namibian people, its persistent acts of aggression against independent neighbouring States, its policy of colonial expansion, its policy of *apartheid* and its development of nuclear weapons constitute a serious threat to international peace and security.

70. Thus we believe that the conditions have been met for the implementation of the restrictive and enforcement provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter.

71. The last operative paragraph contains a solemn appeal to the Security Council to convene urgently to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa in order to compel it to withdraw from the Territory. As mentioned in the fourth preambular paragraph, if the Council does not act in accordance with its mandate, the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity [OAU] decided, at its thirty-third ordinary session, held at Monrovia from 6 to 20 July 1979, that it would meet in special session in order to draw up a new strategy for the liberation of Namibia [see A/34/552, annex I, CM/Res.720 (XXXIII)].

72. The PRESIDENT: We shall now hear those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote on any or all of the seven draft resolutions.

73. Mr. de ALBUQUERQUE (Portugal): As we are drawing closer to a final settlement of some of the serious problems that have beset southern Africa for a number of decades, the Portuguese delegation holds the view that all reasonable avenues of negotiation and compromise should be left open to enhance the prospects of peace.

74. In this connexion a special tribute must be paid to the late President Neto of Angola, whose untiring efforts in the search for peace and independence for Namibia led to the proposal, which is now on the negotiating table, for a demilitarized zone along the border of Namibia, Angola and Zambia. We have noted with satisfaction that the recent round of talks sponsored by the Secretary-General are making some headway. SWAPO, the front-line States and, more recently, South Africa have accepted the idea of a demilitarized zone, and we are confident that negotiations on the practical arrangements for the establishment of such a zone will be crowned with success.

75. On that understanding, my delegation will abstain on the draft resolutions which could have, in our view, an undesirable impact on the ongoing negotiations. But this attitude should not be interpreted in any way as laxity in our commitment to a free and independent Namibia. The international community has been

waiting too long for a peaceful settlement that will take into account the legitimate interests and aspirations of the Namibian people.

76. Positive results must be achieved soon, lest other more effective measures have to be envisaged to ensure the early achievement of an internationally recognized independence for Namibia.

77. Mr. THUNBORG (Sweden): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolutions before us. We shall do so in spite of serious reservations as regards some provisions in one of the resolutions, the one contained in document A/34/L.56 regarding the situation in Namibia.

78. As we have already had occasion to state in our explanation of vote on 31 May 1979 at the resumed session of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly,<sup>9</sup> our affirmative vote on this draft resolution must be seen in the context of the Namibian situation as a whole. It is clear that that situation has reached a stage where it is necessary to continue to exert the greatest possible pressure on South Africa to make it accept the principles laid down by the world community for a solution of the Namibian problem. The draft resolution is a clear expression of continued frustration at South Africa's reluctance to comply with these principles. We share that frustration.

79. The draft resolution also reflects the determination of the United Nations to uphold its legal authority over Namibia and to prevent South Africa from imposing solutions upon the Namibian people which are not consistent with these established principles. We share that determination. In our view, one of these principles is, and must be, that no party enjoying popular support should be excluded from taking part in the process of independence and from being a potential holder of government in the new nation. SWAPO is such a party.

80. I must now record our reservations. In our view, the draft resolution could have better reflected a basic principle which we think should still prevail—namely, that we must persist in exploring every possible peaceful alternative to further and support the legitimate interests of the whole Namibian people. The ongoing negotiations under the auspices of the Secretary-General are such an alternative.

81. In its statement before the General Assembly, my delegation stressed that the Security Council must live up to its responsibility for bringing pressure to bear upon South Africa. On this point we simply wish to add that it must be left to the Council itself to decide on specific measures.

82. My delegation has particular reservations with regard to the paragraphs which, directly or indirectly, legitimize the use of force. As we have stated on many previous occasions, we find it understandable that in their despair and faced with brutal oppression, the Namibian people in the end have seen no other alternative than to resort to armed struggle. That struggle is

pursued with the legitimate goal of creating an independent and united Namibia.

83. To understand this—and practically all countries do—is one thing. It is another thing to have the General Assembly explicitly endorse the use of force. Sweden has always emphasized the role of the United Nations to provide peaceful solutions to international conflicts. The Charter defines the circumstances under which there may be resort to the use of force and places the primary responsibility for undertaking or endorsing action by force upon the Security Council. The Charter provisions in this regard are of fundamental importance in the view of my Government.

84. Despite these reservations, which are serious, we feel that, in the present situation, we must support the over-all thrust of the draft resolution. Our vote in favour of this draft resolution is an expression of our support for the need, in the present extraordinary circumstances, to bring the strongest possible pressure to bear on South Africa.

85. Mr. GAUCI (Malta): On 2 May last year, during the special session on Namibia, I had the privilege to explain at some length our views on this question and to stress our hope for a peaceful solution.<sup>10</sup>

86. During this year's debate, despite our chagrin that the progress so strongly advocated and so internationally backed has not yet been secured, I do not wish to burden the meeting with a repetition of Malta's views.

87. At the same time, we could not let this occasion pass without at least expressing our appreciation to all those who continue valiantly to strive to bring about genuine independence for Namibia, and deploring, once again, in the strongest terms, the defiant attitude of South Africa, in regard to events in Namibia as well as its policies concerning the majority of the people in its own territory, through its relentless and ruthless application of the abhorrent system of *apartheid*.

88. For our own part, I repeat once again that ever since Malta achieved its independence not one cent has enriched the coffers of South Africa through any commercial relations with Malta, nor has a single bullet from my country helped the repressive actions of the South African régime, either against the majority of its own people or against the population of Namibia.

89. We feel it is highly appropriate that this year the debate takes place under your presidency, Sir, and therefore benefits from your long association with and rich experience of this question. We hope that it will be an augury of future success.

90. It is my privilege once again to commend SWAPO and its leaders on their consistent struggle for genuine independence, for which so many noble sons of Africa have given their utmost.

91. We wish to express our solidarity with the countries of Africa in their expression of strong concern

<sup>9</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-third Session, Plenary Meetings, 108th meeting, paras. 5-11.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, Ninth Special Session, Plenary Meetings, 13th meeting, paras. 57-72.



at the delaying tactics of South Africa, and we shall therefore support all the draft resolutions which they have proposed, even though they may contain a few operative paragraphs which, had they been drafted differently, would have attracted much wider support, and consequently would have had better prospects for practical application.

92. Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Finnish delegation will vote in favour of all seven draft resolutions on the question of Namibia. By so doing we wish yet again to give expression to our consistent support for the efforts of the Namibian people to achieve genuine self-determination and independence. We believe that that goal should and can be achieved through peaceful means in keeping with the most profound aspirations of the Namibian people.

93. By adopting resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), the Security Council indeed created a basis for a peaceful, internationally acceptable transition to independence and international recognition for Namibia through elections under United Nations supervision.

94. The position of the Finnish Government on the question of Namibia was fully explained in my statement in the general debate on that question on 6 December [91st meeting] and need not be repeated here. I should, however, like to underline that the Finnish Government has not abandoned hope that a negotiated and peaceful solution will be possible, given the persistence and co-operation of all the parties concerned.

95. Although we support the main purpose of the draft resolutions on Namibia, we have at the same time serious reservations, particularly on draft resolution A/34/L.56. First, we regret that the text does not adequately reflect the efforts to reach a negotiated and peaceful settlement in accordance with the plan formulated by the Security Council.<sup>11</sup>

96. Secondly, Finland has consistently expressed its strong conviction that the United Nations must do its utmost to seek peaceful solutions. That is a position of principle and remains so. Consequently, we do not accept the condoning of armed struggle and we cannot endorse formulations that contradict that principle, except in those cases that are clearly defined in the Charter.

97. Thirdly, there are a number of provisions in that draft resolution which touch on the division of competence between the Security Council and the General Assembly in a manner which, in our opinion, is not consistent with the United Nations Charter. The views of my Government in that respect are well known and need no further elaboration at this time.

98. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/34/L.45, entitled "Programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia". A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

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

*Against:* None.

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

*The draft resolution was adopted by 138 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 34/92 A).<sup>12</sup>*

99. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution A/34/L.46 is entitled "Intensification and co-ordination of United Nations action in support of Namibia". I now put that draft resolution to the vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic,

<sup>11</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-third Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1978*, document S/12636.

<sup>12</sup> The delegation of Equatorial Guinea subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as being in favour of the draft resolution.

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

*Against:* None.

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

*The draft resolution was adopted by 134 votes to none, with 9 abstentions (resolution 34/92 B).<sup>13</sup>*

100. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution A/34/L.47 is entitled "Action by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations with respect to Namibia". I shall now put that draft resolution to the vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

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

Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* None.

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

*The draft resolution was adopted by 136 votes to none, with 7 abstentions (resolution 34/92 C).<sup>14</sup>*

101. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to draft resolution A/34/L.48, entitled "Nationhood Programme for Namibia". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt this draft resolution without a vote?

*The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 34/92 D).*

102. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution A/34/L.49, entitled "United Nations Fund for Namibia". May I take it that the General Assembly also wishes to adopt this draft resolution without a vote?

*The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 34/92 E).*

103. The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider draft resolution A/34/L.50/Rev.1, entitled "Dissemination of information on Namibia". A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

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

<sup>13</sup> *Idem.*

<sup>14</sup> *Idem.*

Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* None.

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

*The draft resolution was adopted by 139 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 34/92 F).<sup>15</sup>*

104. The PRESIDENT: Finally, I put to the vote draft resolution A/34/L.56, entitled "Situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

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

*Against:* None.

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

*The draft resolution was adopted by 125 votes to none, with 17 abstentions (resolution 34/92 G).<sup>16</sup>*

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

106. Mr. KEATING (Ireland): I am speaking on behalf of the nine States members of the European Community.

107. In their statement in the course of the general debate on Namibia, the nine States underlined their conviction that the people of Namibia must be allowed, without further delay, to determine their future and to choose their representatives by means of free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations. This is in accordance with the settlement plan adopted by the Security Council in resolution 435 (1978) and consistent with Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

108. The European Community continues to support the efforts which are being made to achieve an early and peaceful settlement to the question of Namibia and it is closely watching the developments within that Territory. However, they regret that in certain respects the resolutions just adopted by the Assembly do not take these efforts into consideration and could even hinder them.

109. The European Community dissociates itself from explicit and implicit endorsement of armed struggle. It is the responsibility of the United Nations, in accordance with its Charter, to seek peaceful solutions. The commitment of the European Community to the Charter and to its division of competences remains unchanged. Their reservations on certain elements in the resolutions just adopted are well known.

110. The European Community will continue to support all efforts being made to find an early and peaceful solution to the problem of Namibia.

