

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



**94th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 24 January 1979,  
at 3.45 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Tribute to the memory of Sir Milo Boughton Butler, Governor-General of the Bahamas .....	1645
Agenda item 32: Policies of <i>apartheid</i> of the Government of South Africa <i>(concluded)</i> :	
(a) Report of the Special Committee against <i>Apartheid</i> ;	
(b) Report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against <i>Apartheid</i> in Sports;	
(c) Report of the Secretary-General .....	1645
Organization of work .....	1653

**President: Mr. Indalecio LIEVANO (Colombia).**

***Tribute to the memory of Sir Milo Boughton Butler,  
Governor-General of the Bahamas***

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We have learned with great sorrow of the death of the Governor-General of the Bahamas, His Excellency Sir Milo Boughton Butler. On behalf of the General Assembly, may I convey to the Government and people of the Bahamas and to the family of the Governor-General our profound condolences in their bereavement.

2. I request representatives to stand and observe a minute of silence in tribute to the memory of Sir Milo Boughton Butler.

*The members of the General Assembly observed a minute of silence.*

3. Mr. MOULTRIE (Bahamas): The Government and people of the Commonwealth of the Bahamas are mourning the passing of one of their most distinguished sons, Sir Milo B. Butler, Governor-General. This giant national hero stood tall and was always in the forefront of the progressive struggle for independence. He was a man of peace, justice and human dignity and has left a void which we will find difficult to fill. We find comfort in your expressions of sympathy, Mr. President, and are grateful for the condolences of the entire international community. I therefore wish to express the sincere thanks and appreciation of the Government and people of the Bahamas to you, Sir, and to our colleagues the world over.

**AGENDA ITEM 32**

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

(a) Report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*;

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

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the vote. 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."

5. Mrs. NOWOTNY (Austria): Austria has always held the opinion that the Government of South Africa and the people who support that Government and its policies must be brought to understand that the system of *apartheid* is not and can never be the basis for a viable society, that the system in itself is self-destructive. Austria has on many occasions made clear its categorical rejection of the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa. The last time the Austrian position was clearly restated was during the debate on this item [57th meeting]. We also expressed then our hope that the new Prime Minister would not miss the opportunity to lead this troubled nation along the way towards an integrated, multiracial, open and modern society which could win international respect.

6. We believe that the majority of the resolutions just adopted by this Assembly will enhance the chances for the termination of the *apartheid* policy, and we have therefore gladly given our support. However, my Government regrets that the content and wording of other resolutions, partly for constitutional and legal considerations, or because of incompatibility with fundamental principles guiding Austrian foreign policy, have not allowed us to support them.

7. I should like in this context to point out that Austria takes operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/33/L.23 to imply that for the granting of prisoner-of-war status to freedom fighters the conditions of article 1, paragraph 4 of Additional Protocol I<sup>1</sup> to the Geneva Conventions have to be fulfilled. With regard to operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/33/L.24, Austria wishes to restate that we have serious reservations about the arbitrary singling out of Member States for the purpose of condemnation in General Assembly resolutions.

8. Furthermore, I should like to refer to operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/33/L.28. Out of regard for its status of permanent neutrality, Austria has to devote the utmost attention to the questions addressed therein and

<sup>1</sup> See document A/32/144.

it can therefore take a decision only after studying each single case.

9. The aims of draft resolution A/33/L.31, dealing with *apartheid* in sports, are generally supported by the Austrian Government. The implementation of several stipulations of the resolution in Austria will, however, meet with difficulties under the Austrian constitution. Austria therefore saw fit to abstain in the vote on it.

10. Mr. KEATING (Ireland): The Irish Government's condemnation of *apartheid* has already been expressed in the statement which I made in this Assembly on 24 November 1978 [58th meeting]. Consistent with this policy, my delegation is pleased to be able to support 10 of the 15 draft resolutions before us today. We regret to have had to abstain in the vote on four draft resolutions with aspects of which we are in sympathy for reasons I shall outline briefly. My delegation has cast one negative vote; that was on the draft resolution dealing with collaboration between Israel and South Africa. This latter step is in keeping with our position at the thirty-first and thirty-second sessions of the General Assembly, as we feel it inappropriate to single out and condemn selectively one Member State in this manner.

11. My Government abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/33/L.29. We find the reference to armed struggle unacceptable and inappropriate, as we explained at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, we believe that the present South African Government legally represents the Republic of South Africa. However, we look forward to the day when all of the people of South Africa may freely and on an equal basis enjoy the full exercise of their political rights and when a South African Government emerges which truly represents the interests and diversity of all the people of that country.

12. Our reservations on the use of the term "national liberation movement" in draft resolution A/33/L.21 and others of the draft resolutions have already been expressed by the representative of France when speaking on behalf of the nine countries of the European community [93rd meeting].

