



CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 52:

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

- (a) Report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*;
(b) Report of the Secretary-General 937

President: Mr. Hamilton Shirley AMERASINGHE
(Sri Lanka).

AGENDA ITEM 52

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

- (a) Report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*;
(b) Report of the Secretary-General

1. The PRESIDENT: I should like to call the Assembly's attention to the report of the Special Political Committee in document A/31/320.

2. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote on any or all of the 10 draft resolutions before the Assembly.

3. I am sure all representatives are aware of the rule that no delegation that is a sponsor of a draft resolution may explain its vote on that draft resolution.

4. Mr. FUENTES IBAÑEZ (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Bolivia has studied very carefully the draft resolutions on this item. We have also taken the keenest interest in the exhaustive debate on the inhuman practice of *apartheid*.

5. My delegation has no objection to the essential purpose of the draft resolutions. As we have repeatedly said, Bolivia is a society of mixed blood. We have benefited from the contributions of centuries-old cultures such as those of the Tiahuanacos and the Incas. We do not deny our ties with the Western culture—ties that came to us through Spain—to which we owe our religion and our language. With the merging of those currents with the aboriginal cultures we created a new kind of society which is strenuously striving to achieve its own destiny in which there are no vestiges of resentment and no burden of racial prejudice.

6. Because of our history and the successful experience it implies in consolidating our national entity, we consider ourselves fully able to assess all the implications and painful

consequences of obstinately maintaining a discriminatory régime which violates human dignity, as does *apartheid*.

7. Our repudiation of any form of racial discrimination is based on no other interest than our solidarity with the suffering peoples. It is based not on economic and political interests but, I would reiterate, on genuine Christian solidarity and respect for human dignity.

8. Despite our clearly defined conduct, which is in everything subject to the provisions of Bolivian laws, my delegation cannot fail to view with concern some of the concepts included in some of the draft resolutions which will be voted upon today. Therefore, consistent with our intention to vote conscientiously and responsibly and without regard to any political considerations, my delegation wishes to place on record its reservation in regard to the accusatory references to third countries, the decisions and policies of which we do not consider ourselves entitled to judge, especially since neither the General Assembly nor any one of its subsidiary organs has the attributes of a court of law.

9. Thus we consider that there are inconsistencies and contradictions in the recommendations to the Security Council, whose responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security is recognized, in the draft resolution in document A/31/L.13, entitled "Situation in South Africa", operative paragraph 5 of which states that there is "no alternative to the oppressed people of South Africa but to resort to armed struggle to achieve their legitimate rights". We consider it dangerous precedent to imply that the only alternative to the South African Government's persistence in its erroneous course is the use of arms under the aegis of the United Nations.

10. Not many days ago in the Sixth Committee when we were considering the report of the International Law Commission [A/31/10], chapter III of which contains the draft articles on State responsibility and sets out, in article 18, the conditions in which international law must prevail, and, in article 19 on international crimes and international delicts, the procedural status of situations which have not been precisely defined in the sphere of international relations for the maintenance of peace, my delegation expressed its fears regarding the possibility of arriving at the most just and legitimate qualification of the infractions or illegal acts most likely to be agreed to be international crimes. We said that, within the framework of recognized changes and the evolution of the present legal definition of what is an international crime inherent in mankind and its dynamics—this classification could not be unalterable save at the moral level. Going deeper into the subject, we added that in this field, in defining international crime and the application of sanctions by the international community,

the responsibility of the legislator becomes more complex and difficult since these sanctions might condemn an entire people, even women, old people and innocent children, to annihilation as a result of their economic isolation, or to extermination as a result of war in its present context, which includes the use of the atomic bomb.

11. We wish to reiterate what we said then: that the Government of Bolivia firmly believes that the best way to preserve peoples from the scourge of war is to destroy the fatalistic sense which makes violence the obligatory weapon of impatience when confronted with the lack of understanding and the blindness of Governments, often unaware of the true feelings of the people, for reasons of overweening pride or an exaggerated lust for power.

12. We realize that to many delegations in our Organization the use of violence against some Governments would be justified by the rightness of the cause we all acknowledge. But my Government disagrees with this stand because we firmly believe it would result in distortion of the function of the United Nations. Our Organization would assume a serious responsibility if, yielding to the clamour of the suffering, it exceeded its authority and in order to fight an evil went beyond the terms of its mandate.

13. Since it represents a Government and people that are profoundly peace-loving and continue to believe in the efficacy of negotiation, my delegation supports the measures so far adopted by the Security Council. We are sure they will always be more effective than measures which, taken under the influence of emotional attitudes heightened by impatience or political motives, might bring the scourge of war to the African continent.

14. In addition to the reservations I have expressed in regard to the accusations levelled against third States or indications of conduct which are improper for sovereign States, I wish to state that my delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/31/L.9, on relations between South Africa and Israel, since this is politically motivated and its implications might affect and further delay the proper implementation of the Security Council resolutions on the pacification of the Middle East.

15. Mr. KAUFMANN (Netherlands): I am speaking on behalf of the nine countries of the European Communities.

16. There can be no doubt about our position with regard to the policy of *apartheid* of the Republic of South Africa. As we have said many times before and have repeated again in this debate, we utterly reject that degrading and abhorrent policy. We should have preferred to support the draft resolutions before us since we are all in agreement with the condemnation of *apartheid*. However, to our great regret, many of those drafts contain paragraphs or formulations which are unacceptable to us, as they are either unfounded or have no bearing on the subject. For that reason the nine delegations will not be able to cast positive votes on all of the draft resolutions. Indeed, in some cases we shall have no alternative but to abstain in the vote or to vote against them.

17. The Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, my colleague Ambassador Harriman, said here last Friday [56th meeting] in this debate that he did not understand what I meant when, on 28 October [46th meeting], in my statement on behalf of the nine countries of the European Communities, I said that our countries could not support language suggesting that the white population in South Africa could be regarded merely as colonial settlers who had no right to stay there.

18. Although we were reassured by the statement of the Chairman of the Special Committee that there is no justification for the apprehensions of the members of the European Communities, I should like to point out that there is a difference between a colonial and a racist situation. Our countries have therefore taken serious exception to the assertions in the draft resolutions before us that the Government of South Africa is illegitimate and to the implication, by the use of such words as "self-determination", "decolonization" and "liberation", that the situation in South Africa is a colonial one.

19. South Africa is not a colonial Power and the struggle in South Africa is not one for liberation from a colonial situation. The struggle in South Africa is one for equal rights for all inhabitants whatever their race or the colour of their skin. We recognize the important role of the political organizations that have come forth from the ranks of the oppressed, but we cannot regard these organizations as liberation movements in the sense of the word used elsewhere in southern Africa. South Africa itself is an independent State. Any suggestion to the contrary we regard as opposed to the principle of universality of the United Nations and a reflection on the legitimacy of one of its Members.

20. As I indicated on 28 October 1976 during the debate on this item, the nine members of the European Communities continue to regard it as our duty and responsibility to keep open, and to use, channels of communication and to continue to make our views known on a number of problems to the Government and people of South Africa. We hope that in this way the policy of *apartheid* may finally be brought to an end without violence, because violence is not a legitimate method either for achieving change in South Africa or for maintaining the *status quo*.

21. I shall not elaborate further upon the various reservations and misgivings that will motivate the votes of our nine countries on these draft resolutions, as we feel that it would be more appropriate if individual members of our Communities were to do this themselves. I should, however, like to address an urgent appeal to the sponsors of future draft resolutions against *apartheid* to take into consideration the views of all Member States in order that those draft resolutions can be unanimously adopted. Such unanimous adoption would have a greater impact, and South Africa might finally pay heed to the views of the United Nations.