111. Mr. GUERREIRO (Brazil): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/34/L.47, dealing with action by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations with respect to Namibia.

112. Brazil voted in favour of that draft resolution because of the strong support that it lends to the cause of an independent Namibia. Nevertheless, in our opinion, the language used in that text goes beyond what seems to be necessary and feasible to protect the rights and interests of Namibia in international forums. Moreover, the Brazilian Government as a matter of principle cannot favour the conferral upon an organ of the United Nations of the same status as that of sovereign States Members of the Organization.

113. The Brazilian Government would therefore like to put on record that the decision just taken cannot

<sup>16</sup> The delegations of Equatorial Guinea and Turkey subsequently informed the Secretariat that they wished to have their votes recorded as being in favour of the draft resolution.

<sup>15</sup> *Idem.*

be considered either a juridical or a political precedent, for it refers to a *sui generis* situation.

114. Mr. FEITH (Netherlands): The Netherlands fully subscribes to the common explanation of vote of the nine member countries of the European Community made by the representative of Ireland. To that statement we should like to add a few considerations of our own.

115. The Netherlands regards the settlement plan adopted in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as the best basis on which an internationally acceptable solution for Namibia can be achieved. At the root of the problem lies South Africa's persistent refusal to end its occupation of Namibia. It has held that Territory since 1966 in contravention of decisions by the United Nations. The settlement plan would bring about the withdrawal of South Africa's illegal administration and allow the people of Namibia to determine its own future on the basis of free and fair elections under the control and supervision of the United Nations.

116. The Netherlands has throughout supported the efforts of the Secretary-General, the group of five Western States and the front-line States towards the implementation of the plan. We are indebted to them for the contributions they have made and we look forward to an early agreement enabling the United Nations Transition Assistance Group [UNTAG] to be deployed.

117. Since my delegation spoke during the resumed thirty-third session,<sup>17</sup> negotiations between the parties concerned have led to the further narrowing down of outstanding issues. Lack of agreement with South Africa and SWAPO over provisions in the Secretary-General's report of 26 February<sup>18</sup> regarding the restriction to base threatened the final outcome. However, the timely proposal of the late President Neto of Angola for the creation of a demilitarized zone broke the deadlock.

118. Although South Africa's reaction concerning the demilitarized-zone concept can be considered to unblock the current impasse, its reply<sup>19</sup> falls short of the commitment by the front-line States and SWAPO, hedged as it is by pre-conditions. We would therefore call upon South Africa to dissipate, during the coming technical talks any doubts as to its willingness to stand by its acceptance of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Nearly a year has now gone by, and still we have not come to the actual deployment of UNTAG.

119. Looking at the problem in a broader perspective, we feel that the outlook for peaceful change in southern Africa has somewhat improved. We hope that the encouraging developments with regard to Zimbabwe will also facilitate an internationally recognized solution for Namibia. The Netherlands Government considers that both in Zimbabwe and in Namibia the

process of self-determination is to be carried out on the basis of free and fair elections without any outside interference or harassment of political opponents. The various political parties in both Territories must be allowed to vote in an atmosphere of total impartiality. None of these parties should be qualified in advance as the undisputed representative of the population. I should also like to reiterate that any transfer of power to a self-imposed authority in Namibia is unacceptable to my Government. My country is of the opinion that such an internal settlement, if perceived by Pretoria to be in its interest, could become a danger to international peace and security.

120. We had hoped that the General Assembly could have focused its attention on the implementation of the settlement plan and encouraged the mediation efforts to bring it about. It is to be regretted that the resolutions before us generally do not take these developments into account. There are also considerations which have prevented us from voting in favour of all of them. Thus we maintain our opposition to qualifying SWAPO as the sole and legitimate representative of the Namibian people. We regard that organization as a significant political force in Namibia, but for it to claim to be the sole representative would prejudice the outcome of the elections. Nor can we accept passages condoning the use of force in resolutions of the United Nations. Furthermore, we object to the condemnation of certain Western States for allegedly having assisted South Africa in developing a nuclear-weapon capability.

121. Finally, my Government holds that, pending the outcome of the mediation effort, the application of enforcement measures under Chapter VII against South Africa is not warranted. But we remain ready to support Security Council action in case no agreement on the basis of the United Nations plan can be reached.

122. Mr. SCHMID (Austria): Only a few days ago Austria had an opportunity to restate its position on the question of Namibia [92nd meeting]. We expressed our concern and anxiety about the deterioration of the situation in the Territory, which is due to the actions of the Government of South Africa. We made clear our continuing support for a solution of the problem on the basis of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, in particular Security Council resolution 385 (1976), as elaborated in the United Nations transition plan. Austria has stated again and again that international pressure has to be mobilized against South Africa to ensure its compliance with the relevant resolutions. Austria therefore supports both the general aims and the practical goals of the draft resolutions submitted under this agenda item.

123. However, because of certain elements contained in the texts which are contrary to our political traditions and irreconcilable with some of our constitutional principles, our delegation had to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/34/L.56. As we have explained many times, we can only support change by peaceful means and negotiations as provided for in the Charter of the United Nations.

124. Furthermore, it is the view of the Austrian Government that a viable solution can be found only on

<sup>17</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-third Session, Plenary Meetings*, 108th meeting, paras. 53-59.

<sup>18</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fourth Year Supplement for January, February and March 1979*, document S/13120.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, *Supplement for October, November and December 1979*, document S/13680.

the basis of fair and free elections, the outcome of which should not be prejudiced by proclaiming any party the sole representative of the people of a particular territory.

125. Mr. ANDERSON (Australia): Australia voted in favour of six of the seven draft resolutions presented under this item. My Government regrets that it could not also support the text contained in document A/34/L.56 on the situation in Namibia, but there are elements contained in it which, we believe, fail to take adequate account of the reality of the situation. My delegation believes that the draft would have benefited from a wider consultation with interested parties than was possible in this case, and would hope that in future this wider consultation will be possible.

126. In particular, we regret that this resolution fails to take adequate account of the need to support peaceful processes of settlement in Namibia. I am referring, of course, to the settlement plan devised by the five Western countries, a plan which Australia strongly supports, and a plan which offers, in fact, the only promise of peaceful settlement for the Namibian situation.

127. However, Australia regards it as vital that South Africa move quickly and sincerely towards settlement of this festering problem, and we stand ready to join other Members of the United Nations in assisting in the implementation of the plan through a national contribution to UNTAG.

128. Australian positions on the remaining drafts are well known and need not be rehearsed again in this explanation of vote. I would only make the point here that Australia strongly objects to the tendentious naming of countries or groups of countries in some draft resolutions, that we do not believe that it can be agreed that all foreign economic activity in Namibia should be described as necessarily exploitative, and that there is language in some texts which could have been phrased more felicitously.

129. I wish it to be clear, however, that Australia is fully committed to the success of United Nations efforts to resolve the situation in Namibia. We are especially committed to the current efforts of the Security Council to bring Namibia to self-determination and independence, and we fully understand the frustrations which the situation now before the Assembly must arouse.

130. Mr. MacKAY (Canada): In explanation of vote, the Governments of Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States wish to reaffirm our unabated commitment to the early implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and our equally firm attachment to the provisions of the United Nations Charter, in particular those related to the respective powers and functions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

131. Our Governments have undertaken and are firmly committed to pursue our initiative to bring about internationally recognized independence for Namibia.

We do not want it complicated by our taking a position on the substance of the main draft resolutions before us.

132. Consequently, on purely procedural grounds and without prejudice to our well-known positions, our five delegations have abstained in the vote on draft resolutions A/34/L.45, A/34/L.46, A/34/L.47, A/34/L.50/Rev.1 and A/34/L.56. We were pleased to join the consensus on draft resolutions A/34/L.48 and A/34/L.49, despite certain reservations, which have been explained previously.

133. Mr. MURATA (Japan): My delegation would like to make a few comments on some of the draft resolutions which have just been adopted and for which my delegation voted.

134. With regard to the draft resolution entitled "Programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia", contained in document A/34/L.45, my delegation finds some expressions in the operative paragraphs difficult to support.

135. With regard to the draft resolution entitled "Intensification and co-ordination of United Nations action in support of Namibia", contained in document A/34/L.46, my delegation has reservations on operative paragraphs 2 and 7.

136. With regard to the draft resolution entitled "Action by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations with respect to Namibia", contained in document A/34/L.47, my delegation has reservations on some operative paragraphs.

137. Mr. KOLBY (Norway): The Norwegian delegation voted in favour of all the draft resolutions because we support the main thrust of those resolutions. However, we have strong reservations on certain elements in them.

138. Norway has consistently and as a matter of principle been in favour of political change by peaceful means—a fundamental principle of the United Nations Charter. It has been our position not to condone formulations which explicitly endorse the use of armed force. We therefore have serious reservations on such formulations in draft resolutions. In connexion with the call for all necessary support and assistance to SWAPO, I should like to restate the long-standing policy of the Norwegian Government of providing humanitarian and economic assistance.

139. Finally, my delegation feels that the draft resolutions just adopted do not properly reflect the important negotiations now under way towards an internationally acceptable settlement in Namibia allowing for free and fair elections under United Nations supervision and control. The Norwegian Government fully supports these negotiations. Only the results of such a political process can determine the political future of Namibia.

140. Mr. VAYENAS (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation voted in favour of all the draft resolutions on Namibia which have just been adopted. In so doing, we wished once again to convey our full support for the struggle of the Namibian people for their

independence, pursuant to the numerous resolutions on this subject adopted by our Organization.

141. However, some paragraphs in draft resolution A/34/L.56 caused us some difficulty and, had there been a separate vote on those paragraphs, we should have been obliged to abstain. I should like to refer, *inter alia*, specifically to the last two operative paragraphs, which do not appear to have taken account of some recent developments that do seem very encouraging.

142. It is our belief that at this stage it would be useful to avoid any kind of initiative which might harm current negotiations, to which we attach great importance.

143. Mr. PFIRTER (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): We wish to express our reservations with respect to operative paragraphs 3 and 12 of draft resolution A/34/L.56, which has just been adopted.

144. In our view, the contents of those paragraphs are not entirely compatible with the negotiations that have been undertaken pursuant to Security Council resolution 435 (1978) regarding Namibia or with the peaceful, democratic and equitable process that has been called for by this very General Assembly for the decolonization of the Territory. Paragraph 12 also implies an endorsement of measures that is not envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations.

145. These reservations also form the basis for our position on operative paragraphs 4 and 13 of draft resolution A/34/L.56.

146. In conclusion, we should like to reiterate our conviction that specific criticism of countries or groups of countries in this and other texts adopted by the General Assembly is not, in our opinion, to be recommended as decisions adopted here then lack support and efficacy.