13. Our policy ultimately rests on the belief that, while peaceful change is still possible in South Africa, fundamental change is required without delay. As I said in my statement, the international community has a vital part to play by selecting and implementing on a collective basis measures against the South African Government that will be effective in bringing pressure to bear on that Government to abandon its *apartheid* policy. For this reason, and before the Security Council took such a decision, Ireland called upon the Security Council to implement a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa. At the thirty-first session of the General Assembly we supported a proposal, of which we were a sponsor at this session [A/33/L.32 and Add.1], calling upon the Security Council to impose a ban on new investment in South Africa. We have gone further at this session of the General Assembly

and have supported draft resolution A/33/L.22, which requests the Security Council to consider urgently a mandatory oil embargo against South Africa, although we have reservations on this draft resolution, in regard to operative paragraph 3 in particular.

14. If South Africa continues to maintain its present intransigence, we are prepared to consider support for further effective action. But we believe that it is premature at this stage to support all the measures listed in draft resolution A/33/L.25, which does not adequately distinguish between selective and comprehensive measures. Accordingly, my delegation abstained in the vote on it. It is also regrettable that in this resolution, which deals with economic collaboration with South Africa, and in other resolutions a certain confusion arises from the simultaneous request for action by the Security Council and for measures to be taken autonomously by Member States. In the absence of a Security Council decision binding on all States, action by individual States is, in our view, unlikely to be effective and in some circumstances can conflict with international obligations. Our support for resolutions with such provisions is to be interpreted accordingly. My Government also regrets that generalized but unspecific allegations about co-operation with South Africa have been included in some draft resolutions, which have made it more difficult to accept them.

15. My Government regrets that it could not support draft resolution A/33/L.24. We are in full agreement with its general thrust, but we feel that we must take account of the consistent and strenuous denial by at least one of the States concerned of the implication in paragraph 2 that those mentioned by name continue to collaborate with South Africa in nuclear matters.

16. My Government fully shares the feeling of outrage expressed in the debate on the inhuman treatment accorded to the opponents of *apartheid* and especially to those imprisoned for their courageous stand. We were pleased to support draft resolution A/33/L.23. Our reservation on the legal problems raised by paragraph 4 has already been referred to by the representative of France in his statement on behalf of the nine countries members of the European Community.

17. We were also glad to support draft resolution A/33/L.27, on the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. Our attitude to the recommendations in that report is naturally in accordance with the general policy I have outlined.

18. With regard to draft resolution A/33/L.31, my Government wishes to reaffirm its adherence to the principle of non-discrimination in sports. As stated at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, it intends to act in accordance with the spirit of the Declaration on sporting contacts with South Africa and with some of its provisions. However, as we indicated last year, we have certain problems with the International Declaration against *Apartheid* in Sports [resolution 32/105 M, annex] and so we have abstained in the vote on this draft resolution.

19. Mr. CANALES (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Chile took part in the vote in order to lend its decisive

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-second Session, Plenary Meetings*, 102nd meeting, para. 149.

co-operation to the United Nations in its action against racial discrimination and racism since this position fully coincides with the principles and purposes of Chile's foreign policy.

20. In keeping with its traditional humanist stand, and aware of its moral duty to co-operate with the United Nations within the framework of the purposes and principles of the Charter, my country has always joined in the rejection of the policy of *apartheid*. We have lent our resolute support to most of the draft resolutions adopted recently by the General Assembly, and we share the spirit of all the initiatives relating to this matter that are now before the Assembly.

21. However, and very much to our regret, we felt compelled to abstain in the vote on some of the texts, and we have serious reservations with regard to others, either because they were drafted in excessive terms or because they are not fully in keeping with the principles and standards that guide us.

22. To be specific, it is difficult for us to accept the use of inappropriate adjectives in referring to a Member of this Organization, since it merely brings about confusion and division in the international community, dividing it in its efforts to eliminate the nefarious practice of *apartheid*.

23. Nor do we find it appropriate, when dealing with co-operation with South Africa, to single out some States, since such selectivity and discrimination certainly weaken the struggle against racism and racial discrimination.

24. We must be strict in our respect for the basic principles that are at the root of the authority and the moral duty of this Organization to condemn those who attempt to impose racist policies in the world. Our indignation should not lead us to intervene unduly in matters that are clearly within the internal ambit of States or to make demands that, though just, are not within the power of this General Assembly under the terms of the Charter.

25. I wish to conclude by repeating that Chile absolutely rejects any racist or discriminatory practice in general and the crime of *apartheid* in particular.

26. Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/33/L.21. We believe that the General Assembly must express its disapproval of any Government that collaborates with the South African régime since that is contrary to resolutions adopted by our Organization. However, my delegation does not feel that this condemnation should follow criteria of selectivity, and since such criteria are contained in draft resolution A/33/L.21 my delegation abstained in the vote on it.

27. Concerning draft resolution A/33/L.24, on which we cast a positive vote, we would have preferred different language respecting the jurisdiction of the Security Council and taking into account the statements on nuclear policy made by the States mentioned in operative paragraph 2.