22. Mr. MATANE (Papua New Guinea): From what has been said by representatives of many nations not only at this session but at others since 1948 regarding the policies of *apartheid* in South Africa, it is absolutely certain that there is no more room left for further views and suggestions

to be made. In other words, the topic has been thoroughly and exhaustively discussed, but no effective solutions have been reached. However, many things are evident and clear to us. Some of these are: first, that the policies of *apartheid* in South Africa are very bad; secondly, that those people who practise such policies must be assumed by concerned people such as ourselves to be sick in mind; thirdly, that it must be assumed that such people do not possess human feeling for other human beings; and fourthly, that such people must be assumed to be living in an insensitive and unrealistic world.

23. If all people in South Africa are to live in a country of peace and justice, the policies of *apartheid* there should and must be eliminated, not within another 30 years—after all, we have already waited that long—not within 10 years or five years, but now. Those members of the Assembly that have been for a long time heavily involved in the fight against *apartheid* will agree that if such policies were eliminated now it would undoubtedly be classified as a miracle. So other plans have to be made and followed in order to arrive at the complete eradication of the policies of *apartheid*—hence, the draft resolutions before us today.

24. Most of the draft resolutions on the policies of *apartheid* are steps in the right direction. My delegation, which totally rejects policies of *apartheid*, will vote in favour of most of the draft resolutions but will abstain in the vote on the following: draft resolutions A/31/L.9 and A/31/L.10/Rev.1. My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/31/L.8 and A/31/L.13, because we agree with their general principles, but we should like to place on record that we have some reservations on some small parts of those draft resolutions.

25. Baron VON WECHMAR (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation associates itself with the statement made in this Assembly on 28 October [46th meeting] by the representative of the Netherlands, who spoke on behalf of the nine countries of the European Communities condemning the policies of *apartheid* pursued by the Government of South Africa. With regard to the content of the draft resolutions before us, I also refer to the joint explanation of vote of the nine countries that has just been made in this Assembly.

26. If I speak to the Assembly now in the name of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany in order to explain our vote, it is to underline certain aspects of our approach to *apartheid* and to express our sincere concern about specific charges against my country in one of the draft resolutions before us, as well as in contributions by certain speakers to the debate.

27. We wish all members of the Assembly to understand why we find it regrettable, and even harmful to our common cause, to be prevented from an unqualified agreement with the majority. With a more eager search for objectivity on the part of the sponsors of these draft resolutions, such an agreement, in our view, could easily have been reached. The latest developments in the situation in southern Africa fill us with hope and growing anxiety alike.

28. As for Zimbabwe, a turn of events is foreshadowed, for which all concerned deserve thanks and appreciation:

the United States and the United Kingdom Governments, as well as those African personalities who are working with perseverance for a peaceful solution of this pressing problem.

29. Regarding Namibia, all parties concerned seem, at least, about to adopt a more realistic attitude towards the prerequisites for a peaceful solution, including the necessity of participation by the United Nations and the South West Africa People's Organization. Yet, in South Africa itself, there are forces which, despite their awareness of growing isolation, seem little inclined so far to embark on a process of reorientation. Instead of focusing their energies on speedy reforms so as to eliminate discrimination by law and in daily practice, the authorities have recourse to even more totalitarian police action to control the situation. However, by their harsh action against the demonstrators in Soweto, those forces have again aroused public opinion throughout the world. There is a clearer general perception today than ever before of what *apartheid* really means: not only a denial to individuals of their political rights, but absolute discrimination on grounds of race in all walks of life. The wave of indignation aroused by this deplorable disrespect for the principle of equality will finally sweep away the *apartheid* policy, and we hope that we are not too far from that point now.

30. Although we understand, under those circumstances, the anger and indignation that led many Africans to the conclusion that only violence can eradicate *apartheid*, my Government is not convinced that a solution by violence is the only recommendable way out.

31. We continue to support the search for a settlement by peaceful means. Those who are working against *apartheid* within and without the South African Parliament, few though the former may be, can count on all the support we are able to give them. The Federal Republic of Germany has consistently deprecated *apartheid* in the strongest terms, as in the statement by its Vice-Chancellor and Foreign Minister before this Assembly on 28 September [7th meeting]. My Government's position again found expression in the statement of the representative of the Netherlands of 28 October on behalf of the nine countries members of the European Communities. Some days ago, we publicly reaffirmed this attitude by endorsing the resolution concerning the so-called independent Transkei [resolution 31/6 A] and by our sponsorship of the resolution on the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa. [A/31/L.6 and Add.1-5.]

32. This position of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany reflects our way of thinking and our public opinion. One of the representatives, who commended in this debate the demonstrations in our cities and the anti-*apartheid* movement in the trade unions, was wrong in deducing from that an antagonism between those public reactions and our Government's policy. While the Federal Republic of Germany recognizes the political significance of all these manifestations and appeals, we do not content ourselves with this. We have tried as best we could to give effect to our anti-*apartheid* policy in southern Africa through appropriate action. The main guidelines for the implementation of this policy can be described as follows: first, a direct, critical dialogue with the South

African Government; secondly, a complete and strictly controlled arms embargo and abstention from all co-operation in the nuclear field; thirdly, comprehensive development assistance to the independent African States in southern Africa; fourthly, a refusal to promote investments in South Africa; and fifthly, the systematic discouragement of sports contacts implying racial discrimination.

33. Some months ago, the Federal Chancellor and the Federal Foreign Minister again availed themselves of an opportunity for direct critical dialogue and presented in unequivocal language our views, and suggestions to the leading figures of the South African Government. The Federal Government did so because it believes that full use must be made of all possibilities to confront those politicians with the serious consequences to which their isolation is bound to lead.

34. The most important restraint which the Federal Republic of Germany imposes on itself in its relations with South Africa concerns the military sector. It is the firm and established policy of the Federal Government not to supply any arms to South Africa. There is no such thing as military co-operation between the Federal Republic of Germany and South Africa.

35. As early as 1963, long before the Federal Republic of Germany became a Member of the United Nations, the Federal Government, pursuant to Security Council resolutions, placed an embargo upon the supply to South Africa of military weapons, ammunition, military vehicles and installations for the production of war material, declaring that it would refrain from any military co-operation with South Africa. This policy has repeatedly been reaffirmed since then by the Federal Government and is being strictly observed. In view of our stringent control regulations, we can give the firm assurance that South Africa has not received, and is not receiving, any weapons from the Federal Republic of Germany.

36. I also reject most emphatically the insinuation, made over and over again in the debate and in certain documents, about our alleged nuclear co-operation with South Africa. My country did not supply any reactors to South Africa, nor has my Government taken any action to promote developments in South Africa in this field.

37. We have noted with regret that, for very obvious reasons of propaganda, the story of a threat to southern Africa by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [*NATO*] has occasionally been revived. A commercial transaction completed eight years ago, the project known as "Advokaat", has come to be the standard piece of evidence to substantiate this fabrication. Unfortunately, this untenable argumentation is to be found again in a document circulated under the name of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. All charges against *NATO* or against my country in connexion with that project have already been refuted in my statement given in last year's *apartheid* debate on 21 October.¹ May I emphasize in this context that we recognize the work performed by the Special Committee

against *Apartheid*, but we feel that certain publications of the Centre against *Apartheid* are not sufficiently objective.

38. *NATO* is a defence alliance to protect Western Europe, and it affects in no way the southern African region. In our efforts to contribute to stability and to endorse majority rule in southern Africa we concentrate on development assistance to independent African States of that region. Under its bilateral programme of economic co-operation with Zambia, the United Republic of Tanzania, Lesotho, Botswana, Malawi and Swaziland, the Federal Government spends annually more than \$100 million on the development of industry, agriculture, infrastructure and social institutions. At the same time, we rank among the most important participants in multilateral programmes of development assistance implemented in the region. The Federal Republic of Germany is one of the most important financial contributors to funds and scholarship programmes destined for southern Africa.