147. Mr. MAKEKA (Lesotho): My delegation voted in favour of all the draft resolutions before this Assembly. However, with regard to draft resolution A/34/L.56, my delegation has problems with operative paragraph 24.

148. Mr. ERALP (Turkey): The Turkish delegation has voted in favour of all seven draft resolutions concerning the question of Namibia, in spite of certain difficulties we have, especially as regards draft resolution A/34/L.56.

149. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, we recognize the unique responsibilities that the United Nations has over the Territory. As we explained in expressing our views in detail on this question on 7 December last [94th meeting], we still feel that a negotiated settlement of the question of Namibia may best be found in terms of the United Nations transitional plan endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

150. Although we feel that draft resolution A/34/L.56 does not adequately reflect the peace efforts in this regard, we understand the frustrations aroused in the international community by the intransigent attitude of

South Africa and its delaying tactics. Our positive vote for draft resolution A/34/L.56 should therefore be interpreted within the context of the statement that we made before this Assembly on 7 December and the pressing nature of the prevailing situation in Namibia as a whole.

151. Mr. TLOU (Botswana): My delegation voted for all the draft resolutions, but we have a problem with draft resolution A/34/L.56, operative paragraph 24 of which calls for sanctions under Chapter VII.

152. We usually reserve our position on the application of Chapter VII. We would thus like to record our reservation on operative paragraph 24.

153. Inadvertently, Botswana, had been a sponsor of that draft resolution. We accordingly withdraw our sponsorship therefrom.

154. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of SWAPO, who wishes to make a statement.

155. Mr. MUESHIHANGE (South West Africa People's Organization): It gives us great pleasure to intervene once again, especially when the debate is about to conclude.

156. The delegation of SWAPO listened in sincerity and with careful attention to over 86 speakers in this debate. We are greatly heartened that the overwhelming majority of them renewed their constant solidarity with and support for the struggling Namibian people and their vanguard movement, SWAPO. Their positive votes attest to this.

157. We also appreciated the fact that this majority spared no time and did not mince its words when denouncing and condemning the fascist Boer junta of Pretoria for its continued illegal occupation of Namibia, its brutal repression of the Namibian patriots and militants and its ruthless exploitation of the people and natural resources of our country, including its colonialist schemes to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia.

158. We were, furthermore, encouraged to note that not only were the Pretoria Fascists condemned but also the major Western imperialist countries were condemned and indicted for their duplicity and hypocrisy with regard to their involvement in the colonial situation of brutal repression and ruthless exploitation being perpetrated by the Botha régime in Namibia.

159. It is now agreed that the situation in Namibia is critical and extremely dangerous and poses a serious threat to the peace and security of the region. SWAPO welcomes the undertaking by some countries to assist the front-line States most effectively to combat the efforts of the Pretoria-Salisbury illegal régimes to destroy the economic infrastructure and the population centres in those States. Any support for the front-line States is indirect, if not direct, support for the liberation struggle in southern Africa.

160. Like us, many speakers called for the urgent resolution, if possible by negotiated settlement of the Namibian problem. This is to be welcomed. But it was

also stressed that the negotiating business should not go on forever. And, in any case, the instruments of the United Nations should not be used to frustrate the legitimate aspirations of the Namibians for genuine independence and to negate all that the just struggle has been able to achieve through the blood, sweat and tears of our heroic patriots. Puppets were exposed, condemned and rejected.

161. SWAPO reaffirms its readiness to co-operate with the Secretary-General and his team, as well as with all competent political bodies of the United Nations, to ensure the early and speedy independence of Namibia.

162. In this connexion, the Boer junta either wants implementation of the United Nations plan or rejects it. If the latter, then the Security Council has the power to censure that régime by imposing, at the earliest possible time, total economic sanctions against it. With such action must also go a decision by the entire international community to support openly and massively the SWAPO-led armed struggle in Namibia, as a matter of conviction.

163. We leave New York inspired by the many good things said about the struggle of our people and about SWAPO. We are enormously reinforced in the knowledge that so long as the harsh conditions of the struggle continue to exist for so long can we expect the solidarity and support of the overwhelming majority of the States Members of this Organization.

164. The struggle continues; death or independence; we shall win.

## AGENDA ITEM 28

### **Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa (continued)\***

- (a) Report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*;
- (b) Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports;
- (c) Report of the Secretary-General

165. The PRESIDENT: At its 56th meeting, on 7 November 1979, the General Assembly decided that several organizations should be heard by the Special Political Committee. The Committee's report on that subject is contained in document A/34/675. May I consider that the General Assembly decides to take note of the report of the Special Political Committee?

*It was so decided [decision 34/423].*

166. The PRESIDENT: I call first on the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, who wishes to make a short statement.

167. Mr. CLARK (Nigeria), Chairman, Special Committee against *Apartheid*: I hesitate to speak at this stage to plead for understanding and co-operation in the efforts of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* to combat the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa. I am all the more reluctant to

do so because we have always counted on the help and support of the Secretary-General. He has always shown full understanding and appreciation of our mandate, and I want to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to him and his staff for all the assistance they have always given to the Centre against *Apartheid*.

168. However, I understand that during the consideration of the financial implications of draft resolution A/34/L.34/Rev.1 on the programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, the Fifth Committee was informed by the Secretary-General of a study by the Administrative Management Service on the reorganization of the work and reallocation of the various functions of the Centre against *Apartheid*. I gather from paragraph 66 of the note submitted by the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/34/54 and Corr.1 of 28 November 1979 relating to the study I referred to that "there has been an increase in the volume of the work performed by the Centre and an expansion of its activities". In paragraph 69 of the note the Secretary-General went on to recall the decision of the General Assembly at its thirty-third session to open a liaison office in Geneva to maintain the closest contact with the specialized agencies in Europe and with the non-governmental organizations, which contribute enormously to the efforts at educating and mobilizing world public opinion against *apartheid*.

169. The report of the Fifth Committee [A/34/822] would have the adverse effect of closing the liaison office in Geneva. Even though I am in basic agreement with the Secretary-General's note to which I have referred stating that the arrangements for liaison work in Geneva could be improved—an observation that apparently led to the proposal to close the liaison office in Geneva—I wish to propose that consideration of draft resolution A/34/L.34/Rev.1 be deferred for a while to enable me to consult more fully with the Secretary-General, and subsequently with the Fifth Committee, on the wisdom of closing down the Geneva office at a time when there is a crying need for a marked expansion and improvement of United Nations work in the anti-*apartheid* area. Let me add that, as a former Permanent Representative in Geneva, I know the unique role of Geneva in these matters, and I respectfully suggest that the matter be looked into more closely.

170. The financial implications of closing the office in Geneva so as to redeploy the officer in charge to New York are minimal. The incumbent will continue to earn the same salary, at the P-4 level, and the appropriate perquisites, whether he works in Geneva or in New York.

171. I therefore wish to repeat my appeal to you, Mr. President, and to the Assembly to defer consideration of the draft resolution in question in order to enable the matter to be resolved to the satisfaction of all concerned. I would not normally have done this since the report of the Fifth Committee does not affect the wording of the draft resolution, but there is the technicality of determining its financial implications: hence my humble plea.

172. The PRESIDENT: If the Assembly has no objection—and I would hope that, in order to facilitate

\* Resumed from the 69th meeting.

our work, there will be none—we shall defer consideration of draft resolution A/34/L.34/Rev.1 in accordance with the proposal made by the representative of Nigeria.

*It was so decided.*

173. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the 17 draft resolutions before it.

174. I shall call first on those representatives who wish to explain their votes on any of those draft resolutions. I should like to remind the Assembly that under rule 88 of the rules of procedure: "The President shall not permit the proposer of a proposal or of an amendment to explain his vote on his own proposal or amendment."

175. Miss FORT (United Kingdom): The speakers in the debate on item 28 have without exception expressed their abhorrence of that system of racial separation and discrimination. My delegation wishes to associate itself with this common view: *apartheid* is an insult to the dignity of mankind and must come to an end.

176. I should like, however, to place on record certain fundamental positions of principle which my delegation holds in relation to the debate on *apartheid* and in particular to the draft resolutions which we have before us today.

177. On draft resolution A/34/L.22, my delegation would like to state that, with the assumption today of full legislative and executive authority over the Territory of Southern Rhodesia by the British Governor, the references in this draft resolution to Rhodesia can apply only to the period preceding the return to legality.

178. With reference to draft resolution A/34/L.25/Rev.1, various delegations have spoken of their deep concern at the possibility of South Africa's acquiring a nuclear-weapon capability. If a nuclear explosion had taken place in the South Atlantic it would be a matter which we, of course, would view very seriously indeed. But we note that there has been no further evidence to corroborate the United States Government's indications of the possibility of an explosion's having taken place. Various delegations that have drawn the conclusion from what little evidence is available that South Africa has exploded a nuclear device have implied that my Government has in some way contributed to this. Any such hint or allegation we categorically reject. It is unthinkable that we, as a depositary Power of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*], should assist South Africa to manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, and we have not done so.

179. On draft resolution A/34/L.27, we shall be associated with the consensus because we do not recognize the bantustans. We cannot, however, accept the full implications of operative paragraph 6 of this draft resolution since my Government will not take measures infringing individual freedom to prohibit all individuals and corporations under United Kingdom

jurisdiction from having any dealings with the bantustans.

180. As in the past, my delegation will also go along with the consensus on draft resolution A/34/L.28. Nevertheless, we do not accept the reference in operative paragraph 5 to the legitimacy or otherwise of the South African Government.

181. We should also like to place on record our reservations on the provisions of draft resolutions A/34/L.30, A/34/L.32/Rev.1 and A/34/L.33 calling for action by private organizations, the press, television and broadcasting corporations, which in our country are autonomous and not subject to governmental control.

182. The United Kingdom, while being prepared to join a consensus on draft resolution A/34/L.36/Rev.1, dissociates itself from any endorsement of violence as implied in paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the proposed Declaration, does not accept that paragraphs 4 and 5 require the adoption by it of any new legislative or administrative measures and does not interpret any of the language of paragraphs 3 and 7 as being used in the sense of Article 39 of the Charter.

183. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): In explaining our vote on the various draft resolutions on *apartheid* which are before us, my delegation while endorsing all of them, feels that they do not adequately address themselves to one very grave and cruel component of *apartheid* which racist South Africa has been practising with impunity.

184. An abundant and balanced flow of information deserves our commendation for highlighting this inimical aspect of *apartheid*, which represents primordial covetousness at its worst. It is a universal issue requiring a universal response.

185. We could not but be shocked by a dispatch published by the *New York Times* on 6 December 1979 from correspondent John F. Burns, under the heading: "South Africa Plans to Move a Town of some 50,000 people". The article refers to a "neat little town of some 50,000 people" who have lived there for generations. According to the article, it has

"... eleven schools, seven churches, as many general stores, a community centre and a clinic. But . . . the Government in Pretoria, a Government of the white man, has ruled that the town must be struck down and its people, all blacks, removed".