28. My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/33/L.27. In this connexion I wish to state that my

delegation views with concern the powers of the General Assembly on staff matters. We have serious reservations on operative paragraph 6 since we believe that the decisions to which it refers are exclusively within the competence of the Secretary-General.

29. Finally, with regard to draft resolution A/33/L.30, which received our favourable vote, we are concerned that the General Assembly is not respecting the autonomy and preferential jurisdiction in this field ascribed by the Charter to the Security Council.

30. Mr. SCHELTEMA (Netherlands): The Permanent Representative of France has already given an explanation of vote on behalf of the nine members of the European Community with regard to the resolutions the General Assembly has adopted. My delegation will therefore make only a brief statement to explain its vote on those draft resolutions.

31. When he addressed the General Assembly on 27 September [*11th meeting*], my Foreign Minister stated that the Netherlands would promote and support a policy of increasing pressure on South Africa if the Government in Pretoria continued to refuse to change its inhumane policy of racial discrimination. Indeed, the South African Government has so far not shown any indication that it wants to make such a change. During the past months it has even reinforced its repressive policies.

32. For this reason my delegation would have much preferred to vote in favour of all the draft resolutions just adopted. A consensus on all the draft resolutions would have been a clear signal to South Africa that the whole world was united in its rejection of the policies of *apartheid*. Unfortunately, however, my delegation could not agree with all of them, some of which contain elements we cannot accept.

33. My Government regrets that it could not vote in favour of draft resolution A/33/L.25 with regard to economic co-operation with South Africa. As we have said before, it is high time to consider measures in the economic field. However, we cannot agree with the view set forth in the second preambular paragraph that every form of co-operation with South Africa is a hostile act against the people of South Africa and constitutes a threat to international peace and security. Furthermore, my delegation rejects the accusation made in the sixth preambular paragraph as totally unfounded. In particular, we are opposed to the call in operative paragraph 1 for the severance of all links with South Africa.

34. My delegation holds the view that existing channels of communication with South Africa should be used to put maximum pressure on the Government of that country to abolish the system of *apartheid*. For this reason my delegation regrets that it had to vote against this draft resolution.

35. Because of the gravity of the situation created by the *apartheid* policies of the South African Government my delegation has supported the draft resolution concerning an oil embargo [A/33/L.22]. As such a measure makes sense only if it is applied effectively, we wish to emphasize that

my delegation regards operative paragraph 2, in which the Security Council is requested to consider a mandatory oil embargo against South Africa, as the essential paragraph of this resolution. We therefore interpret operative paragraph 3 entirely in the light of the preceding paragraph—that is, the Netherlands Government will implement operative paragraph 3 **only** if the Security Council decides in favour of a mandatory oil embargo. The same argument applies to operative paragraphs 4 and 5.

36. With regard to draft resolution A/33/L.24 on nuclear co-operation we wish to point out that we cannot agree to such a form of co-operation as long as South Africa has not acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, or at least accepted full-scope safeguards, an undertaking which we would wish to be met not only by South Africa but by all countries in the world. Although South Africa has indicated that it does not intend to accept these conditions, we would have voted in favour of this draft resolution if the implicit accusation of certain friendly countries, mentioned by name, had been omitted. In view of the wording of operative paragraph 2, my delegation felt constrained to abstain in the vote.

37. My Government fully supports the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa and, consequently, my delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/33/L.30. Nevertheless, we regret the unwarranted conclusion of the fourth preambular paragraph. Moreover, the implementation of operative paragraph 2 poses problems of a legal nature, while subparagraph (d), in our opinion, goes beyond the framework of an arms embargo.

38. With regard to draft resolution A/33/L.27 on the situation in South Africa my delegation would like to point out that, although the authenticity of the movements struggling against *apartheid* within South Africa cannot be denied, they are certainly not the only authentic representatives of the people of South Africa. During my statement in this debate [56th meeting] we emphasized once again the need for peaceful change and a peaceful solution. We cannot therefore support a draft resolution reaffirming the legitimacy of armed struggle. Nor can my delegation accept the view that any collaboration with South Africa should be regarded as a hostile act against the purposes and principles of the United Nations. For all these important reasons we voted against this draft resolution.

39. Although the Netherlands Government cannot subscribe to all the recommendations of the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, my delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/33/L.27 on the Committee's programme of work in order to express the importance it attaches to the Committee's activities.

40. Finally, I should like to point out that the Netherlands, although it voted in favour of draft resolution A/33/L.23 on political prisoners in South Africa, cannot accept the interpretation of the Geneva Convention set forth in operative paragraph 4.

41. Mr. HUSSON (France) (*interpretation from French*): The French delegation, as it has stated frequently, strongly condemns the policy of *apartheid*. Nothing is more contrary to our philosophy of man and life in society than an

institutionalized system of discrimination and racial segregation.