39. We view these activities as a decisive contribution towards the solution of the most pressing problems of Africa. Going beyond mere declarations and solemn gestures, we have translated our awareness of these problems into practical politics, thus assisting our African partners on their way to genuine independence. This material and human engagement in favour of almost all countries in Africa has so far met with recognition by African Governments in our bilateral relations. We take pride in this. It therefore escapes us all the more why some of these Governments here in New York associate themselves with attacks against us based on false statements by "certain Eastern countries", which also belong to the group of industrialized States but do not spend even one tenth of the amount mentioned previously for the economic development of those African countries. This comparison should, I think, give food for thought to those who find it smart to allude here again and again to "certain Western countries" or "certain *NATO* States".

40. The Federal Government does not encourage investments in South Africa and has expressly excluded South Africa from all investment promotion schemes applied to other African States. This means no official guarantees for investments, no investment promotion treaties, no tax incentives under the development aid tax law, and no promotion of joint ventures by the German Corporation of Development Assistance. As the economic order of the Federal Republic of Germany is based on the principle of a free-market economy, my Government would, however, have constitutional difficulties in enforcing a general cessation of private investments in a foreign country.

41. My Government endeavours, to the extent possible, to discourage sports contacts with South African teams that have not been formed in accordance with the Olympic principle of non-discrimination. From several recent sports events we received first indications of a certain success in our efforts in that respect. Our measures concerning sports contacts must, of course, be in line with the principle of freedom of movement as embodied in our Constitution.

42. In the light of what I have stated, representatives will understand that several of the draft resolutions before us cannot meet with my Government's approval, even where

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirtieth Session, Special Political Committee, 961st meeting.*

we do agree with the essential parts of their contents. I have to emphasize, in particular, that we consider the charges against the Federal Republic of Germany contained in the draft resolution on an arms embargo [A/31/L.8], expressly mentioning the name of my country, as being entirely unjustifiable. We cannot accept the practice of some countries that criticize or even condemn individual States Members of the United Nations in this world forum without having carefully examined the facts. Such a one-sided and arbitrary approach runs counter to the efforts aiming at constructive and objective co-operation and a fair reconciliation of interests in this world Organization. It seems absurd and improper to reverse arbitrarily the principle of the onus of proof—as called for in the debate in the Fourth Committee on item 87—and to consider a State guilty until it has proved itself innocent, and to condemn it on that basis.

43. Nevertheless it is our conviction that no difference of opinion in this General Assembly must distract us from our task of combating the evil of *apartheid* with all the means that appear appropriate to us. All participants in this General Assembly, without any exception, pursue the same goal.

44. Mr. UPADHYAY (Nepal): My delegation strongly condemns the act of collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa by any Government. The heinous crime of *apartheid* can be abolished only if the South African racist régime does not get any support in any form from the world community.

45. These racists have been isolated from the rest of the world, but it is alarming that they still get encouragement from a few who, with the selfish motive of trade and profit, continue to collaborate with South Africa. Any explanation of such collaboration is not only unworthy but outrageous. We cannot associate ourselves in any way with the ridiculous arguments of some of the collaborationists in defence of their violation of a United Nations resolution nor can we entertain the idea that the same can be condoned if it is committed with others. It is a ridiculous argument to say that someone is not alone in committing crimes.

46. My delegation, which has had the privilege to have served in the Special Committee against *Apartheid* from its very beginning, is well aware of its obligations, and so we have joined in sponsoring the draft resolutions against *apartheid*. However, we could not join in sponsoring one of them because in our opinion the practice of trying to single out one State for any action is not healthy. We see no justification in trying to isolate and condemn one State.

47. However, in no way do we imply that we approve of any activity contrary to United Nations resolutions by any State. For this reason, my delegation will not be in a position to support draft resolution A/31/L.9 and will abstain in the vote on it.

48. Mr. GIGNAC (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): The Canadian delegation, in its statement made in the Assembly last week [49th meeting], made it clear that the Government of Canada utterly and categorically rejects the policies and practices of *apartheid* and racial discrimination

which have been institutionalized by the Government of South Africa. The Canadian representative, Mr. Stanbury, concluded his remarks by urging that our individual and collective efforts be intensified and harmonized and that no opportunity be missed to expose the Government of South Africa and its electorate to unanimous and relentless international pressures for fundamental change and the abandonment of *apartheid*.

49. It is within this context that my Government has considered the set of draft resolutions at present before us. Unfortunately, on reading these texts we regret that we must conclude that our Organization is about to lose a major opportunity to translate into action the unprecedented degree of unanimity attained by the international community on this question.

50. Last year this Assembly adopted by consensus or without objection six resolutions against *apartheid* [3411 A-F (XXX)]. Canada, for its part, voted "yes" on all six. There were profound differences of approach on only one resolution, the comprehensive resolution 3411 G (XXX), which drew abstentions or negative votes from 31 countries, including Canada. This year we have 10 draft resolutions on which we will have to vote, representing a total of 30 pages embodying approximately 170 operative paragraphs. In contemplating this mass of documentation, we profoundly support the conviction so eloquently expressed by the representative of Saudi Arabia [51st meeting] that this scattergun approach serves only to obfuscate the issues and to sow confusion, the more so since several of these draft resolutions embody approaches on which there is deep division. While recognizing that the events of the past year have, as never before, helped to increase our concern and frustration with regard to *apartheid*, we believe that this is precisely why it is more important than ever for the Government and electorate of South Africa to hear the unanimous clear and forthright voice of this Assembly.

51. The Canadian delegation finds, to its disappointment, that the language of several of these draft resolutions is not likely to win the support of the majority of our Organization, and we can vote in favour of only four of the 10 texts, including that relating to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa [A/31/L.6]—of which we are one of the sponsors—and that relating to solidarity with South African prisoners [A/31/L.7], on which we consider it especially important to make known our views to the Government of South Africa. Similarly, we shall again support the draft resolution denouncing *apartheid* in sports [A/31/L.10/Rev.1]. We regret that in its revised form that draft resolution no longer leaves open, as we had hoped it would, all options for study by the Special Committee of the best means for strengthening further the boycott of South African sporting events. We have said that a declaration designed to draw the widest possible support might perhaps best serve our common purpose without entailing the delays, complexities and pitfalls of an international legal instrument. Furthermore, while certain provisions of that draft resolution either are not applicable to the Canadian situation—such as, for example, operative paragraph 3(c)—or may not be fully consistent with the Canadian policy regarding sporting contacts with South Africa, my Government intends to implement that draft

resolution as fully as possible within the context of its own policy. As we have stated before, this policy essentially denies financial or moral support to any Canadian athlete or team competing in athletic events in South Africa or to any Canadian athletic event permitting South African participation. At the same time, however, I must add that my Government is not prepared to restrict the freedom of Canadians to travel abroad wherever they wish.

52. As regards the programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* in draft resolution A/31/L.11, we wish to express our support for its broad outlines.

53. With reference to the draft resolution on the arms embargo against South Africa [A/31/L.8], my delegation wishes to recall that the Canadian Government has since 1963 maintained an embargo on the sale of arms and military equipment to South Africa and in 1970 extended it to cover spare parts for such equipment, in accordance with the relevant Security Council resolutions. We thus subscribe to the fundamental objectives of that draft resolution. None the less, we fear that we must abstain in the vote on the text in view of our reservations regarding recourse to Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, which is so serious in nature. In addition, we dispute the validity of the unproved allegations in the fourth and sixth preambular paragraphs against the six countries named in the fourth preambular paragraph. We consider that it is not reasonable to place the burden of proof of innocence on the so-called accused; what we must have is clear, unquestioned documentation.

54. I turn now to the draft resolutions which my delegation cannot support. We oppose draft resolution A/31/L.9 on relations between Israel and South Africa. We have already clearly stated our opposition to any military co-operation with, or transfer of arms to, South Africa by any State; and, in that respect, we agree with the second preambular paragraph because it seems to us to be relevant. However, the draft resolution in its operative part also deals with State-to-State relations. We do not believe that in that field States which adopt policies different from those advocated by the General Assembly should be singled out for condemnation in this manner. Indeed, Israel is not the only State which has relations with South Africa. We shall therefore oppose this draft resolution.