They are presumably to be removed because they have three small rivers flowing through their land.

186. Such savage brutality would call for the strongest condemnation by the General Assembly, even if it were a single isolated crime; but evidently, it is not, for according to the same dispatch,

"... about two million blacks have been uprooted and resettled elsewhere in the past quarter of a century under a policy that in human consequences and scale finds few echoes in Western experience".



187. According to the racist Government, another million blacks could be removed before its master plan is completed. And on what grounds is the black population uprooted? Ostensibly for what the Government calls "strategic considerations"—very reminiscent of Israel's continuing uprooting of the Palestinian people over the past three decades on what the colonizers call security grounds. The real reason is, in both cases, that—

188. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of Israel on a point of order.

189. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Jordan is one of the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in A/34/L.37 and Add.1, "Relations between Israel and South Africa" and is therefore not entitled to explain its vote in that connexion.

190. The PRESIDENT: If the representative of Jordan is explaining his vote with reference to that specific draft resolution, he is not entitled to do so, but of course there are a number of other draft resolutions on which the Assembly is about to vote. I invite the representative of Jordan to make sure that his explanation of vote refers to those draft resolutions of which his delegation is not a sponsor.

191. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): As a matter of fact, I was going to make a specific suggestion which does not refer to any of the draft resolutions of which my delegation is a sponsor. Therefore I hope that we shall not fall into the category of delegations precluded from making the suggestion that I am about to make.

192. The real reason is both cases, as I was saying, is to enable the outlaw aggressors to take over the land for themselves and to assign the legitimate inhabitants to arid and barren areas, without water or means of sustaining vegetation or grazing. Such appalling inhumanity and greed makes a particularly piercing wound in our hearts, because our people have been through this kind of uprooting and we know exactly what it means.

193. This is my message. It is the fervent hope of my delegation that our President, at his discretion and at the behest of the General Assembly, will issue a statement on behalf of the Assembly condemning past and impending measures in South Africa and requesting that they be rescinded forthwith.

194. Such a statement would be an expression of the very deep concern with which the General Assembly views the uprooting, dislocation and physical and psychological suffering to which the black majority of South Africa is being continually subjected.

195. We should be failing in our duty and blind to our moral imperatives if we did not make our voice clearly heard. We should express the conscience of mankind, regardless of whether it will be heeded.

196. Mr. BLUM (Israel): In our statement during the debate on the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa, I remarked that we were engaged, not in a process of deliberation, but in a ritualistic incantation which has severely undermined the very purpose

of the annual debate on *apartheid*. I also took that opportunity to restate Israel's position on *apartheid*, its unequivocal rejection of racism and racial discrimination in any form, and its equally unequivocal rejection of the specious and malicious policy of singling out Israel. Time and again we have produced official international statistics showing that Israel's trade with South Africa amounted to two fifths of 1 per cent of South Africa's foreign trade, and we have asked to see the special resolutions condemning the countries that account for the other 99.6 per cent of that trade. We have stated and restated our compliance with Security Council resolution 418 (1977), and we have refuted the specific lies and distortions contained in the special report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*.

197. All of this has been to no avail. Reality must not be allowed to intrude on a sacred ritual. If we had not been presented today with a special draft resolution concerning Israel, it would have amounted to an admission that such a policy in the past had been mistaken and misguided. And so the Assembly is being asked to vote today on a rehashed concoction of malicious lies that have become an embarrassment to the very stature and prestige of this world Organization.

198. The sponsors of draft resolution A/34/L.37 have seen fit to ignore official communications from my Government, contained in official documents of the United Nations, refuting the false allegations against Israel. Instead they have relied on the unsupported distortions, innuendoes and speculative press reports contained in the special report of the Special Committee. It is on "evidence" like this that draft resolution A/34/L.37 is based.

199. I shall not repeat the figures relating to trade because they can be learned from official international publications. But if it is an "alliance" with *apartheid* that we are talking about, let us at least apply the same standards to every country represented here, and let us then receive a full accounting of all trade, investment, tourism, gold purchases and oil supplies to South Africa. Most of the countries represented in this world Organization, including many of the sponsors of this hypocritical draft resolution, might find themselves the targets of special resolutions. By singling out Israel, however, the sponsors intend to cover up, rather than to investigate, the issue.

200. The necessity of repeating these plain and obvious facts is a wearisome task. It is high time that a serious assessment of this ritual took place before it backfires completely. When certain States persist in turning an *apartheid* debate into a Middle East debate, they succeed only in showing their disdain for and disinterest in a subject of vital concern to both Africa and the world. Since draft resolution A/34/L.37 contains particularly obnoxious falsehoods, it is worth considering who in fact is committing a hostile act against Africa, for the double-standard of which I have spoken has actually undermined the international campaign against racism and racial discrimination.

201. Neither the special report [A/34/22/Add.1] nor—it goes without saying—the statements of certain representatives mention my delegation's letters to the

Security Council or its replies to the inquiries of the Special Committee which document Israel's full compliance with Security Council resolution 418 (1977). The Special Committee's decision to omit relevant official United Nations documentation clearly demonstrates the total lack of integrity characterizing the authors of such reports. Moreover, not content with denying Israel a fair hearing in this Assembly, the sponsors deny Israel's right to any hearing at all, as is made only too clear by the fact that draft resolution A/34/L.37 before us today was drawn up even before Israel had addressed the General Assembly on this agenda item. Instead of promoting universal consensus, that draft resolution has succeeded in causing division and recrimination.

202. Because Israel has been singled out as the only country in the world for specific condemnation on its own in a special resolution, based on patent falsehoods, my delegation will not participate in the voting on this agenda item. I request that this non-participation be duly reflected in the record. We take this stand to express our abhorrence at the cynical debasement of this entire discussion.

203. Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): I speak on behalf of the five Nordic countries: Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden.

204. The Nordic countries' consistent condemnation and rejection of *apartheid* and all forms of racial discrimination are well known and of long standing. This is based on the traditional Nordic concepts of justice and freedom and our faith in the equality and dignity of every human being. Our commitment to those goals is also demonstrated by our continuous humanitarian assistance to the victims of *apartheid*.

205. Therefore, the Nordic countries will again vote for the majority of the draft resolutions that will shortly be put to the vote. In view of this basic position of our countries, we regret that we will not be able to support all the draft resolutions. Some of them in fact give us grave difficulties. Those difficulties are difficulties of principle, some of them encountered in several draft resolutions. I shall therefore describe the reasons for those difficulties in general terms.

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

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

208. Thirdly, the situation in South Africa results from the system of *apartheid*, which is a system of oppression and subjugation. We do not conceive of it as a case for decolonization and, consequently, cannot accept formulations implying that it is.

209. Fourthly, because of the strict adherence of the Nordic countries to the provisions of the Charter, we must generally reserve our position with regard to formulations which fail to take into account that only

the Security Council can adopt decisions binding on Member States.

210. Fifthly, the Nordic countries deplore the inappropriate singling out of individual countries in a situation in which only concerted international action can bear fruit.

211. Sixthly, the implementation of some of the draft resolutions would encroach upon the constitutional freedoms and rights of Nordic citizens and private organizations.

212. Finally, we have to voice our growing concern over the general tendency to introduce increasingly controversial elements into resolutions dealing with *apartheid*. Far from strengthening the case against *apartheid*, this tendency is likely to erode the broad international support that is necessary.

213. Those are the considerations on which most of our reservations are based. They apply particularly to draft resolution A/34/L.21, concerning the situation in South Africa. In fact I should be less than frank if I did not confess that all the Nordic countries were on the verge of voting against it. More specifically on draft resolution A/34/L.21, we have particularly strong reservations on operative paragraphs 3, 8 and 9.

214. With regard to draft resolution A/34/L.26, concerning the oil embargo against South Africa, it is our view that operative paragraph 4 should be conceived as an extension of operative paragraph 3—that is, as being subject to Security Council decision. The measures foreseen in operative paragraph 4 can in several instances be implemented by the Nordic countries only on the basis of such a decision.

215. On draft resolution A/34/L.28, concerning political prisoners in South Africa, the positive vote of the Nordic countries should not be seen as giving up our position concerning the applicability of prisoner-of-war status in accordance with relevant Geneva Conventions. In this connexion I am instructed to express on behalf of the five Nordic Governments our profound shock and indignation at the very severe sentences imposed on 12 members of the African National Congress on 15 November in Pietermaritzburg, in South Africa. The death sentence received by Mr. James Daniel Mange and the other sentences imposed upon the 11 co-accused involving long-term imprisonment of from 14 to 19 years must be seen as yet another tragic result of South African *apartheid* policies. On behalf of the five Nordic Governments I launch an urgent appeal to the South African authorities to spare the life of Mr. James Daniel Mange and to reconsider the sentences imposed on the other defendants.

216. I turn next to draft resolution A/34/L.32/Rev.1, concerning the role of mass media in international action against *apartheid*. The Nordic countries will not be able to vote for the draft resolution in spite of our support for the widest possible dissemination of information on the importance of combating *apartheid*. What I said a moment ago about the reservations caused by the constitutional freedoms of Nordic citizens applies particularly to this draft resolution. In fact, the wording of the first few operative paragraphs

implies an infringement of the freedom of the press, which to us is sacrosanct. For those reasons some of the Nordic countries seriously considered casting a negative vote on this draft resolution.

217. On draft resolution A/34/L.35, dealing with *apartheid* in sports, the Nordic Governments support the general objectives of the International Declaration against *Apartheid* in Sports. We should like to point out, however, as we have done on previous occasions, that sports organizations in the Nordic countries are private entities. While in some Nordic countries the authorities may suggest that those organizations act in a certain manner, the organizations are free to take that advice or to reject it.

218. All the Nordic countries will vote against draft resolution A/34/L.37, concerning relations between Israel and South Africa, since, as I have already mentioned, we consider it inappropriate to single out one individual country in this context.

219. In conclusion, I wish to note that the Nordic countries will support most of the draft resolutions, and have sponsored some. This is in line with our consistent opposition to the system of *apartheid* in all its forms and manifestations. Our commitment to combat actively the evil of *apartheid* through the United Nations remains firm.

220. Mr. TLOU (Botswana): My delegation will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions on *apartheid* except those that have to do with sanctions against South Africa.

221. We are, of course, not against sanctions, for we know their real objective, and we support that objective. Our abstention is based solely upon our precarious geographical position vis-à-vis the *apartheid* State. It is that position that renders our economic survival extremely precarious. It is for that reason alone that we are not able to go along with all the draft resolutions.