42. France participates in the pressure exerted by the international community in an effort to persuade the South African Government to respect human rights. We subscribed to the unanimous decision of the Security Council to impose an arms embargo on South Africa, and we apply that measure strictly.

43. We believe that the United Nations can play a useful and effective role in promoting human rights in South Africa. Hence we regret that the General Assembly should not have been able to formulate resolutions acceptable to everybody.

44. My delegation has already explained why the nine countries of the European Community, including France, were not able to support all 14 draft resolutions which have just been adopted.

45. The indignation we all feel over *apartheid* must not lead us into paths which are not in keeping with the role of our Organization or into recommendations whose implementation might have results contrary to what was sought. Several of the draft resolutions submitted to the Assembly are not along the right lines and contain provisions which we felt would not have the desired effect. The French delegation was obliged to vote against some of them and to abstain in the vote on others.

46. As my delegation sees it, it is not the role of the United Nations to encourage, as does draft resolution A/33/L.29, recourse to armed struggle, that is, to civil war, or to call on Member States to provide assistance to that end. We should, on the contrary, encourage the peaceful transformation earnestly desired by all those in South Africa who have come to understand the need for change.

47. Nor do we believe that the complete isolation of South Africa, particularly economically, would have the beneficial effects which some delegations seem to expect. Such measures might be more likely to harden the irrational obstinacy of the most intransigent supporters of *apartheid*.

48. I should like to spell out more clearly our position on draft resolution A/33/L.24, in which a number of countries, including my own, are singled out by name under a procedure that must once more be deplored because it goes against the true interests of our Organization.

49. In the nuclear field, draft resolutions A/33/L.24 and A/33/L.30 are liable to lead to results which would be the opposite of what is desired. The halting of all civilian nuclear co-operation with South Africa would inevitably provoke an autonomous and uncontrolled development of that country's nuclear activities in every field. The essential aim remains, in our view, to persuade South Africa to pursue an effective policy of non-proliferation.

50. I would add that one of the draft resolutions which we have approved nevertheless contains provisions on which we are obliged to enter explicit reservations. I refer to draft resolution A/33/L.26. Moreover, if draft resolution A/33/L.23 had been put to the vote, the French delegation would have had to abstain.

51. In conclusion, I wish to reaffirm the importance that France attaches to the rapid and peaceful establishment in South Africa of a multilateral and democratic society in which all the inhabitants of that country will have their rightful place. It is to be hoped that the Government recently installed in Pretoria will become convinced that there is no other course for the future.

52. Mr. ONDA (Japan): I should like to place on record my delegation's comments and reservations on some of the draft resolutions on which the Assembly has just taken decisions.

53. With regard to the draft resolution entitled "International mobilization against *Apartheid*", contained in document A/33/L.19, my delegation voted in its favour. However, my delegation finds it difficult to accept the wording of some paragraphs in the preamble.

54. As for the draft resolution entitled "Political prisoners in South Africa", contained in document A/33/L.23, which was adopted by consensus, we wish to record our reservations on operative paragraph 4 because of some legal questions which that paragraph involves.

55. With regard to the draft resolution entitled "Nuclear collaboration with South Africa", contained in document A/33/L.24, my delegation cast a positive vote because we firmly support its essential objectives. But we cannot support the practice of accusing specific countries by name when there is no clear evidence.

56. We voted in favour of the draft resolution entitled "Programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*", contained in document A/33/L.27. My delegation's affirmative vote, however, does not mean that we accept all the recommendations of the Special Committee.

57. My delegation also voted in favour of the draft resolution entitled "Assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement", contained in document A/33/L.28, because we support its main objective. However, we do not agree with the wording in operative paragraph 1 for the reason that we have stated on numerous occasions.

58. The draft resolution entitled "Situation in South Africa", contained in document A/33/L.29, contains some highly objectionable and controversial concepts in both preambular and operative paragraphs. However, because of our dissatisfaction with the situation obtaining in South Africa, my delegation chose not to vote against it but simply to abstain. We hope that resolutions on this matter, as well as any other, will be formulated without elements which generate unnecessary complications.

59. As for the draft resolution entitled "Military collaboration with South Africa", contained in document A/33/L.30, my delegation cast an affirmative vote because we support its main objective. However, my delegation reserves its position regarding some proposals which are vague, dubious in effectiveness, or unjustifiable in the light of the main objective of the resolution.

60. My delegation also voted in favour of the draft resolution entitled "*Apartheid* in sports", contained in

document A/33/L.31. However, I should like to state that the implementation of some of the provisions of the Declaration mentioned in operative paragraph 2 may prove difficult.

61. Mr. ULRICHSEN (Denmark): I am speaking on behalf of the five Nordic countries, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and my own country, Denmark.

62. The Nordic countries' firm stand against the repulsive system of *apartheid* in South Africa has been demonstrated on many occasions and is well known. We find the racial discrimination against and oppression of the majority of the South African population abhorrent and have never hesitated to condemn the South African Government for its continued defiance of world opinion. We have also repeatedly denounced South Africa's open support of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia, its continuing aggression against neighbouring African countries and not least its illegal occupation of Namibia.