55. Similarly, we shall abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/31/L.12 on economic collaboration with South Africa. It is my Government's practice to carry on trade in peaceful goods with all countries of the world, except Rhodesia, on the grounds that the maintenance of normal trade and commercial relations with other States does not in any way imply support for their political policies. Accordingly, we cannot accept that the existence of economic relations constitutes collaboration with or encouragement for the policies of *apartheid*. That applies equally to the draft resolution on new investments [A/31/L.15], on which we shall also abstain.

56. In so far as draft resolution A/31/L.13, the omnibus draft resolution relating to the situation in South Africa, is concerned, this year as last year we find ourselves opposed to several of its provisions and conclusions. This was evident from the thrust of our statement last week on

apartheid and my foregoing comments. We shall therefore vote against that draft resolution. Nevertheless, my delegation wishes to emphasize that we support operative paragraph 12 of that draft resolution, which is designed to facilitate assistance to help Lesotho and other countries bordering on South Africa to provide educational facilities for the rapidly growing number of refugee students from South Africa.

57. Finally, we shall abstain in the vote on the draft resolution on the programme of action against *apartheid* [A/31/L.14]. In general, we are in agreement with several aspects of the annexed programme of action, in particular the paragraphs dealing with government measures concerning military and nuclear collaboration, sporting contacts, dissemination of information and assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa. However, we find ourselves in fundamental disagreement with those sections relating to normal State-to-State contacts noted in paragraph 21 (a), (c), (d) and (e). Furthermore, we continue to have difficulty with other provisions of that draft resolution.

58. In concluding, I should also indicate that Canada rejects the assumption or implication suggested by some of the language in the various draft resolutions before us to the effect that the situation in South Africa is a colonial type of situation. We believe, rather, that what prevails at present in South Africa is a situation that requires the urgent co-operation of all South Africans to ensure the establishment of a new society based on justice.

59. Mr. HARRY (Australia): Mr. President, at your request we have consolidated all our explanations on these draft resolutions into a single explanation before the vote. We would hope that possibly on the next occasion when, unfortunately, we may have to consider the problem of *apartheid* there may be some consolidation of draft resolutions into a smaller number.

60. During the debate [45th meeting] my delegation set out unequivocally the Australian Government's abhorrence of the South African Government's policy of *apartheid*. We urged at the same time that we should put great weight when considering action on the points on which we could unanimously agree. Unfortunately, some of the draft resolutions before us have not met that test, and I must explain the Australian vote on three of them.

61. The first is in document A/31/L.12, "Economic collaboration with South Africa". The Australian delegation has studied the draft resolution with great care. This draft resolution raises issues of vital economic importance to a great number of Members from all parts of the globe. It raises important questions of principle. It requires each of us to examine the extent of its commitment to end the *apartheid* system in South Africa. The practical difficulties raised by this draft resolution and the principles that it espouses cannot be lightly skimmed over. We have already underlined the seriousness of the situation in South Africa. We have condemned the resort to violence by the South African Government and we see no immediate end to the upheaval there. But we must speak frankly about this draft resolution and examine carefully the challenges it presents to us.

62. This draft resolution proposes a number of measures seeking, in essence, the economic isolation of South Africa. These measures seem to us to have been drafted in such a way as to suggest that only some countries with a certain kind of economic system trade with South Africa, or at least that their economic connexions with South Africa are somehow more significant than those of others. We all know that this is not the case. South Africa is a significant participant in world trade and many countries have economic relations with it. In this situation it is difficult, but necessary, to distinguish objectively between legitimate economic involvements in the South African economy and those involvements which would seem to bolster and maintain the *apartheid* system. These issues have not been dealt with adequately in this draft. Apart from the question of principle, we doubt whether the draft resolution is capable of full implementation by many whose economic relations with South Africa may be most significant in assisting the South African Government. If a *prima facie* case could be established that the denial of economic co-operation with South Africa was the only effective means of ensuring an early peaceful end to *apartheid*, then a study of the South African economy with a view to determining to what extent foreign economic collaboration of every kind with South Africa bolsters the *apartheid* régime might be justified. Such a study, universal in scope, would be the essential precursor of a meaningful decision on economic collaboration with South Africa.

63. The draft does not, however, address itself to these vital questions. Indeed, it seeks to avoid them, and for this reason we shall, with regret, abstain in the vote on it.

64. Secondly, I should like to refer briefly to draft resolution A/31/L.8, "Arms embargo against South Africa". The position of the Australian Government on the supply of arms to South Africa is quite clear. We have ensured that Australian weapons shall not contribute to the arming of the South African Government and we have ensured that there is not, nor will there be, military co-operation between Australia and South Africa. However, irrespective of the situation, and no matter how strongly we may feel, it is for the Security Council and the Security Council alone to determine the existence of any threat to international peace and security and for the Security Council alone to decide what measures should be taken in this regard, as is laid down in Chapter VII of our Charter.

65. Australia believes that the fundamental objective of all resolutions concerning *apartheid* in South Africa should be to gather as great a consensus as possible to bring home to South Africa the extent of its isolation within the international community. Our main target must therefore be to focus attention on South Africa, and not to divert attention from it by opportunistic references to other countries and the use of intemperate language which can only detract from what we all really want to achieve. Australia will therefore regretfully abstain in the vote on this draft resolution also.

66. Finally, I should like to touch briefly on draft resolution A/31/L.10/Rev.1, "*Apartheid* in sports". Australia recognizes, as I am sure all representatives do, that with regard to some points of detail in this draft resolution domestic legislation and procedures may limit the extent

and timing of possible action by Governments. However, the draft resolution before us is broadly consistent with Australian policy established and in effect, and in the spirit of taking constructive action against *apartheid*, we are pleased to support it.

67. Mr. GUTIERREZ MACIAS (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): During the general debate on this item my delegation not only clearly reaffirmed its firm condemnation of *apartheid*, but also stated how we have carried out in practice a clear policy of action on the basis of United Nations decisions against countries which, like South Africa, pursue a racist policy as part of their institutional system.

68. On the basis of this premise, Mexico voted in the Third Committee in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/31/L.16/Rev.1 on the item, "Adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights of political, military, economic and other forms of assistance given to colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa", which in operative paragraph 3:

"Condemns strongly the collaboration of all States, particularly France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Israel and Japan, as well as those foreign economic interests which maintain and/or continue to increase their collaboration with the racist régimes of southern Africa, especially in the economic, military and nuclear fields".²

69. Moreover, Mexico will vote in favour of draft resolution A/31/L.12, which condemns all forms of economic co-operation with South Africa.

70. However, the delegation of Mexico will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/31/L.9 because we cannot favour a proposal singling out one country, which would seem contrary to the criteria on which the two other draft resolutions I have referred to were based.

71. Mr. CHAVES (Grenada): Grenada is definitely and whole-heartedly opposed to *apartheid* and all forms of discrimination, racism and official prejudice. There is harmony among all races in Grenada; there is no discrimination, segregation or official prejudice of any kind in our country.

72. For these reasons, we regret that the wording of some of the draft resolutions before us makes it impossible for the Assembly to achieve a consensus, and we hope that future draft resolutions will take into consideration the fact that decisions of the Assembly would have a much greater impact, authority and beneficial effect if they could be supported by all the Members of the United Nations.

73. We do not believe in selective condemnation. We hold that the moral and juridical principles on which this Organization is based are applicable to all, and we therefore do not believe that selective condemnation should be

² *Ibid.*, *Thirty-first Session, Annexes*, agenda item 70, document A/31/331, paras. 7 and 11.

approved. Furthermore, we do not believe in unjust or unfair condemnation of Members which have been charged in some of these draft resolutions with violations which they have not committed.

74. We therefore associate ourselves with statements made here by the representatives of the Netherlands, on behalf of the nine members of the European Communities, Australia and the Federal Republic of Germany, and, although we may not agree with their final votes on these draft resolutions, we feel that the reasons for their votes are quite understandable and justified.

