

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



**102nd
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 14 December 1977,
at 4 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 100: Proposed programme budget for the biennium 1978-1979 (continued) Report of the Fifth Committee	
Agenda item 101: Financial emergency of the United Nations: report of the Negotiating Committee on the Financial Emergency of the United Nations Report of the Fifth Committee	
Agenda item 102: Review of the intergovernmental and expert machinery dealing with the formulation, review and approval of programmes and budgets Report of the Fifth Committee	1657
Agenda item 107: Appointments to fill vacancies in the membership of subsidiary organs of the General Assembly (continued): (b) Committee on Contributions Report of the Fifth Committee	
(d) Investments Committee: confirmation of the appoint- ments made by the Secretary-General Report of the Fifth Committee	
Agenda item 104: Joint Inspection Unit: (b) Appointment of the members of the Joint Inspection Unit	1659
Agenda item 24: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (con- cluded): (a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples; (b) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia; (c) Report of the Secretary-General	1660
Agenda item 27: Policies of <i>apartheid</i> of the Government of South Africa (continued): (a) Reports of the Special Committee against <i>Apartheid</i> ; (b) Report of the World Conference for Action against <i>Apartheid</i> ; (c) Report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against <i>Apartheid</i> in Sports; (d) Report of the Secretary-General	1660

President: Mr. Lažar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).

AGENDA ITEM 100

**Proposed programme budget for the biennium 1978-1979
(continued)***

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/32/454)

* Resumed from the 90th meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 101

**Financial emergency of the United Nations: report of the
Negotiating Committee on the Financial Emergency of
the United Nations**

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/32/435)

AGENDA ITEM 102

**Review of the intergovernmental and expert machinery
dealing with the formulation, review and approval of
programmes and budgets**

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/32/390)

AGENDA ITEM 107

**Appointments to fill vacancies in the membership of
subsidiary organs of the General Assembly (con-
tinued):****

(b) Committee on Contributions

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/32/292)

**(d) Investments Committee: confirmation of the appoint-
ments made by the Secretary-General**

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/32/294)

1. Mr. BELYAEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Re-
public), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee (*interpretation
from Russian*): I have the honour to submit for considera-
tion and adoption by the General Assembly five reports of
the Fifth Committee.

2. Under item 100 of the agenda, the report of the Fifth
Committee on the enlargement of the Advisory Committee
on Administrative and Budgetary Questions is contained in
document A/32/454. In paragraph 9 of this report, the
Fifth Committee recommends to the General Assembly the
adoption of a draft resolution increasing the number of
members of the Advisory Committee from 13 to 16 and
introducing amendments to rules 155, 156 and 157 of the
rules of procedure of the General Assembly. This draft
resolution was adopted in the Fifth Committee without
objection.

3. Under item 101 of the agenda, the report of the Fifth
Committee is contained in document A/32/435. In para-
graph 8 of the report, the Fifth Committee recommends to
the General Assembly the adoption of a draft resolution on

** Resumed from the 66th meeting.

this agenda item which was adopted in Committee by consensus.

4. Under item 102 of the agenda, the report of the Fifth Committee is contained in document A/32/390. In paragraph 2 of the report, it is pointed out that at its 47th meeting, on 22 November, the Fifth Committee decided, without objection, to postpone its consideration of this item to the thirty-third session of the General Assembly. In paragraph 3 of the report, the Fifth Committee recommends that the General Assembly decide to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-third session the item entitled "Review of the intergovernmental and expert machinery dealing with the formulation, review and approval of programmes and budgets".

5. Under item 107 (b) of the agenda, the report of the Fifth Committee on nominations to the Committee on Contributions, is contained in document A/32/292. The Committee recommends the appointment of six candidates—Mr. Abdel Hamid Abdel-Ghani, Mr. Leoncio Fernández Maroto, Mr. Carlos Moreira Garcia, Mr. Japhet G. Kiti, Mr. Angus J. Matheson and Mr. Atilio Norberto Molteni—as members of the Committee on Contributions for a three-year period beginning on 1 January 1978. These candidates were elected in the Committee by a secret ballot.