222. We will, accordingly, register our abstention on draft resolutions A/34/L.21, A/34/L.23 and A/34/L.26.

223. Our support for the liberation movement is, of course, not affected by our abstention. We remain as firm as ever in our support for the cause of our brothers in southern Africa, and they can always count upon it.

224. Mr. PFIRTER (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): We shall abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/34/L.27, concerning relations between Israel and South Africa because we do not agree with the selective criterion used.

225. For similar reasons, and without prejudice to our support for all the other draft resolutions, we should like to reserve our position on the mention of countries in the various texts that are about to be voted upon. In our view the enumeration of countries by name, apart from resulting in unjust discrimination, impairs support for and therefore the effectiveness of the decisions of the General Assembly.

226. Similarly we wish to express reservations on the following paragraphs of the draft resolutions. First, we

have reservations on the reference to armed struggle in operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/34/L.21, on the situation in South Africa, since this represents support for a means of action that has not been contemplated in the United Nations Charter. Our reservations on that paragraph apply also to operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/34/L.36/Rev.1, which contains a Declaration on South Africa.

227. In addition, we should like to make it perfectly clear that in our view the fulfilment of the measures proposed in operative paragraph 12 of draft resolution A/34/L.21 could not be required of Governments until such time as the Security Council, the only organ that can impose mandatory sanctions against a State, adopts relevant resolutions.

228. Similarly, we wish to reserve our position on operative paragraph 2 (c) of draft resolution A/34/L.24/Rev.1, on the arms embargo against South Africa, since it includes as cases of collaboration with Pretoria particular cases which do not necessarily belong in that category.

229. Finally, we wish to express our reservations on the fourth preambular paragraph and on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/34/L.28 concerning political prisoners in South Africa. We do so because Argentina abstained on article 44—on combatants and prisoners of war—of Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949, relating to the protection of victims of international armed conflicts,<sup>20</sup> and because that Protocol is still being studied by our authorities.

230. Mr. ERALP (Turkey): The Turkish delegation will support all the draft resolutions on agenda item 28, with the exception of two: draft resolutions A/34/L.21, on the situation in South Africa, and A/34/L.25/Rev.1 on nuclear collaboration with South Africa, on both of which we shall abstain.

231. Our views on this agenda item were explained in detail to the Assembly on 8 November 1979 [*59th meeting*]. Our support for these draft resolutions, therefore, is a reflection of our consistent opposition to the degrading and inhuman policies of *apartheid* as well as our clear-cut recognition of the necessity of taking effective mandatory measures against the Government of South Africa because of those policies.

232. However, my delegation would like to put on record that we are not pleased about the wording and nature of some of these draft resolutions. Furthermore, we are not convinced that any useful purpose is or can be served by singling out some countries by name among others which also follow similar policies that contradict the United Nations resolutions in this connexion.

233. Our abstention in the voting on the draft resolutions I have mentioned stems from the fact that we reject in principle singling out the names of countries on a selective basis, and therefore is to be explained in that context.

<sup>20</sup> See document A/32/144, annex I.

234. Operative paragraph 9 of document A/34/L.21 and operative paragraph 2 of document A/34/L.25/Rev.1 contain such language, and sweeping generalizations. In fact, if it had not been for the language of those operative paragraphs, my delegation would have voted for those draft resolutions as well.

235. As for operative paragraph 11 of draft resolution A/34/L.21 on the situation in South Africa, on which we shall abstain, I wish to recall that the Turkish delegation voted for the draft International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly [*resolution 3068 (XXVIII), annex*]. However, my delegation, in a statement made at the time,<sup>21</sup> pointed out the substantial legal problems which the draft Convention posed for us. Certain provisions of the Convention are not compatible with some of those of our national legal system. This position of the Turkish Government still remains unchanged vis-à-vis the said Convention.

236. As for draft resolution A/34/L.32/Rev.1 on the role of the mass media in international action against *apartheid*, we shall support it, in spite of some constitutional difficulties it causes for us. The freedom of the press is one of the basic provisions of the Turkish constitutional system. That being the case, we shall still vote for the draft resolution because we interpret its main thrust as the taking of possible and effective action against *apartheid*, action which we fully support.

237. Mr. MALINGA (Swaziland): Because of the strong historical, ethnic and geographical links that exist between our people and the people of southern Africa, and in particular those of South Africa, Swaziland supports their liberation with an intensity of passion. We want them to be fully independent. We long for the day when, in common with us all here, they will enjoy their inalienable right to determine the destiny of the country of their birth.

238. This is why we shall vote for almost all the draft resolutions before us. However, because of our proximity, which exposes us to economic vulnerability, Swaziland has difficulty in supporting the call for mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter.

239. It is basically for this reason that we find ourselves in a position in which we must abstain on draft resolutions A/34/L.21, A/34/L.23 and A/34/L.26.

240. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Panama will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions which have been submitted under agenda item 28 on the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa.

241. Nevertheless, we wish to put on record a reservation, because my country does not think that we should single out specific names, as is the case in operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/34/L.21.

242. However, with that exception, my delegation will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions.

243. Mr. PIZA ESCALANTE (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Costa Rica will vote in favour of most of the draft resolutions on the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa, with the following exceptions and reservations.

244. In connexion with draft resolution A/34/L.21, we wish to make an express reservation to the thirteenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 9, because they single out individual countries but do not mention other countries which also co-operate with the South African régime—not only countries in Western Europe, or the United States, but countries in general in all continents and with different ideologies.

245. In connexion with draft resolution A/34/L.37, my delegation will abstain first because draft resolution A/34/L.21 already refers in general to the same subject, and, secondly, because once again if Israel is mentioned, we believe that all States which have the same kind of political, military, nuclear and economic collaboration with South Africa should also be mentioned as being guilty of co-operating with that régime.

246. In connexion with draft resolutions A/34/L.29/Rev.1 and A/34/L.34/Rev.1, although we shall vote in favour of them we wish to make an express reservation concerning operative paragraph 4 of the former and operative paragraph 11 of the latter since we consider it dangerous and serious for the United Nations to be asked to finance offices in New York of certain organizations and entities.

247. The PRESIDENT: I now call upon the representative of the United States who wishes to speak on a point of order.

248. Mr. DUNFEY (United States of America): My delegation requests a vote on the identical language in draft resolution A/34/L.29/Rev.1, operative paragraph 4; and in draft resolution A/34/L.34/Rev.1, operative paragraph 11. We believe that it is unwise and illogical for the United Nations to offer financial support to organizations whose avowed purpose is to overthrow the Government of a State Member of the United Nations. We urge delegations to reject the identical language now contained in operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/34/L.29/Rev.1 and in operative paragraph 11 of draft resolution A/34/L.34/Rev.1.

249. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now take decisions on the various draft resolutions before it. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of those draft resolutions is contained in document A/34/822.

250. We shall turn first to draft resolution A/34/L.21 and Add.1, entitled "Situation in South Africa". The delegation of Senegal has asked for a separate vote on operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

<sup>21</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Third Committee, 2007th meeting, paras. 37-41.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh,<sup>22</sup> Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica,<sup>22</sup> Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

*Against:* Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Central African Empire, Chile, Colombia, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico,<sup>23</sup> Nepal, Niger, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Zaire.

*Operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution was adopted by 67 votes to 25, with 45 abstentions.*

251. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/34/L.21 and Add.1 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar,

Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, 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, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

*Abstaining:* Austria, Bahamas, Botswana, Central African Republic, Chile, Finland, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Japan, Lesotho, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Singapore, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay.

*The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 109 votes to 12, with 21 abstentions (resolution 34/93 A).<sup>24</sup>*

252. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to draft resolution A/34/L.22 and Add.1, entitled "United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa". May I take it that the General Assembly is prepared to adopt this draft resolution without a vote?

*The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 34/93 B).*

253. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/34/L.23 and Add.1, entitled "International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar,

<sup>22</sup> The delegations of Bangladesh and Jamaica subsequently informed the Secretariat that they wished to have their votes on operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution recorded as abstentions.

<sup>23</sup> The delegation of Mexico subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution.

<sup>24</sup> The delegation of the Sudan subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as being in favour of the draft resolution.

Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

*Abstaining:* Australia, Austria, Botswana, Guatemala, Honduras, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 125 votes to 7, with 12 abstentions (resolution 34/93 C).*

254. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/34/L.24/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1, entitled "Arms embargo against South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

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

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

*Abstaining:* Belgium, Canada, Central African Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Italy, Luxembourg, Portugal, Spain.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 132 votes to 3, with 9 abstentions (resolution 34/93 D).*

255. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/34/L.25/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear collaboration with South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

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

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

*Abstaining:* Belgium, Canada, Central African Republic, Denmark, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Spain, Togo, Turkey.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 119 votes to 4, with 18 abstentions (resolution 34/93 E).*

256. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/34/L.26 and Add.1, entitled "Oil embargo against South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic,

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

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

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

*The draft resolution was adopted by 124 votes to 7, with 13 abstentions (resolution 34/93 F).*

257. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/34/L.27 and Add.1, entitled "Bantustans". In the past, similar draft resolutions have been adopted by consensus. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt that draft resolution without a vote?

*The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 34/93 G).*

258. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to draft resolution A/34/L.28 and Add.1, entitled "Political prisoners in South Africa". May I take it that the General Assembly also wishes to adopt that draft resolution without a vote?

*The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 34/93 H).*

259. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/34/L.29/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1, entitled "Assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement". A separate vote has been requested on operative paragraph 4. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colom-

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

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

*Abstaining:* Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Chile, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Uruguay.

*Operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution was adopted by 111 votes to 9, with 21 abstentions.*

260. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/34/L.29/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, 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, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab

Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

*Abstaining:* Belgium, Canada, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Honduras, Luxembourg, Portugal.

*The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 134 votes to 3, with 7 abstentions (resolution 34/93 I).*

261. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/34/L.30 and Add.1, entitled "Dissemination of information on *apartheid*". A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

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

*Against:* None.

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

*The draft resolution was adopted by 142 votes to none, with 3 abstentions (resolution 34/93 J).*

262. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/34/L.31 and Add.1 entitled "Women and children under *apartheid*". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt that draft resolution without a vote?

*The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 34/93 K).*

263. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/34/L.32/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1, entitled "Role of the mass media in international action against *apartheid*". A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, 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, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* None.

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

*The draft resolution was adopted by 125 votes to none, with 19 abstentions (resolution 34/93 L).*

264. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/34/L.33 and Add.1, entitled "Role of non-governmental organizations in international action against *apartheid*". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt that draft resolution without a vote?



*The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 34/93 M).*

265. The PRESIDENT: Consideration of draft resolution A/34/L.34/Rev.1, entitled "Programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid", has been postponed by the Assembly to a later date [see para. 172 above].