63. Furthermore, the Nordic countries have always strongly supported an intensification of the international pressure against the *apartheid* régime. The adoption of Security Council resolution 418 (1977) imposing a mandatory arms embargo on South Africa was an important first step in that direction. There are, however, many other areas where the United Nations should step up pressure against South Africa.

64. The Nordic countries voted in favour of most of the resolutions just adopted. Those positive votes should be seen as an expression of our strong support for the objectives behind those resolutions. We have, however, a number of reservations concerning specific elements, among which I shall limit myself to the following.

65. We have not been able to support draft resolution A/33/L.21 concerning the relations between Israel and South Africa as we consider it inappropriate to single out one country in this context.

66. Concerning draft resolution A/33/L.22 on an oil embargo against South Africa, operative paragraph 3 should, in our view, be seen as an extension of operative paragraph 2 and subject to a Security Council decision in accordance with that paragraph. The Nordic Governments have reservations with regard to certain paragraphs in this and other resolutions which fail to take into account the fact that only the Security Council can adopt decisions which are binding on Member States. This is particularly the case with regard to draft resolution A/33/L.25 on economic collaboration with South Africa, on which we have, therefore, abstained. It also applies to certain other resolutions which we have, nevertheless, been able to support.

67. The Nordic countries voted in favour of draft resolution A/33/L.23 concerning political prisoners in South Africa. However, we maintain our position concerning the applicability of prisoner-of-war status in accordance with the relevant Geneva Conventions.

68. The Nordic countries fully support the objectives behind draft resolution A/33/L.24 on nuclear collaboration



with South Africa, but deplore the inappropriate singling out of certain countries in operative paragraph 2.

69. We abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/33/L.29 on the situation in South Africa. Our abstention was primarily motivated by the wording of operative paragraph 3. It has consistently been the firm position of the Nordic countries not to condone paragraphs explicitly endorsing the use of armed force. We also have reservations with regard to certain other paragraphs in draft resolution A/33/L.29, mainly because of our steadfast support for the principle of the universality of the United Nations.

70. Operative paragraph 6(a) in draft resolution A/33/L.28 raises legal difficulties for the Nordic countries. We interpret the appeal contained therein in accordance with the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter.

71. Concerning draft resolution A/33/L.31 on *apartheid* in sports, the Nordic Governments support the general objectives of the International Declaration against *Apartheid* in Sports. We should like to point out, however, as we have done on previous occasions, that the sports organizations in the Nordic countries are private entities.

72. The fact that the Nordic countries have supported most of the resolutions just adopted and have sponsored some of them testifies to our firm opposition to the *apartheid* system in all its forms and manifestations. The Nordic countries wish to reaffirm their commitment actively to take part in the efforts of the United Nations to eliminate the *apartheid* system in South Africa and to express again their deep concern over the dangerous situation in southern Africa which results from the policies of the Pretoria Government.

73. Mr. LOEIS (Indonesia): I asked to be allowed to speak in order to clarify my delegation's affirmative vote on the draft resolution on nuclear collaboration with South Africa [A/33/L.24]. My delegation voted in favour of that draft resolution because of the importance we attach to United Nations efforts at preventing the South African Government from developing nuclear weapons.

74. None the less, my delegation is not at all happy with operative paragraph 2, which singles out certain States for their nuclear collaboration with South Africa. Not only is such chastisement not helpful to the solution of the problem, but some of the States mentioned in the pertinent paragraph have categorically denied any collaboration with the South African Government in that regard.

75. Consequently, had that draft resolution been put to the vote paragraph by paragraph, it would not have been possible for my delegation to support operative paragraph 2.

76. Mr. LOHANI (Nepal): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/33/L.21. We wish to state our view, as we have done in the past, namely, that the practice of singling out and condemning one country among many which collaborate with South Africa is unfair and unjustified. My delegation also abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/33/L.24. We wish to reaffirm our strong and continued opposition to collaboration by any country in

the nuclear, military and other fields with the racist régime of South Africa. However, my country was not satisfied with the language used in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/33/L.24, since that paragraph mentions countries on a selective basis. My delegation therefore had to abstain in the vote.

77. Mr. VAYENAS (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): The Greek delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/33/L.30, as well as others which the Assembly has just adopted. We would however like to point out that we do not agree with the wording of the fourth preambular paragraph of that resolution, which refers to a particular group of States. The same goes for certain of its aspects which create some legal difficulties for my delegation.

78. Moreover, my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/33/L.29 because of the wording of some of its paragraphs which prevented us from voting in favour of the text, whereas actually the substance of the resolution is fully in accord with our views on the subject.

79. I should also like to confirm that our abstention on draft resolution A/33/L.24 does not imply any change in our position as far as concerns the implementation of Security Council resolution 418 (1977). My country has so informed the Secretary-General.