75. We do not believe that force is a solution to the problem of *apartheid*. We hope and pray that reason will prevail and that all instruments of the international community will be fully used to achieve a satisfactory settlement. We call on all nations to contribute to putting an end to the evil of *apartheid*. In this context we hold that economic sanctions against and limitations on normal economic relations with a State tend to place heavier burdens on the people and contribute but little to the establishment of peace and justice in the world.

76. The affirmative votes of Grenada regarding some of these draft resolutions are therefore to be interpreted as a condemnation of *apartheid*, but we dissociate ourselves from those parts of the draft resolutions which selectively or unfairly condemn any State.

77. Therefore, Grenada will vote affirmatively on those draft resolutions which, in our view, address themselves primarily to the issue of *apartheid* and abstain in the vote on those which, in our view, condemn certain countries selectively.

78. Mr. HERZOG (Israel): My delegation has made its position quite clear in the course of this discussion and on other occasions on Israel's attitude towards *apartheid*. In the words of my Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Yigal Allon, to this General Assembly,

"Racism and racial discrimination, in any guise, including *apartheid*, are abhorrent to my country and my people. The basic tenets of Judaism are irreconcilable with any form of racism and racial discrimination."
[22nd meeting, para. 148.]

79. However, in explaining our vote permit me to reiterate a few remarks which I have already made. It is regrettable that, instead of being able to achieve consensus on a subject which calls for such consensus, as has been pointed out by a number of representatives this morning, it has again this year not been possible to do so because of the injection by the Arab delegations of irrelevancies into the debate and of the discordant note which is the invariable result of their interventions.

80. Not only are they busy tearing each other apart in the Middle East, their various agreements notwithstanding, but they will not be satisfied until they tear this Organization apart too.

81. The African world has been trying to achieve a modicum of consensus on the issue of *apartheid*, but the

Arab States, in their traditional approach of disdain towards the African world, have chosen to prejudice any prospect of achieving consensus on what is close to the hearts of the Africans. Driven by their old rivalries, hatreds and illogical and immature approaches, they have ignored the interests of the African world in order to advance their goal of the destruction of a Member State, regardless of whether such action prejudices moves against racism and racial discrimination.

82. Why should they care, since many of them have written into their Constitutions principles and laws based on racism and racial discrimination, laws which when applied, as they are, discriminate against, among others, Jews, women and blacks. Small wonder, therefore, that in their inevitable exercise in hypocrisy they see in the struggle of the black people merely an opportunity to pursue their own narrow and destructive aims in this body.

83. Last year they succeeded in alienating a considerable and important part of the world from any association with the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and they continue to do so this year. The Arab countries have launched an attack on Israel in this debate. Those who raise their voices against us in this debate are the very countries which have not the slightest interest in advancing the struggle against racism and racial discrimination in the world. Many African leaders and writers are, as I have pointed out, very concerned about this new exercise in neo-colonialism by a number of Arab States, whereby they attempt to impose their will on the Africans in matters irrelevant to the African world, make promises which are never honoured, proffer blandishments which never materialize, issue veiled threats which are a violation of national sovereignty against countries which fought for that sovereignty and behave in international conferences, such as this one, as if they owned the place, without regard to national feelings, national dignity and national sovereignty.

84. The Arab representatives have taken a subject which is close to the hearts of our African colleagues and have converted it into a barren discussion of the Middle East problem, as they do on every possible occasion.

85. If there were a discussion in this forum today on international measures to prevent the spread of a fatal disease, the Arab delegations would convert that discussion into a debate on the Middle East problem, and the disease would continue to take its toll of the populations of the world.

86. This month we shall have at least a dozen debates and discussions in this Organization on various aspects of the Middle East problem. Last year half the time of the Assembly, according to the then President, was devoted to the Middle East problem. Do our African brothers not deserve the right to deal exclusively with their problems without on each and every occasion being driven by Arab pressure and threats to subordinate their issues to those that the Arab States wish to be discussed?

87. I can do no more than ask, For how long will this theatre of the absurd continue to make a mockery of this Organization and debase it in the eyes of the civilized

world? For how long is this international forum going to continue to be a centre of international duplicity, allowing the Arab countries and their associates to proceed blithely reconciling the irreconcilable, accusing others of what they are flagrantly guilty of—and, what is more, getting away with it?

88. Here we have a draft resolution on *apartheid* presented to this Organization in document A/31/L.9. That text has been drafted by Iraq and presented by Libya and it calls for a condemnation of Israel for alleged crimes in which Arab States are the major culprits. On another occasion I pointed out how Alice's wonderland had come to life in this Organization. And why not? As long as Saudi Arabia continues blithely to negotiate in Pretoria for gold in return for oil, to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars, and to effect the exchange; as long as the royal family in Kuwait continues to expand its holdings in the London and Rhodesia Corporation and to trade and mine in Rhodesia and South Africa; as long as Iraqi oil from the Basra oil fields is shipped to South Africa; as long as Arab investors offer 100 million rand to two bantustans—according to official South African Government announcements; as long as Egypt develops closer economic ties with South Africa, following several secret trips in both directions; as long as Mr. Vorster feels confident enough to announce—according to *The New York Times* of 11 April 1976—that he does not anticipate any harm to South Africa's relations with the Arab oil suppliers; as long as—according to the monthly newspaper of the United Nations Association, in its issue of last month—"the list of nations which currently trade with South Africa is as long as, and in many cases identical with, the roll call of States which have proclaimed their hostility to the *apartheid* régime";³ as long as all this and much more goes on—and we have volumes on this issue—then it is perfectly logical, in this latter-day Alice's wonderland, to condemn Israel. That is, after all, what the Mad Hatter's tea party was all about.

89. But what is the purpose of it all? Israel has to be singled out because the Arab delegations have so decided. It is irrelevant that Israel's trade with South Africa is only two fifths of one per cent of that country's trade, and the remaining 99.6 per cent of that trade is carried out by most of the countries represented in this hall. Israel is accused of training South African forces. It is irrelevant that our Minister of Defence has officially denied this in our Parliament, the Knesset. It is irrelevant that over the years Israel has given economic, technical, agricultural and social aid to newly emerging African countries. It is irrelevant that such aid continues to be made available to African countries, even in the absence of formal relations.

90. What is relevant is that the Arab delegations have dictated the singling out of Israel for condemnation. That is what is relevant. The facts, as is inevitably the case in this forum, are irrelevant.

91. I have pointed out [*49th meeting*] that in the London International Institute for Strategic Studies report, there is a detailed list of the equipment and weapons maintained in the South African defence establishment. It is a very

comprehensive list. Not one of the items listed was supplied by Israel. I do not recall any country which supplied those weapons over the years being singled out for a special resolution by the General Assembly in this manner.

92. By allowing the Arab States to dictate on this issue on which they are the most vulnerable, those who have this issue most at heart have betrayed their own cause. The only expression of appreciation they will get from the Arab States for this will be a rise in the price of oil of approximately 15 per cent in the near future, so as to cripple them economically even further and so as to enable the Arab countries to acquire more hotels in London and buy more gold from South Africa.

93. I represent a small country—a very small country—and a people which gave the principles of equality to this world. I am proud of the fact that I represent a country which is not bound by cheap expediency and is free to speak up and uncover duplicity.

94. I wish to thank the representatives of those countries that have indicated that they will not support a one-sided and biased resolution condemning Israel. However, because this has been turned into an anti-Israel issue, ignoring as it does the major moral problem of *apartheid* which should be exercising this body, because those who prepared the draft resolution against Israel are guilty of crimes of which they accuse others, because what we are called upon to participate in is a monstrous act of deceit and a cynical vote based on international hypocrisy and unscrupulous falsehood, my delegation will have none of it. We will not even be a party to a legislative process which reveals the depths to which this Organization has descended. My delegation will accordingly, in protest against this selective and dishonest process, not participate in the voting on any of the draft resolutions brought before this Assembly on this item.

95. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now proceed to take decisions on the various draft resolutions before it.