266. The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/34/L.35 and Add.1 entitled "Apartheid in sports". A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

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

*Against:* None.

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

*The draft resolution was adopted by 131 votes to none, with 14 abstentions (resolution 34/93 N).*

267. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/34/L.36/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1, entitled "Declaration on South Africa". May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt that draft resolution without a vote?

*The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 34/93 O).*

268. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/34/L.37 and Add.1, entitled

"Relations between Israel and South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, 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, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

*Abstaining:* Argentina, Bahamas, Brazil, Burma, Central African Republic, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Greece, Guatemala, Ivory Coast, Japan, Malawi, Mexico, Nepal, Portugal, Samoa, Singapore, Thailand, Uruguay.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 102 votes to 18, with 22 abstentions (resolution 34/93 P).*

269. The PRESIDENT: Lastly, the Assembly will vote on draft resolution A/34/L.39 and Add.1, entitled "Investments in South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

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

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

*Against:* None.

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

*The draft resolution was adopted by 130 votes to none, with 12 abstentions (resolution 34/93 Q).*

270. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those delegations that wish to explain their votes after the vote.

271. Mr. KEATING (Ireland): I shall speak on behalf of the nine member States of the European Community.

272. The nine States in their common statement in the course of the debate on item 28 [58th meeting] condemned *apartheid* without reservation. It is an evil system which violates the fundamental rights of the majority of the citizens of South Africa. It is as demeaning to those who impose the system as to those on whom it is imposed.

273. The nine States are convinced that the *apartheid* system must end and they continue to urge the South African Government to bring about rapid and fundamental change in South Africa. Change is inevitable. The nine States earnestly hope that the South African Government will respond to the wishes of the majority of its citizens and of the international community as a whole by ending *apartheid* before opportunities for peaceful change have passed.

*Mr. Piza Escalante (Costa Rica), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

274. The debate on this item has demonstrated the unanimous opposition of this Assembly to *apartheid*. While sharing the feelings of frustration of the authors of the draft resolutions, the nine States think that a greater effort should have been made to give expression to this Assembly's total rejection of *apartheid* through texts which could have been accepted by all. The nine States regret that extraneous and unnecessary elements have been introduced in these texts.

275. The nine States maintain that, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the division of competence between the General Assembly and the Security Council must be respected, and that the General Assembly should remain a forum for discussion among Member States.

276. The nine States continue to support those within South Africa who are striving to bring an early and peaceful end to *apartheid*, and to achieve freedom, equality and social justice for all South Africans within their sovereign independent State. The nine States do not consider the situation in South Africa to be a problem of decolonization. They hope for the early emergence of a system in South Africa which truly reflects the interests and diversity of all the people of that country. At the same time, the nine States reaffirm their adherence to the principle of universality of the membership in the United Nations.

277. The nine States are conscious that the continued existence of *apartheid* policies in South Africa suggests to many that these will be ended only through armed struggle. However, the nine States believe that the United Nations has, above all, the obligation to encourage peaceful solutions and, therefore, find implicit or explicit endorsement in General Assembly resolutions of armed struggle unacceptable.

278. The nine States maintain their previously expressed position of principle on the applicability of "prisoner of war status" in conformity with the relevant Geneva Conventions. However, on the question of political prisoners in South Africa, the nine States wish to underline that they have continued to press the Government of South Africa to release, immediately and unconditionally, all those who have been arrested and are still detained because of their desire to bring about an early and peaceful end to *apartheid*.

279. The nine States cannot support a demand to cut off all relations with South Africa. They believe that existing channels of communication should be used to permit free expression of views on all political, social and economic matters of concern to the people of South Africa.

280. The nine States remain dedicated to the Olympic principle of non-discrimination. They reject without qualification *apartheid* in sports. They must point out, however, that sports are organized on a private basis in our countries. Sporting organizations in our countries are aware of our Governments' opposition to sporting contacts in violation of the Olympic principle. The nine States will continue to act in this regard in accordance with this principle.

281. The individual rights of our citizens in the area of freedom of movement and in the area of freedom of information and expression do not admit of the imposition of constraints. Our Governments cannot support texts which imply limitations of these fundamental human rights. In particular, we cannot endorse texts which imply that mass media or journalists are subordinate to governmental dictates. This suggests a relationship between government and mass media which would be inconsistent with the traditional freedom of the press and media in our countries.

282. The nine States reject all arbitrary and unjustified attacks on individual Member States.

283. The nine States regret that, for the reasons which I have indicated, it did not prove possible for them to give their support to all of the draft resolutions on this subject before the Assembly. The nine States reaffirm their commitment to continue their efforts to bring about the ending of the system of *apartheid* in South Africa.

284. I wish to conclude by making a few brief remarks by way of explaining Ireland's votes on the 17 draft resolutions before us today. My delegation was pleased to support 12 of the draft resolutions. It regrets that it was necessary to abstain on three and, as last year, to vote against one which singles out and condemns selectively one Member State in an inappropriate manner, and to vote against another draft resolution, A/34/L.21, which is unacceptable to my Government.

285. Ireland believes that fundamental change in South Africa is required as a matter of urgency. Ireland continues to believe that in this regard the international community has a vital role to play by selecting and implementing effective measures against South Africa on a collective basis. It is for that reason that Ireland has again sponsored a draft resolution, A/34/L.39, calling on the Security Council to consider imposing a ban on new investments in South Africa and has voted for draft resolution A/34/L.26 concerning the imposing of an oil embargo against South Africa. As was made clear in Ireland's explanation of vote at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly,<sup>25</sup> my delegation's inability to support certain draft resolutions is in no way inconsistent with the Irish Government's condemnation of the *apartheid* system.

286. My Government has, however, a number of reservations about some of the calls for actions contained in these draft resolutions. First, my Government believes that action by individual States, in the absence of sanctions imposed by the Security Council, is unlikely to be effective and may in some circumstances conflict with international obligations. Secondly, a number of the draft resolutions call for action by Governments which would go beyond what is normal in our society and which in some cases would cause legal difficulties. Thirdly, my Government regrets that some of the draft resolutions do not clearly distinguish between selective and comprehensive measures.

287. The reasons for my Government's many reservations on draft resolution A/34/L.21 have already been made clear in the statement that I have made on behalf of the nine member States of the European Community. In particular, my Government cannot accept the indiscriminate condemnation of a considerable number of Member States on broad and unspecified grounds. Furthermore, my Government's views on the endorsement by the General Assembly of armed struggle were made clear last year. In relation to draft resolution A/34/L.25/Rev.1, concerning nuclear collaboration with South Africa, my Government wishes to stress that it is in full agreement with the thrust of that draft

resolution, but has abstained because at least one of the States mentioned in operative paragraph 2 has repeatedly and unequivocally denied that it continues to collaborate with South Africa in nuclear matters.

288. My Government wishes to reaffirm its unequivocal support for the Olympic principle of non-discrimination in sports. The Government of Ireland has demonstrated its particular concern on this matter through clear statements of its policy which have been conveyed to sporting organizations in Ireland. Recently, it did not permit a football team from South Africa to enter Ireland. Ireland will continue to act in accordance with the spirit of the International Declaration on *Apartheid* in Sports [resolution 32/105 M, annex], but reluctantly has to abstain on draft resolution A/34/L.35 as certain of the provisions of the Declaration relate to matters which are the responsibility of private organizations in our country. Other aspects of the Declaration and perhaps the international convention against *apartheid* in sports which is currently being drafted may give rise to legal and other difficulties in our country. However, my Government continues to attach the greatest importance to action on this question by the world community.

289. Before concluding, I wish to put on record my Government's dismay at the heavy sentences imposed on 12 members of the African National Congress on 15 November and, in particular, on the death sentence imposed on Mr. James Mange. My Government urges the authorities in South Africa to review these sentences, particularly the death sentence which has been imposed on James Mange.

290. Mr. GUERREIRO (Brazil): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolutions A/34/L.21, A/34/L.26 and A/34/L.36/Rev.1.

291. The Brazilian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/34/L.21, on the situation in South Africa, as an expression of its full support for international efforts for the elimination of *apartheid*. We do, however, have reservations about a few points raised therein which seem excessive.

292. Despite the belief of my delegation that the matter under consideration falls essentially within the competence of the Security Council, we voted in favour of draft resolution A/34/L.26 on an oil embargo against South Africa, because we fully support its main thrust and objectives.

293. Regarding draft resolution A/34/L.36/Rev.1, on the Declaration on South Africa, my delegation fully recognizes the legitimacy of the struggle of the liberation movements in southern Africa. We should like to reiterate our understanding that the action of those liberation movements is to be conducted in compliance with the basic rules of international law, especially with the rules generally recognized in the United Nations.

294. Mr. LEPRETTE (France) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation already had an opportunity during the debate on this item [59th meeting] to recall France's position towards *apartheid*. We unreservedly condemn that degrading system, which is

<sup>25</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-third Session, Plenary Meetings, 94th meeting, paras. 10-18.

based on racial discrimination and is, furthermore, in contravention of fundamental individual human rights.

295. The French delegation associates itself fully with the statement made by Ireland on behalf of the European Community. We also regret the fact that in certain of the draft resolutions elements have been introduced which have pointlessly prevented a unanimous vote on them by the Assembly. For that reason, the French delegation has had to cast a negative vote on some of those draft resolutions and to abstain on others.

296. Thus, my delegation was moved to vote against draft resolution A/34/L.23, which proposes the organizing of an international conference on sanctions against South Africa. One of the essential prerequisites for the proper functioning of our Organization is, as we see it, respect for the Charter. Therefore, it is essential that the rules be obeyed which determine the respective competencies of the General Assembly and of the Security Council. The powers of the Security Council cannot, by a resolution, be attributed to any other body or authority, even less to an international conference.

297. This general remark is equally applicable to other draft resolutions, particularly to draft resolution A/34/L.26, in which it is proposed that an oil embargo be imposed.

298. Draft resolution A/34/L.24/Rev.1, on the arms embargo against South Africa, which calls for the cessation of all nuclear collaboration with that country, would be tantamount to blurring the distinction—which we regard as fundamental—which exists in this field between co-operation for civilian and peaceful purposes and that for military purposes. My delegation a few days ago had occasion to set forth the absurd consequences which would ensue from a confusion of these two ideas. It would call into question once again the entire system of guarantees against non-proliferation and would be equivalent to permitting only nuclear Powers to make use of nuclear energy.

299. The Committee of the Security Council was created by resolution 421 (1977) to monitor the implementation of resolution 418 (1977) of the Council regarding the embargo on arms for South Africa. My delegation, which has actively participated in the work of the Committee, has had occasion frequently to recall that France has respected this embargo strictly. Further, we find it difficult to understand how we are to entrust to a new body part of the mandate which is being carried out by a Committee which was specially created by the Security Council to discharge it.