80. Before concluding, I should like once again to stress the fact that our condemnation of *apartheid* is strong and unchanged.

81. Mr. GAGLIARDI (Brazil): The affirmative votes that my delegation cast on the resolutions adopted this morning by the General Assembly constitute renewed testimony of Brazil's strong rejection of the policies and practices of *apartheid*, as well as of my country's firm support for the international efforts aimed at their complete eradication.

82. For the record, let me state that my delegation would have abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/33/L.24 had it been put to a separate vote.

83. Finally, my delegation is somewhat concerned over the language of operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/33/L.29. We would have preferred a formulation that would more adequately reflect the support of the international community for all efforts aimed at the final abolition of *apartheid*.

84. Mr. VALDERRAMA (Philippines): As a member of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* from its very inception, my delegation voted in favour of and supported all the resolutions on *apartheid* as testimony of the Philippines' abiding support for and fidelity to the international campaign for the elimination of the inhuman and anachronistic policies of *apartheid* of the racist white minority régime in South Africa.

85. However, if operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution in document A/33/L.24, entitled "Nuclear collaboration with South Africa", had been put to a separate vote, my delegation would have abstained, because we believe some of the countries mentioned in that paragraph

have categorically denied having nuclear collaboration with the racist régime in South Africa and we do not believe that the naming of countries serves a useful purpose.

86. Mr. JASUDASEN (Singapore): My delegation has consistently supported all efforts to bring to an end the abhorrent system of *apartheid* in South Africa. In keeping with this spirit my delegation has voted in favour of draft resolution A/33/L.24. However, my delegation wishes to place on record that it has some reservations on operative paragraph 2 of the said draft resolution and would have abstained had there been a separate vote on that paragraph.

87. Miss GARCIA-DONOSO (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation voted in favour of all the draft resolutions on agenda item 32 relating to *apartheid* with one exception—draft resolution A/33/L.21.

88. Ecuador, faithful to its convictions reflected in its traditional international policy, condemns *apartheid* as being a crime against humanity the existence of which truly shames our civilization.

89. For that reason and because of its traditional interests and role, Ecuador was the first Latin American country to ratify the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*, on 12 May 1975.

90. For that reason also, the Head of State of Ecuador, Admiral Alfredo Poveda, stated the following on a solemn occasion:

“By choice and conviction Ecuadorian society has always been and continues to be against racism and, therefore, opposes racial segregation, discrimination and colonialism, as it has amply shown by supporting resolutions adopted by the United Nations against the racist and colonialist régimes in South Africa.”

91. Likewise, at the World Conference for Action against *Apartheid*, held at Lagos in August 1977, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ecuador stated:

“On behalf of the Government and people of Ecuador, we reject and condemn the practice of *apartheid*, which is contrary to the purposes and principles embodied in the United Nations Charter and which violates commitments solemnly entered into by Member States to ensure universal respect for the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all, without distinction as to race.”

92. Ecuador follows with special attention the process of this just world pressure to bring the Pretoria régime to end its inhuman policy of *apartheid*—a policy which leads it to separate its inhabitants even after death, interring them in different cemeteries which stand as a silent monument to the anti-human policy practised by the racist régime.

93. In spite of the aforementioned, we do not consider it necessary or timely to adopt a special resolution on the case of Israel; for that reason we abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/33/L.21, but voted in favour of all the other drafts relating to agenda item 32.

94. Mr. RAHMAN (Bangladesh): Bangladesh's position in condemning and calling for the total elimination of the

abhorrent manifestation of *apartheid* is well known. Our unequivocal and consistent stance on this question needs no further elaboration.

95. Bangladesh voted in favour of draft resolution A/33/L.24 on nuclear collaboration with South Africa. In doing so, however, my delegation would like to reiterate its position whereby we would have preferred that the call upon all States, in operative paragraph 2, had remained general rather than specific in nature. We believe that in terms of objectivity our main thrust should be directed towards urging constructive action rather than registering a negative stance.

96. I should also like to take this opportunity to state that because of unfortunate circumstances beyond our control we were not able to participate in the voting on draft resolutions A/33/L.19 and A/33/L.20. As a sponsor, Bangladesh would naturally have voted in favour of both drafts if we had been present. I would be grateful if this affirmative position would be formally recorded.

97. Mr. MANSUVAN (Thailand): I regret that, owing to the unavoidable absence of my delegation, we missed the first part of the recorded vote on agenda item 32 this morning. Had my delegation been present, we would have voted in favour of draft resolutions A/33/L.19, A/33/L.20, A/33/L.22 and A/33/L.24, and we would have abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/33/L.21. I should be grateful if this statement could be reflected in the records of the Assembly.

98. Mr. OAISA (Papua New Guinea): My delegation voted in favour of almost all the draft resolutions on *apartheid* in order to reaffirm my Government's strong opposition to the policy of *apartheid* in South Africa. My Government has in the past strongly condemned that abhorrent practice of racial discrimination and will continue to do so until it is eliminated.