96. The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/31/L.6 and Add.1-5 entitled "United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa". It is my understanding that the General Assembly would like to adopt this draft resolution without a vote, as was done last year. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that that procedure is acceptable to the Assembly.

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 31/6 B).

97. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on draft resolution in A/31/L.7 and Add.1-3, entitled "Solidarity with South African political prisoners". It is my understanding that the General Assembly is prepared to adopt this draft resolution without a vote, as was done last year. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that that procedure is acceptable to the Assembly.

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 31/6 C).

98. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/31/L.8 and Add.1-3, entitled

³ See "Who Trades with South Africa . . .", *The Inter Dependent*, vol. 3, No. 9 (October 1976), p. 1.

"Arms embargo against South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, 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, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iran, Ireland, Japan, Malawi, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Portugal, Spain, Uruguay.

The draft resolution was adopted by 110 votes to 8, with 20 abstentions (resolution 31/6 D).⁴

99. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote upon draft resolution A/31/L.9 and Add.1-3 entitled "Relations between Israel and South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta,

Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahamas, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, Greece, Grenada, Haiti, Iran, Ivory Coast, Japan, Malawi, Mexico, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Singapore, Surinam, Swaziland, Uruguay, Venezuela.

The draft resolution was adopted by 91 votes to 20, with 28 abstentions (resolution 31/6 E).

100. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/31/L.10/Rev.1 and Add.1 and 2, entitled "Apartheid in sports". The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of this draft resolution is contained in document A/31/321/Add.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, 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, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, 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, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, 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, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

⁴ The delegation of Ghana subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Luxembourg, Malawi, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

The draft resolution was adopted by 128 votes to none, with 12 abstentions (resolution 31/6 F).

101. The PRESIDENT: In operative paragraph 2 of the resolution just adopted the General Assembly decides to establish an *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports composed of the existing members of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and seven other Member States to be appointed by the President of the General Assembly on the basis of equitable geographical distribution. I shall report to the Assembly on this matter at a subsequent date.

102. The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/31/L.11 and Add.1-3, entitled "Programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*". The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of this draft resolution is contained in document A/31/321. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, 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, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, 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, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, 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, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, 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, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

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

The draft resolution was adopted by 133 votes to none, with 8 abstentions (resolution 31/6 G).

103. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on draft resolution A/31/L.12 and Add.1-3, entitled "Economic collaboration with South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, 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, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, 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, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Canada, Central African Republic, Denmark, Finland, Grenada, Guatemala, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Uruguay.

The draft resolution was adopted by 110 votes to 6, with 24 abstentions (resolution 31/6 H).

104. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to draft resolution A/31/L.13 and Add.1-3, entitled "Situation in South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary,

India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, 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, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: 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: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Central African Republic, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Finland, Gabon, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Japan, Malawi, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Uruguay.

The draft resolution was adopted by 108 votes to 11, with 22 abstentions (resolution 31/6 I).

105. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to draft resolution A/31/L.14 and Add.1 and 2 entitled "Programme of Action against *Apartheid*". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, 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, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Japan, Liberia, Malawi, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Uruguay.

The draft resolution was adopted by 105 votes to 8, with 27 abstentions (resolution 31/6 J).

106. The PRESIDENT: Lastly, we come to draft resolution A/31/L.15 and Add.1, entitled "Investments in South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, 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, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, 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, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, 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, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, Central African Republic, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Guatemala, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malawi, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

The draft resolution was adopted by 124 votes to none, with 16 abstentions (resolution 31/6 K).

107. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has now taken decisions on all the draft resolutions, and I shall now call on those delegations that wish to explain their votes.

108. Mr. VUNIBOBO (Fiji): My country's position on *apartheid* is clear and unequivocal. We are against *apartheid* in its totality. We find considerable difficulties, however, in the wording of several of the draft resolutions. Nevertheless, having regard to the objectives of the draft resolutions, we have voted in favour of all but one. Had there been voting on each paragraph, we should have been forced to abstain in the vote on several.

109. In regard to draft resolution A/31/L.9, we find ourselves in some difficulty. We feel that the resolution somewhat lacks objectivity and impartiality in that only one country has been singled out, whereas it is our understanding that a much larger number of countries have trading relations with South Africa. Consequently, we have had to abstain in the vote on that draft resolution.

110. Mr. MUWAMBA (Malawi): Malawi, as the Assembly is already aware, was once a possession of a European Power. Therefore the Malawians know what it means and how it feels to be politically emasculated in one's own land. Malawians also know how painful and irritating it is for the majority to be oppressed and repressed by the minority. In fact, Malawi's present-day independence is public international testimony to its disdain and contempt for policies of racism and racial discrimination. Therefore, because the policies of *apartheid* continue to cause our African brothers and sisters in South Africa to suffer what we went through, the Malawi Government has made known its strongest objections to the policies of the Government of South Africa, not only through the normal diplomatic channels but also from the steps of the Union Building in Pretoria itself. The Head of State and Government of the Republic of Malawi, H.E. Ngwazi Dr. H. Kamuzu Banda, has, with repeated frequency, attacked those policies publicly and without reservation.

111. My decision to take the podium is prompted by my delegation's desire to articulate two points in connexion with the draft resolutions which have been voted on by the General Assembly following the conclusion of the debate on item 52. My delegation feels that the following points are pertinent. First, the Malawi Government's objections to the policies of *apartheid* are total and without qualifications. Second, my delegation's reluctant abstention in the vote on some of the draft resolutions has been necessitated by our inability to clear in time the implications of a few of the operative paragraphs which, from our point of view, appear to have elements of possible controversy. Therefore, in order not to impede progress, my delegation had no option but to abstain in the vote when those draft resolutions were presented.

112. Although my delegation agrees with the general substance of the resolutions which have been voted upon, we have been unable to establish beyond any reasonable doubt the approach adopted to some of the issues brought out in some of the operative paragraphs.

113. For instance, in regard to the sale of arms to South Africa, a few countries that are said to be the traditional allies of that country have been specifically mentioned. My delegation is of the view that all countries, traditional allies or not, that supply arms to that country should have been specifically mentioned for the international community to know. Current information floating about the corridors of the United Nations does indicate that different types of military hardware, made both in the West and in the East, are readily available to South Africa today. And indeed, in view of the additional information that my delegation had just received about the sale of arms to South Africa, either directly or by proxy, by those unnamed countries which pretend to be more vocal on this issue than others, we found ourselves obliged to abstain. My delegation is unable

to reconcile itself to this apparent double-faced hypocrisy and political gimmickry.

114. Draft resolution A/31/L.9 refers specifically to the relations between Israel and South Africa, giving the impression that Israel—and Israel only—trades with South Africa. If this resolution is to have any impact at all, then it should include every country in the world that has similar relations with South Africa. My delegation is aware, for instance, that some palaces and even vaults of central banks of those countries which maintain similar if not greater trade relations with South Africa than Israel are as pregnant with South African gold as South Africa itself is contaminated by the policies of *apartheid*. My delegation is also aware that some of the arms we are talking about here have found their way to South Africa through those countries which these resolutions have not named.

115. With reference to the call for the invocation of Chapter VII of the Charter against South Africa, my delegation would take the liberty of reminding representatives assembled here of my Government's honest and forthright confession, made by my Head of State and Government at the OAU Cairo summit conference in 1964,⁵ of Malawi's inability to participate in such boycotts because, as a land-locked and geographically disadvantaged country, it could not withstand any extraneous economic pressures. Those representatives who are aware of Malawi's position in central and southern Africa do understand and appreciate this. But as to my Government's commitment to the principles of self-rule and the independence of colonial peoples, I make bold to suggest that Malawi strongly believes in positive action, and not mere rhetoric.