300. Draft resolution A/34/L.25 directly concerns nuclear collaboration with South Africa. The same errors appear in its general approach to the problem as are to be found in draft resolution A/34/L.24/Rev.1. Furthermore, the impression is conveyed that some countries, which have been mentioned by name, give South Africa their assistance in the production of atomic explosives. This implicit accusation is contrary to the facts. Need I recall the repeated declarations which have been made by the French authorities to the effect that they are firmly opposed to the production or testing of nuclear weapons by South Africa? Various

initiatives which have been taken by my Government in this connexion clearly demonstrate that its intentions are above suspicion.

301. My country was also unjustifiably implicated in other draft resolutions, such as that contained in document A/34/L.21 on the situation in South Africa. My delegation had no choice but to vote against those texts.

302. Generally speaking, we do not believe that the complete isolation of South Africa, in particular in the economic field, would have the effects expected by certain delegations in effectively combating *apartheid*. In fact, this "quarantining" would serve only to increase the difficulties being experienced by the great majority of the South African population and would harden the position of those who are absolutely opposed to any change. Consequently we cannot agree with the provisions that are aimed at bringing this about, as contained in particular in draft resolution A/34/L.26 on the oil embargo.

303. Because an article was added to the text initially suggested proposing that the liberation movements be financed through the United Nations budget, we were forced to vote against draft resolution A/34/L.29/Rev.1, which deals with assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement. Although my country agrees that it should participate in international efforts of a humanitarian nature to help the victims of *apartheid*, the French delegation considers that, generally speaking, the drafting of this text goes beyond this goal and distorts the assistance that should be given by extending it to areas that are alien to it.

304. My delegation could have voted in favour of some of the other draft resolutions had they not contained elements that compelled us to abstain. My country's attachment to freedom of movement for people, property and ideas forced us to express certain reservations in connexion with draft resolutions A/34/L.30 regarding dissemination of information on *apartheid* and A/34/L.32/Rev.1 on the role of the mass media. These texts are part of a philosophy that we cannot share. The freedom enjoyed by the information media in France does not prevent us—quite the opposite—from disseminating available information, and particularly on the positions taken by the authorities of my country, or of other countries, which clearly indicate the unacceptable nature of the *apartheid* system.

305. It is to be regretted that drafting ambiguities have cast a doubt on the real purport of draft resolution A/34/L.36/Rev.1. My delegation wishes to repeat that it can recognize as legitimate only peaceful means in the struggle against *apartheid*. We also express our reservations on the use of language that could be interpreted as defining a situation that would come under Chapter VII of the Charter.

306. The commitments included in this draft resolution, in particular operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 are general in nature and this over-generalization is prejudicial to their sense. They could only be binding upon States to the extent that implementation was

reasonably possible and compatible with the juridical organization of the State in question. I am speaking in particular, as regards France, of the freedom of movement of people and of the independence of the information media. However, the French delegation was not prevented from joining in the consensus.

307. We took the same attitude with regard to draft resolution A/34/L.28 concerning political prisoners in South Africa. We should recall in this connexion that French authorities have not signed Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions and that we stated, at the time of its adoption, that we did not feel ourselves bound by that provision.

308. We voted in favour of draft resolutions A/34/L.22 concerning the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, A/34/L.27 on bantustans, A/34/L.31 on women and children under *apartheid* and A/34/L.33, which deals with the role of non-governmental organizations in international action against *apartheid*. This does not mean, however, that we can associate ourselves with all the provisions contained in these texts, even if we sympathize with the spirit that motivated them.

309. In particular, our vote on draft resolution A/34/L.31 should not be interpreted as acceptance of all the conclusions and recommendations of the International Seminar on Children under *Apartheid*, held in Paris from 18 to 20 June 1979 [A/34/512, annex].

310. Similarly, in connexion with draft resolution A/34/L.33, my delegation would recall that non-governmental organizations are completely independent of the State under the French legal system.

311. Draft resolution A/34/L.27 also caused us to enter certain reservations because of the difficulties involved in its implementation, particularly of operative paragraph 6, for a country that honours freedom of movement. Having given this clarification, we would reiterate our firm opposition to the so-called bantustanization policy. We do not recognize these artificial creations and we shun all official contact with them.

312. In conclusion, I should like to reaffirm the importance that France attaches to the rapid and peaceful advent in South Africa of a multiracial and democratic society. It is our ardent hope that the leaders of that country may finally understand that they must immediately carry out the reforms that have been so long awaited.

313. Mr. SCHELTEMA (Netherlands): Since the representative of Ireland has already made a general explanation of vote on behalf of the nine members of the European Community on the draft resolutions under agenda item 28, I can be brief in further explaining the vote of my delegation.

314. All the resolutions that have been adopted today have one thing in common: they are aimed, each in its own way, at the abolition of the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa. In my statement on 8 November [59th meeting] I repeated my Government's position on South Africa's policies of racial discrimination and persistent violation of human rights,

which are at the root of the dangerous situation in southern Africa. For that reason my delegation has cast a positive vote on most of the no less than 17 resolutions that have just been adopted and has sponsored some of them. However, certain resolutions contain elements or formulations that we cannot accept.

315. My delegation has voted against draft resolution A/34/L.21 on the situation in South Africa because of several objectionable paragraphs. We cannot agree to the description of South Africa as a country under the rule of an illegitimate government that should be liberated by armed struggle as suggested by operative paragraphs 1 to 3. Nor do we believe that every form of collaboration with South Africa constitutes a threat to international peace and security, as stated in operative paragraph 8. For the same reasons we cannot agree with operative paragraphs 9, 12, 14 and 16, in which certain countries or organizations are condemned or called upon to end all relations with South Africa, because we do not believe that those measures would bring about the necessary peaceful changes in that country.

316. My Government is of the opinion that, should the situation in South Africa not show substantial improvement, further pressure should be applied against the Government of South Africa by means of selective economic sanctions, in order to bring about peaceful change in that country. My Government realizes, however, that such sanctions can be effective only under Chapter VII of the Charter, or, in the case of voluntary measures, if applied by a sufficient number of countries having the potential to exert effective pressure. In the field of sanctions, my country has, for instance, scrupulously applied the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa. We voted in favour of draft resolution A/34/L.24/Rev.1, on the arms embargo, even though we have hesitations about certain operative paragraphs. In particular, we have reservations regarding operative paragraphs 3 and 4, which entrust the Special Committee against *Apartheid* with *inter alia*, certain monitoring tasks that fall within the competence of the Security Council and the Committee it established by its resolution 421 (1977). Similarly, we have a problem with operative paragraph 2, which aims at widening the scope of the measures against South Africa beyond the mandatory arms embargo.

317. My delegation also voted in favour of draft resolution A/34/L.26, on an oil embargo, as it did during the thirty-third session of the General Assembly. We wish to reiterate in this connexion that such a measure makes sense only if it is effectively applied, and for that reason we regard operative paragraph 4 entirely in the light of operative paragraph 3, in which the Security Council is requested to consider a mandatory oil embargo against South Africa. We consider this to be the essential paragraph of this draft resolution. Therefore, my Government will implement operative paragraphs 4 and 7 only if the Security Council decides in favour of a mandatory oil embargo.

318. The question of the desirability of mandatory sanctions against South Africa is one of the most hotly debated issues of foreign policy in my country. It is a question that has commanded a great deal of our atten-

tion and a sizeable amount of our time during the debates on South Africa in this hall.

319. In those debates, as well as on other occasions, we have had ample opportunity to express our opinion on the issue of mandatory sanctions against South Africa. In particular, we have submitted that the application of a total embargo against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter would run counter to international efforts consisting in a combination of dialogue and pressure. We believe that the holding of an international conference aimed at the eventual adoption of such a total embargo under Chapter VII will not serve this purpose. Such a conference could lead only to a repetition of our debates here. Effective measures can be initiated only by the Security Council in accordance with the Charter. For those reasons, we abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/34/L.23, on the international conference on sanctions against South Africa.

320. My country has consistently opposed the proliferation of nuclear weapons. We for our part cannot agree to nuclear co-operation as long as South Africa has not acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*] or has at least accepted full-scope safeguards preventing the diversion of peaceful nuclear technology for military purposes. However, since we have no indication that in fact the countries mentioned in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/34/L.25/Rev.1 are helping South Africa to acquire a nuclear weapon, we abstained in that vote.

321. My delegation joined the consensus on draft resolution A/34/L.36/Rev.1, regarding the Declaration on South Africa, because we agree with the intention of the Declaration as embodied in paragraph 1, namely, the recognition of the legitimacy of the struggle of the people of South Africa for the elimination of *apartheid* and the establishment of a non-racist society guaranteeing the enjoyment of equal rights by all the people of South Africa, irrespective of race, colour or creed.

322. We wish to emphasize, however, that the means of struggle referred to in paragraph 2 are in our opinion limited to peaceful means, since the Declaration would otherwise not be in accordance with the Charter of the Organization. Also, we do not agree with paragraph 3, because it wrongly places *apartheid* in the context of decolonization, whereas in our opinion it is to be regarded as a systematic violation of human rights. Paragraph 5 should not be taken to imply an infringement of the principle of freedom of information. As to paragraph 6, I should like to refer to what I have said about the resolution on nuclear collaboration with South Africa.

323. We voted in favour of draft resolution A/34/L.29, concerning assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement and draft resolution A/34/L.34, concerning the programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, but we wish to record our reservations regarding the last operative paragraph of both texts. We do not believe that the African National Congress of South Africa and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania can claim to represent the people of South Africa. We have always considered those organizations to be political move-

ments whose aim is the abrogation of the system of *apartheid*. The representation of South Africa should take place through its legitimate Government.

324. Mr. SCHMID (Austria): Austria has always been of the opinion that the Government of South Africa and the minority that supports its policies must be brought to understand that *apartheid* is not and can never be the basis for a viable society.

325. Only recently, Austria's categorical rejection of the policies of *apartheid* was clearly restated [*57th meeting*] during the general debate on this item. We made it quite clear, however, that we believe in change brought about by peaceful means and negotiations and that durable solutions can be found on this basis only.

326. We believe that the majority of the resolutions just adopted by this Assembly will enhance the chances for the termination of the *apartheid* system and we have therefore gladly given them our support. My delegation regrets that the content and the wording of other resolutions have not allowed us to support them unconditionally, partly for constitutional and legal considerations, and partly because of their incompatibility with the fundamental principles that guide Austria's foreign policy.

327. This consideration pertains, for example, to operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/34/L.28. We understand this particular paragraph to imply that in order to grant prisoner-of-war status to freedom fighters, the pre-conditions according to article 1, paragraph 4, of Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions have to be fulfilled.