99. Although we voted in favour of draft resolution A/33/L.24, we have reservations on operative paragraph 2, which contains the names of countries. My delegation strongly believes that this Organization should present a collective front in dealing with this problem. By the naming of countries, division has been created, thereby rendering common or collective action ineffective.

100. In this connexion and because of the discriminatory and unfair nature of draft resolution A/33/L.21, my delegation abstained in the voting on that draft resolution.

101. Mr. RIOS (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Panama wishes to state once again, as it has done many times before, its repudiation of *apartheid* and all forms of racial discrimination. For historical reasons that are well known, the people of Panama are totally opposed to discriminatory practices.

102. We voted in favour of the draft resolutions on *apartheid* with the exception of draft resolution A/33/L.21. My Government believes that any measure aimed at eliminating *apartheid* deserves its enthusiastic backing. In spite of this, we must emphasize that we did not agree with draft resolution A/33/L.21. The singling out of a Member

State for recriminations and condemnation for apparently political reasons is something that we honestly do not believe is the best way in which to combat the crime of *apartheid*. Only one State is accused of committing an offence that is committed by other States with impunity. Today, we heard news on the radio according to which the State of Israel is in fact trying to co-operate in some way with measures against *apartheid*. I am referring to the news concerning the severance by Israel of sports ties with South Africa. We found this to be quite an encouraging sign.

103. For these reasons we abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/33/L.21.

104. In concluding this brief explanation of vote, we wish to reaffirm our resolute support for the peoples of southern Africa which have for so many years been struggling to free themselves from the yoke of *apartheid*.

105. Mr. HARRIMAN (Nigeria): I wish to take this opportunity, on behalf of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, to express gratitude to the many delegations which have made generous remarks in appreciation of the work of the Special Committee and of myself as its Chairman, and, indeed, to the General Assembly as a whole for again commending the Special Committee for its activities in the discharge of its mandate.

106. We are greatly encouraged by the confidence of Member States and acutely conscious of the responsibility vested in this Special Committee. We pledge to continue and redouble our efforts in the sacred cause of the eradication of *apartheid* and the liberation of South Africa.

107. The resolutions which the General Assembly has adopted today on the recommendation of the Special Committee, unanimously or by overwhelming majorities, provide a framework for effective international action.

108. I have listened carefully to the reservations made by many delegations, and I should like to pose a question, Can some of the countries named tell us why they allow nuclear scientists in hordes to visit South Africa, which is friendly territory, when those same people would be gaoled for life if they went to Eastern Europe? This is the collaboration about which we are talking, and we have the evidence.

109. Let us be clear that the issue before us today is not merely the inhuman and criminal oppression of the black people of South Africa in the name of "*apartheid*". It is the completion of the emancipation of the continent of Africa after five centuries of slavery and humiliation. It involves the dignity and honour of every man and woman of African origin. It is essentially the security and independence of every independent African State. It encompasses, moreover, the abolition of racism from our globe.

110. We are watching with the utmost anxiety the developments in Namibia and Zimbabwe, where the gory tentacles of the *apartheid* régime—the bastion of racism and colonialism in the region—have caused untold misery and conflict. We are following the Western efforts at negotiated solutions in those territories—by the five Western Powers in Namibia and the British and Americans in Zimbabwe—with the hope that since their prestige is invested in their efforts

they cannot report failure. We are hoping—I trust not in vain—that they will exert their undoubted leverage in favour of genuine freedom in southern Africa.

111. I must say that we are very much encouraged by the consistent pronouncements of the leadership in the United States, and we hope that the United States will, with its prestige and honour and the leverage of its power, continue to assist in eradicating this evil from the African continent. But we cannot for one moment forget the fact that the *apartheid* régime in Pretoria is the main enemy of Africa, of freedom and of peace in our unfortunate continent, which, as I said earlier, has been abused for almost half a millennium and subjected to enslavement through the exploitation of blacks, to slavery through colonialism, to manipulation through neo-colonialism and to the desecration of human values in South Africa in the name of *apartheid*.

112. There can be no security or stability, and no peace, in southern Africa so long as *apartheid* is not eliminated from South Africa, so long as Africa is not totally emancipated. Any partial settlement which is not based on self-determination will only lead to internecine conflict and instability in that whole area in the future.

113. As I have mentioned on many occasions, the three major challenges confronting the world, and in particular the United Nations, today are, first, the abolition of racist and colonial oppression; secondly, the ending of poverty and the establishment of a New International Economic Order; and, thirdly, the ending of the arms race and the maintenance of international peace. I believe that the United Nations should be equally concerned with these three matters. These three major challenges are inextricably interrelated and deserve to be given utmost priority by the international community.

114. This is the message that was reaffirmed only a few days ago at the observance in Atlanta of the fiftieth birthday of the late Martin Luther King—a martyr in the struggle against racism, poverty and war—at which the Special Committee was honoured by the presence and participation of the Secretary-General and many eminent leaders from all over the world.