116. My delegation is unable to resolve, within the given time, the confusion that appears to have developed as a result of the branding, on one resolution, of the present South African Government as illegal. Although last year's General Assembly resolution does in fact label that Government as illegal [*resolution 3411 G (XXX)*], the decision during the past few weeks by the Fifth Committee to question the reduction of South Africa's contribution to the United Nations, based on the new scale of assessments recommended by the Committee on Contributions [*see A/31/11, chap. V*], seems to negate the spirit and letter of that resolution. Therefore, it is the considered view of my delegation that any contribution made to the United Nations by the present South African Government might immediately have the effect of legitimizing that Government, in that it would be contrary to the resolution which deprived it of its legitimacy by United Nations standards.

117. My delegation has also been forced to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution that in effect seeks to reconfirm last year's General Assembly resolution that stripped the South African Government of any legitimacy until the views of the African Heads of State and Government have been made known. The information received from the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU, held in Port Louis, Mauritius, in July, indicate that this matter is currently under study.

⁵ First session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held at Cairo from 17 to 21 July 1964.

118. However, my delegation does recognize the view that the present South African Government cannot claim to represent the majority of the people of South Africa. It is for this reason that my Government has not subscribed, nor does it, nor will it ever, subscribe to the “policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa”.

119. Mr. KANAZAWA (Japan): My delegation's position was made clear in the statement which Ambassador Abe delivered on 2 November in the general debate on the present item of the agenda [51st meeting]. Here I should like to place on record the following clarification of my delegation's votes on the draft resolutions on *apartheid*.

120. First, concerning draft resolution A/31/L.13 on the situation in South Africa, my delegation abstained in the vote because we could not accept the following paragraphs: the sixth preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 10.

121. Secondly, with regard to draft resolution A/31/L.12 on economic collaboration with South Africa, my delegation abstained in the vote because we found difficulty in accepting some paragraphs. However, my Government will continue its policy measures to discourage economic relations with South Africa, some of which Ambassador Abe mentioned in his statement on 2 November.

122. Thirdly, my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/31/L.8 concerning the arms embargo against South Africa because of some doubts on the appropriateness of the proposed action. However, as Ambassador Abe stated during the general debate on the present item, my Government will continue to enforce strictly the arms embargo against South Africa.

123. Lastly, my delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/31/L.7 concerning solidarity with South African political prisoners, and voted in favour of draft resolutions A/31/L.10/Rev.1 concerning *apartheid* in sports and A/31/L.11 concerning the programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, although my delegation finds difficulty in accepting some of the wording of those resolutions.

124. Mr. SAYAR (Iran) (*interpretation from French*): Whenever the occasion has arisen, my delegation has consistently voiced its profound disapproval of any régime based on racism and racial discrimination and its total rejection of all forms of colonialism.

125. We share the indignation of the international community over the odious system of *apartheid* and wish to co-operate to the extent of our possibilities towards its elimination.

126. This position, known to all, is in keeping with the age-old traditions of Iran, which has always practised tolerance and fought all forms of inequality based on race, colour or creed.

127. During the general debate on this agenda item [52nd meeting], the head of the Iranian delegation specifically set forth in six points our approach to the various aspects of the problem of *apartheid*. Consequently, it is in the light of

that explanation that my delegation has examined the draft resolutions on which we have just voted.

128. This is why, moreover, we voted in favour of the three draft resolutions A/31/L.10/Rev.1, A/31/L.11 and A/31/L.15.

129. As for the other draft resolutions, A/31/L.8, A/31/L.9, A/31/L.12, A/31/L.13 and A/31/L.14, we abstained in the voting because, aside from a verbal escalation in tone, it seemed to us doubtful, for technical reasons, that parts of the content of those draft resolutions would be practicable, and in our view this could not fail to lessen their scope and effectiveness.

130. Furthermore, my delegation believes that certain questions to which those draft resolutions refer fall within the purview of the Security Council.

131. Rev. Robert P. HUPP (United States of America): The United States was pleased to participate in the adoption without objection of draft resolutions A/31/L.6, on the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, and A/31/L.7, concerning solidarity with South African political prisoners.

132. We voted against draft resolution A/31/L.8 concerning the arms embargo against South Africa. We did so because we are not convinced that the invocation of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations against South Africa for its *apartheid* policies is appropriate at this time. We object strongly to those paragraphs which allege that the United States is sending weapons to South Africa. As the General Assembly well knows, the United States has continued to impose its own arms embargo against South Africa since 1962 and has urged other nations to impose voluntarily an embargo concerning military equipment.

133. Recently it was discovered that a United States company had illegally shipped arms to South Africa. The shipment was made as a result of misrepresentation by a company employee. That employee was subsequently prosecuted, convicted and sent to gaol. Let me make this clear so that no doubt remains as to the strength of our commitment: we have gaolled an American citizen for facilitating an arms shipment to South Africa. The United States Department of Justice is continuing to investigate reports of illegal arms sales to South Africa involving American arms manufacturers.

134. The United States voted against draft resolution A/31/L.9, concerning relations between Israel and South Africa. We disagree with the decision to single out Israel for criticism of its relations with South Africa. While we do not condone Israel's military trade with South Africa, we are aware that other nations also are involved in such trade. The report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* [A/31/22/Add.2] and this unbalanced draft resolution stem from anti-Israel political motives rather than from any decision to investigate impartially those countries which are trading in military *matériel* with South Africa.

135. The United States abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/31/L.10/Rev.1, concerning *apartheid* in sports. The United States Government supports the Olympic principle that no discrimination should be allowed

in sporting events on the grounds of race, religion or political affiliation. We urge United States sports teams to respect the principle and to compete against teams that are selected on the principle of the Olympic ideal.

136. Because United States sports teams are organized privately and have no official sponsorship or regulation, we are not able to support several of the recommendations contained in that draft resolution. Those recommendations would have the United States Government intervene in the affairs of private sports organizations, which it lawfully cannot do. The results of this resolution could, in fact, prove contrary to its sponsors' intentions, and instead of breaking down *apartheid*, could assist in consolidating it.

137. This is borne out by the experience of the last four years, when open international competition has resulted in some breaking down of barriers in South Africa. For instance, Arthur Ashe broke the colour barrier in the South African Open. He encouraged the South African tennis authorities to desegregate the audience for the Open. Black tennis players were also permitted to participate in other major tennis tournaments in the country.

138. The United States abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/31/L.11, concerning the programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, for reasons which we have elaborated on elsewhere in this statement.

139. The United States has voted against draft resolution A/31/L.12, concerning economic collaboration with South Africa. In our view, the decision to impose a type of economic sanctions against South Africa is a decision of the utmost seriousness and can and should be taken only by the Security Council. Moreover, we believe that the facts do not warrant such a decision. We cannot accept the thesis of this resolution that economic relations with South Africa work to the disadvantage of the population or necessarily result in its exploitation. On the contrary, some United States corporations have been among the leading forces for equal rights and enlightened employment practices in South Africa. It is too simplistic to condemn in blanket fashion economic relations with South Africa.

140. The United States voted against draft resolution A/31/L.13, concerning the situation in South Africa. We cannot agree with a number of paragraphs in the resolution. Specifically, we do not believe that the situation in South Africa, however abhorrent the policies of the South African Government may be, constitutes a threat to international peace and security. It is also clear that this lengthy resolution is tantamount to a call for an uprising in South Africa that would, in effect, result in a racial blood-bath. My Government cannot subscribe to the thesis that this is the best or only way to work for peace in South Africa.

141. The United States voted against draft resolution A/31/L.14, concerning a programme of action against *apartheid*. The United States Government is not prepared to support a comprehensive régime of sanctions against South Africa which this and other draft resolutions have called for, or to provide assistance for a violent uprising in South Africa. We also have serious reservations on the financial implications of the programme of action and the drawing of United Nations specialized agencies into this

clearly political campaign. The United States has already discussed its position towards South Africa as set forth by its Secretary of State, Mr. Kissinger, in Philadelphia on 31 August. We continue to believe that, although time is running out, the opportunity still exists for South Africa to move away from the *apartheid* system peacefully and to create a just society with freedom for all South Africans.