328. With regard to draft resolutions A/34/L.21 and A/34/L.25/Rev.1, I wish to say again that we have serious reservations about the arbitrary singling-out of Member States for the purpose of condemnation in General Assembly resolutions.

329. As regards draft resolutions A/34/L.30 and A/34/L.32/Rev.1, for constitutional reasons, the Austrian Government cannot and will not exert any influence on the editorial policies and the reporting of the news media.

330. Finally, the aims of draft resolution A/34/L.35, dealing with *apartheid* in sports, are generally supported by my Government. The full implementation of several stipulations of that draft resolution, however, would meet with difficulties under the Austrian Constitution.

331. Mr. ANDERSON (Australia): As is well known from our policies and as is clear from the pattern of the votes we have just cast on the various draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 28, Australia treats particularly seriously the international problems presented by the South African Government's *apartheid* policies.

332. There are, however, a number of comments and observations which I wish to incorporate into the records on those votes.

333. It is a matter of particular regret to my delegation that a draft resolution of the importance of that adopted on the situation in South Africa was drafted in such a way as to ensure that it could not achieve unanimous support. If one thing has been clear from the debate on the item, and indeed from the general debate at the outset of the session, it is that the situation resulting from the persistent application of *apartheid* in South Africa has attracted the universal condemnation of the nations of the world. Yet, to our regret, the draft resolution was clearly prepared without any thought for the objective of bringing the real weight of international opinion to bear on the situation. It was evident from the start that it could never hope to gain the consensus that would have done so much for the people of South Africa as a whole.

334. It is our earnest hope, as has often been stated in this and other bodies, that *apartheid* as a policy will be eradicated and that all forms of racial discrimination and exploitation will be eliminated. But these policies are strongly entrenched and their removal requires co-operation among States. On an issue of such importance, the role of the United Nations must be to produce a united front.

335. Australia's determination to co-operate with and play a concrete part in the international effort to rid the world of *apartheid* is in no way qualified by its vote on draft resolution A/34/L.21. My country has, for very many years, been closely involved with these efforts and our policy towards South Africa and its Government has been consistently directed towards the achievement of what is recognized as a paramount objective—the removal of *apartheid*. The Australian contribution to this international activity has been stated and reaffirmed on very many occasions and I do not need to go over it again.

336. It is well known that Australia has particular difficulty with paragraphs in draft resolutions which approve the concept of violence and armed struggle. Similarly, Australia takes exception to the tendentious and irresponsible naming of countries as collaborators in one way or another with racist or *apartheid* régimes. The term "collaboration" has also assumed a particular pejorative sense for many countries, including Australia. We do not accept that every form of contact with South Africa can justifiably be described as collaboration. Indeed, it is often via such contact that we can, and do, exert pressure on the South African authorities.

337. It is also a fact that sanctions can be imposed only by the Security Council. Regardless of the moral importance of calls for various forms of sanctions, this Assembly, other bodies and conferences cannot purport to assume responsibilities in this area which impinge on and fetter the freedom of the Council to take the action which it judges will best serve the cause of international peace and security.

338. The Australian position on *apartheid* arises from a deeply held Australian conviction that the violations of human rights and the political tensions which it causes offend the conscience of humanity at large. For that reason, sharing as we do the emotional and human commitment of our African colleagues, we decided to

vote in favour of the draft resolution on the Declaration on South Africa. South Africa is an example of a country whose violations of rights are so gross as to be the proper subject of international concern. This emphasis in the Declaration on common humanitarian objectives was the factor which persuaded my delegation that the Declaration merited a positive vote, despite what we regard as defects in the text in other respects.

339. It is also a matter of concern to my delegation that certain of the texts contain inconsistencies which Australia cannot support. It is, for example, a fundamental tenet of the international law of human rights that the press must remain free. In this context, I would make the point that more careful drafting of some texts and more consultation with interested delegations could have led to more positive and perhaps even universal support for some of the draft resolutions. The same point can be made about those passages in draft resolution A/34/L.29/Rev.1 concerning the financial responsibility of the United Nations for the activities of the liberation movements. Australia cannot support the thesis that the concretization of General Assembly resolution 31/6 I should lead to this responsibility's becoming a charge on the regular budget of the Organization.

340. Because of the importance that Australia attaches to the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and our growing concern about the negative attitude of some States on this question, the Australian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/34/L.25/Rev.1, on nuclear collaboration with South Africa.

341. It is also Australia's long-standing view that South Africa should adhere to the nuclear Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, or at least accept full-scope safeguards on its nuclear industry.

342. There are, however, some aspects of that draft resolution which cause the Australian delegation some misgivings. We strongly object to the tendentious naming of States in the text. Nor do we see the point of vigorously condemning a "reported" nuclear explosion.

343. Furthermore, we consider the draft resolution deficient in that it fails to make the general distinction between peaceful and military applications of nuclear energy. In saying this, however, my delegation wishes to make perfectly clear that Australia will not co-operate with South Africa in any nuclear activity.

344. Mr. VALDERRAMA (Philippines): My delegation voted in favour of the 17 draft resolutions on agenda item 28 which were adopted this afternoon. We did so in keeping with the long-standing policy of the Philippine Government of total opposition to the anachronistic and odious policies of *apartheid*. The Philippines supports the repeated calls of the General Assembly for the total isolation of South Africa. However, we do not believe that it serves a useful purpose to name countries for particular condemnation. My delegation therefore abstained in the separate vote on operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/34/L.21.

345. Mr. MacKAY (Canada): Canada has never wavered in its commitment to United Nations efforts to end the degrading and oppressive system of *apartheid*. We remain convinced that the people of South Africa are entitled to the strong support of the international community in their struggle for justice and racial equality. While the Canadian delegation could not endorse all the draft resolutions under consideration, nevertheless it supported the driving spirit that motivates each one of them. In some instances my delegation either abstained or voted against a particular draft resolution, believing the action called for was inappropriate for consideration by the General Assembly or because we considered the proposed action might not be the most effective way of approaching the problem.

346. Turning now to the 17 draft resolutions before us—which is nearly double the number in 1976—I should like to outline the considerations that guided my Government in adopting its position on them.

347. The Canadian delegation supported the nine draft resolutions contained in documents A/34/L.22, A/34/L.27, A/34/L.28, A/34/L.30, A/34/L.31, A/34/L.32/Rev.1, A/34/L.33, A/34/L.35 and A/34/L.36/Rev.1.

348. Canada agrees with draft resolution A/34/L.35, on *apartheid* in sports. It gave strong support to the International Declaration against *Apartheid* in Sports and took an active part in its drafting. In explaining its affirmative vote last year on a similar draft resolution, the Canadian delegation called for flexibility in interpreting the Declaration to take account of differences not only in legal and constitutional but also in social and political systems. Canada has implemented the Declaration within the legal framework of its own legislation and within its national approach to sporting activities.

349. However, the Canadian delegation continues to have reservations concerning a reference in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/34/L.35 to an international convention against *apartheid* in sports, because the constitutional requirements of its Federal system would make it impossible for Canada to adhere to such a convention. It may be that other member States will experience similar difficulty, and Canada believes an appropriate approach would be to continue to seek universal support for the principles and objectives of the Declaration as one of the most effective instruments in the campaign against *apartheid* in sports.

350. The Canadian delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolutions A/34/L.24/Rev.1, A/34/L.25/Rev.1, A/34/L.29/Rev.1, A/34/L.34/Rev.1, A/34/L.36/Rev.1 and A/34/L.39.

351. With regard to draft resolution A/34/L.24/Rev.1, on the arms embargo against South Africa, in 1963 Canada supported the United Nations voluntary arms embargo against South Africa, and it has maintained an embargo on the supply of military spare parts to that country since the early 1970s. Canada voted for Security Council resolution 418 (1977) of 4 November 1977, which enacted a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa.

352. Nevertheless, the measures called for in this resolution are the prerogative of the Security Council, and therefore my delegation has abstained, as it did on a similar resolution in 1978.

353. Again, in draft resolution A/34/L.39, on investments in South Africa, the measures called for are the prerogative of the Security Council, and the Canadian delegation abstained for that reason.

354. Draft resolution A/34/L.25/Rev.1, on nuclear collaboration with South Africa, calls for an immediate end to all nuclear collaboration with South Africa. While Canada does not have any nuclear co-operation arrangements with South Africa, it continues to believe that this text might have the undesirable effect of weakening incentives for South Africa scrupulously to adhere to international nuclear safeguards and to the Treaty on the Nuclear Non-Proliferation on the Weapons. Therefore the Canadian delegation abstained in the vote on that draft resolution.

355. Canada abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/34/L.29/Rev.1, on assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement. While Canada continues to make substantial contributions to various humanitarian programmes designed to assist in meeting the educational, training and other needs of the oppressed peoples of South Africa, it cannot support the unnecessary inclusion in this draft resolution of operative paragraph 4, which calls upon the General Assembly to concretize its resolution 31/6 I of 9 November 1976. Canada voted against that resolution for many reasons that remain valid. Further, while Canada fully supports the peaceful efforts of all parties, both within and outside South Africa, in the struggle against *apartheid*, it cannot do so within the context proposed in operative paragraph 4.

356. The Canadian delegation voted against draft resolution A/34/L.21, on the situation in South Africa, as it did on a similar proposal last year, since it expresses a number of basic elements inconsistent with Canadian policy. This is an expanded version of the resolution of the same name adopted at the preceding session [*resolution 33/183 L*], and Canada cannot support the statement contained in the preamble that the *apartheid* régime constitutes a threat to international peace and security or the resultant actions that are called for in the resolution. Such grave and important decisions can be made only by the Security Council, and Canada does not believe that the General Assembly should attempt to prejudge such critical issues in this manner. In addition, Canada cannot support the continued affirmation of the legitimacy of armed struggle in operative paragraph 3.

357. From my remarks on draft resolution A/34/L.21, it must be clear that the Canadian delegation would vote against draft resolutions A/34/L.23 and A/34/L.26, calling for respectively an International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa and for an oil embargo against South Africa. Such serious measures are the prerogative of, and can be implemented effectively only through mandatory decisions by the Security Council in accordance with the appropriate Charter provisions and in the light of the circumstances



prevailing at that time. Furthermore, Canada does not agree with the basic premise of those resolutions—that economic sanctions against South Africa are essential to resolve the grave situation in that country.

358. Finally, the Canadian delegation voted against draft resolution A/34/L.37, concerning relations between Israel and South Africa. We regret that annual resolutions of this sort continue to be a divisive element in our common struggle against *apartheid*.

359. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The working time of the interpreters has been exceeded, and I am informed that no relief team is standing by. Since the Assembly has still to hear some 10 explanations of vote, we shall adjourn now and meet again punctually at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, when we shall begin by hearing the remaining explanations of vote.

*The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.*