115. The General Assembly has today issued a call for an international mobilization against *apartheid* and requested the Special Committee to promote this mobilization and ensure co-ordination of action for the eradication of *apartheid* and the liberation of South Africa.

116. On behalf of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, I appeal to all Governments, specialized agencies, trade unions, churches, student and youth organizations, anti-*apartheid* movements, solidarity committees, institutions, information media—and, indeed, all decent men and women—to co-operate with us in concerted international action. I appeal to them to join us in launching the international mobilization on 21 March this year, at the conclusion of the International Anti-*Apartheid* Year, and in developing co-ordinated and effective action all over the world in the light of the resolutions adopted here today.

117. The United Nations has assumed a special responsibility towards the oppressed people of southern Africa and



has recognized that it has an important and vital role to play in support of their righteous struggle for liberation and human dignity.

118. I am confident that the Special Committee can continue to enjoy the valuable co-operation and guidance of the Secretary-General in the discharge of its task. I hope it can count on the assistance of all departments concerned and that the Centre against *Apartheid* will be provided with all necessary resources to discharge its important responsibilities in support of the Special Committee.

119. I cannot but stress again the utmost importance of the full implementation of the resolution adopted today. We hope that the delegations which have continued to oppose the application of effective sanctions against the criminal *apartheid* régime will search their consciences. We will continue to remind them that no one, absolutely no one, has a right to provide aid and comfort to racist criminals.

120. In this connexion, I must express satisfaction at the recent announcement by Iran that it will stop oil supplies to South Africa. I should like to recall that the Special Committee had repeatedly appealed to Iran to co-operate in instituting an oil embargo against South Africa and to terminate its growing collaboration with South Africa in military, economic and other fields.

121. In 1973, my predecessor, the then Chairman of the Special Committee, approached the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iran to convey the appeal of the Special Committee. He was rebuffed. He then made a public appeal in the General Assembly, but without response.

122. Last year, a high-level Committee of the Organization of African Unity, which was strongly supported by the Special Committee, tried to visit Iran to appeal for co-operation in instituting an oil embargo against South Africa, but the Government of Iran failed to receive the mission.

123. Last November, the Special Committee prepared a report on the collaboration of Iran with South Africa and sent it to the Government of Iran with an earnest appeal to terminate such collaboration.

124. Despite all the rebuffs, we entertained confidence that Iran would ultimately range itself on the side of the forces of liberation against racism and cease to be an embarrassment to its friends. I must therefore express particular satisfaction at the recent announcement about an oil embargo, because it results from the concern of public opinion over the honour of the country and its integrity. This confirms my faith that when people are informed of the true facts they will surely support liberation struggles in South Africa and elsewhere and terminate all collaboration with the *apartheid* régime, despite any temporary sacrifices which may be required. I would like to appeal to the Government and people of Iran to terminate urgently all

collaboration with the *apartheid* régime: in diplomatic, military, economic and other fields.

125. Press reports indicate that the *apartheid* régime is contacting other oil-producing countries to obtain crude oil supplies. I here wish to appeal to all concerned to rebuff the *apartheid* régime, in accordance with the resolutions of the United Nations.

126. In South Africa this week, the African people and their national liberation movement are observing the centenary of the heroic battle of the Zulu people against colonial forces. They recall the memory of their leaders in the resistance to a 100 years' war waged by the alien settlers to rob the African people of their land and possessions and to enslave them. They pledge to redeem their rights and build a non-racial society.

127. The history of South Africa since the advent of the settlers has been a story of the spirit of freedom of the African people, of their repeated efforts for peaceful coexistence, of their firm faith in non-racialism despite the bestiality of the racist tyrants.

128. As we recall the memory of the great leaders of South Africa, and indeed of the African Diaspora, we cannot but be impressed by the fact that not only have they struggled for the liberation of oppressed people, but have upheld the vision of a world in which all men and women would live in dignity and freedom.

129. Let us pay homage to these great leaders and uphold their vision. For it must become a reality if the purposes of the United Nations are to prevail.

#### *Organization of work*

130. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Unfortunately, we are once again encountering difficulties in adhering to our schedule of meetings, since documents are not available in all official languages. This is the case in regard to the remaining agenda items for this afternoon. This is due to a new measure on the part of the staff which has put a stop to the work, as happened last December. I have been informed by the Secretary-General that all necessary measures are being taken to ensure that the General Assembly will be able to conclude its consideration of the items on its agenda at the earliest possible time. To provide adequate time for this purpose, I do not intend to schedule a plenary meeting for tomorrow. However, the necessary preparations must be made expeditiously.

131. It will be announced in the *Journal of the United Nations* whether it will be possible to hold a plenary meeting on Friday. In any event, the General Assembly will meet at the latest next Monday, 29 January. May I take it that the General Assembly agrees with this proposal?

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 5.05 p.m.*