142. Mr. TEMPLETON (New Zealand): In view of New Zealand's strong opposition to the policy of *apartheid*, my delegation would have much preferred to support all the draft resolutions submitted for consideration by the General Assembly on this occasion. We were glad in fact to be able to support the resolution on the Transkei adopted on 26 October [resolution 31/6 A], to join in sponsoring the draft resolution on the Trust Fund for South Africa [A/31/L.6] and to support the draft resolutions on solidarity with South African political prisoners [A/31/L.7], on the work programme of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* [A/31/L.11] and on investment in South Africa [A/31/L.15]. I am sorry to say that on several draft resolutions we had difficulties with various paragraphs which were of sufficient weight to oblige us to abstain in the voting.

143. We particularly regret that we were unable to support the draft resolution on the arms embargo [A/31/L.8]. New Zealand joined in sponsoring a more moderate text on this question in 1974⁶ and does, of course, itself continue to apply an embargo on the supply of arms to South Africa. Unfortunately, the draft resolution this year, in the absence of evidence, charges a number of States by name with violating the arms embargo and, in doing so, disregards statements by representatives of those countries here and in the Security Council setting out their individual policies on the supply of arms to South Africa.

144. In the case of draft resolution A/31/L.9, which deals with relations between Israel and South Africa, the draft is unbalanced and singles out one State in an unjustified manner. On that text, we felt compelled to cast a negative vote.

145. On the question of sports contacts, the subject of draft resolution A/31/L.10/Rev.1, New Zealand's policy was recently set out by the New Zealand Minister of State in a statement issued jointly with the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* as follows:

"Sport in New Zealand is, as the Special Committee has recognized, completely multiracial. Sports bodies in New Zealand are autonomous organizations wholly free from Government control and do not depend on Government for financial support. It is the Government's policy not to interfere in their affairs. The Government does not therefore seek to dictate to New Zealand sports bodies what teams they should or should not play against. It does, however, deplore the selection of any team, in any country, on a basis other than merit.

"It notes the concern expressed by the Special Committee about contacts with South African teams selected

⁶ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 37, document A/9931, paras. 14 and 15.

on a racial basis and will draw the attention of New Zealand sports bodies to the relevant United Nations resolutions. The Government does not welcome, encourage, or give official recognition to sports contacts with teams selected on a basis other than merit."

I regret that, in the light of New Zealand's consistent policy of refraining from restrictions on travel, my delegation is unable to accept the recommendations in subparagraphs 5 (c) and (d) of the draft resolution.

146. Although New Zealand does not have significant trade with or investment in South Africa, it is our view that the imposition of sanctions is a matter for decision by the Security Council, and we were therefore obliged to abstain in the vote on draft resolutions A/31/L.12 and A/31/L.14; however, we were able to support the more moderate draft resolution A/31/L.15.

147. Finally, as I indicated in my statement on 2 November [51st meeting], New Zealand does not consider that there is no alternative to armed struggle as the means of achieving the legitimate rights of the disenfranchised majority in South Africa. For this reason and because of the extreme language of draft resolution A/31/L.13, we abstained in the vote on that draft.

148. Mr. KENNEDY (Ireland): I should like to associate my delegation with the statement before the vote made this morning by the representative of the Netherlands, who spoke on behalf of the nine countries of the European Communities on the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa.

149. Speaking now on behalf of Ireland, may I mention that I have already indicated our Government's policy in my statement in the Assembly on 1 November [50th meeting]? I should like to emphasize in this connexion that Ireland has consistently supported the voluntary arms embargo against South Africa, which it has strictly observed.

150. As indicated in my previous statement in this Assembly, the recent actions of the South African Government in using force on an increasing scale to suppress the protests to which the *apartheid* system inevitably gives rise clearly illustrate the need for this embargo. There is an increased danger of a conflict which may extend beyond the boundaries of South Africa. Those who have in the past advocated maintaining contact in order to press for change must now recognize, in our view, the need for concerted international pressure to impress on the South African Government that this change can no longer be delayed. Unless the South African Government changes those policies which may threaten international peace and security in relation to Namibia and in South Africa itself, the case for concerted and binding action by the international community in relation to the supply of arms of any kind may well come to seem a compelling one.

151. For those reasons, my delegation supports the general objectives of draft resolution A/31/L.8 on the arms embargo against South Africa, but we felt constrained to abstain in the vote on it because some of the formulations have been drafted without due regard to the specific policies announced by certain countries in this connexion.

152. My delegation has consistently condemned *apartheid* in sports as long as the Government of South Africa continues to refuse permission for teams of mixed racial background to participate in sports in defiance of the Olympic principle of non-discrimination in sports. The Irish Government has publicly opposed participation by Irish sportsmen in events organized in violation of the Olympic principle and will continue to oppose such participation.

153. For those reasons, my delegation voted for draft resolution A/31/L.10/Rev.1, on *apartheid* in sports, despite reservations on our part about the need for an international convention against *apartheid* in sports to promote adherence to the Olympic principle. Furthermore, the Irish Government would have difficulty in applying all the recommendations in operative paragraph 5 because of domestic legal arrangements. I explained our domestic situation in this regard in greater detail in my general statement on *apartheid* to this Assembly on 1 November.

154. The Irish delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolutions A/31/L.12 on economic collaboration with South Africa, and on A/31/L.14, on the programme of action against *apartheid*, because, notwithstanding our positive commitment to the struggle against *apartheid*, several of the steps recommended to Governments are such that certain countries, including my own, would find it difficult to apply unilaterally.

155. We have voted against draft resolution A/31/L.13, on the situation in South Africa, because it calls in doubt the legitimacy of the Government of South Africa and because it uses language implying the seizure of power there by means not sanctioned by the Charter of the United Nations. That draft resolution and draft resolution A/31/L.9, on relations between Israel and South Africa, which we also opposed, single out certain countries in a manner which we find quite unacceptable.

156. We would reaffirm that, as the legislative measures to give effect to *apartheid* were introduced in South Africa through the legislative process, the best way to remove *apartheid* would likewise be through a process of peaceful change involving all the people of South Africa.

157. I would repeat, in this connexion, the hope of the nine countries of the European Communities, as expressed by the representative of the Netherlands this morning. We hope, in pleading for peaceful change, that the policy of *apartheid* may finally be brought to an end without violence, because violence, in our opinion, is not an acceptable method either of achieving change in South Africa or of maintaining the unacceptable *status quo*.

158. Mr. KAUFMANN (Netherlands): Speaking now as representative of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, I wish to explain the vote of my delegation on draft resolution A/31/L.8, on the arms embargo against South Africa, and on draft resolutions A/31/L.12 and A/31/L.15, dealing with economic measures against South Africa.

159. The negative vote of the Netherlands delegation on the arms embargo draft resolution was prompted by the entirely unwarranted allegations contained in the fourth and sixth paragraphs of the preamble. It is unacceptable to

my Government that some Member States are summarily labelled allies of a racist régime and several of them are accused by name of being accomplices in the oppression in South Africa. My Government wishes to reject those vicious allegations. If those paragraphs had not unwisely been included, my delegation would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/31/L.8. My delegation very much regrets that it was denied the opportunity of having the true position of the Netherlands on this issue reflected in the Assembly's vote.

160. With respect to the idea itself of a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa, the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands recently stated in Parliament that he was in favour of a decision of the Security Council to that effect. On sanctions in the economic field, Minister van der Stoep said on the same occasion that, in view of the rapid deterioration of the situation in South Africa, such measures would in principle be justified if the South African

Government remained unwilling to change its policies at an early date.

161. To express this view, my delegation did not vote against draft resolution A/31/L.12, but abstained in the vote, notwithstanding the serious objections on our part. While not opposing the draft resolution, my delegation takes exception to its implacable and unrealistic language and to the ill-considered recommendations which it contains. In the view of the Netherlands Government, effective measures can be decided upon only by the Security Council acting under the powers entrusted to that body under the Charter.

162. This explains, furthermore, why my delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/31/L.15, which quite rightly points in that direction.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.