6. Under item 107 (d) of the agenda, the report of the Fifth Committee on confirmation of appointments to the Investments Committee is contained in document A/32/294. In paragraph 3 of this report, the Fifth Committee recommends that the General Assembly should confirm the appointment by the Secretary-General of the following persons as members of the Investments Committee for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1978: Mr. Hamza Mirghani, Mr. David Montagu and Mr. Yves Oltramare. This recommendation was adopted in the Committee without objection.

7. I should like to express the hope that the reports of the Fifth Committee that I have just introduced and the recommendations contained therein will be adopted by the General Assembly.

Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Fifth Committee.

8. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will consider first the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 100 [A/32/454]. The General Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Fifth Committee in paragraph 9 of its report. The draft resolution is entitled "Enlargement of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: amendments to rules 155, 156 and 157 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly". The Fifth Committee adopted this draft resolution without objection. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 32/103).

9. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Sweden, who wished to explain his position after that decision had been taken.

10. Mr. AMNÉUS (Sweden): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the delegations of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden. The Nordic countries welcome the decision just taken with respect to the enlargement of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. An increased number of seats for experts in administrative and budgetary matters from developing countries is well justified. We are confident that the experts to be appointed will make a constructive contribution to the work of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee and to the work of the United Nations in general. The Nordic countries thus support the enlargement of the Advisory Committee in favour of representatives from developing countries. At the same time, we envisage representation on the Advisory Committee of experts also from smaller developed nations, such as the Nordic countries, in the future.

11. The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 101 [A/32/435]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Fifth Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. The draft resolution is entitled "Financial emergency of the United Nations". The Fifth Committee adopted that draft resolution by consensus. May I take it that the General Assembly adopts that draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 32/104).

12. The PRESIDENT: The next report of the Fifth Committee is on agenda item 102 [A/32/390]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the recommendation contained in paragraph 3 of its report, document A/32/390, to the effect that the item entitled "Review of the intergovernmental and expert machinery dealing with the formulation, review and approval of programmes and budgets" should be included in the provisional agenda of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly. The Fifth Committee adopted that recommendation without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

The recommendation was adopted (decision 32/426).

13. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now consider the reports of the Fifth Committee on subitems (b) and (d) of agenda item 107 entitled "Appointments to fill vacancies in the membership of subsidiary organs of the General Assembly".

14. The first report under agenda item 107 deals with vacancies in the Committee on Contributions. In paragraph 5 of its report, document A/32/292, the Fifth Committee recommends that the General Assembly should appoint the following persons as members of the Committee on Contributions for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1978: Mr. Abdel Hamid Abdel-Ghani, Mr. Leoncio Fernández Maroto, Mr. Carlos Moreira Garcia, Mr. Japhet G. Kiti, Mr. Angus J. Matheson, Mr. Atilio Norberto Molteni. May I take it that the General Assembly adopts that recommendation?

The recommendation was adopted (decision 32/315).

15. The PRESIDENT: We come now to the report dealing with vacancies in the Investments Committee [A/32/294].

In paragraph 3 of its report the Fifth Committee recommends that the General Assembly should confirm the appointment by the Secretary-General of the following persons as members of the Investments Committee for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1978: Mr. Hamza Mirghani, Mr. David Montagu and Mr. Yves Oltramare. May I consider that the General Assembly adopts that recommendation?

The recommendation was adopted (decision 32/316).

16. The PRESIDENT: Before representatives of the Fifth Committee leave the hall I have a special appeal to address to them. Of course, I am keenly aware of the tremendous workload carried by that Committee and the dedication with which it has approached its responsibilities. We are now, however, approaching the end of the session. I attach great importance to the conclusion of our work on 20 December, as agreed upon by the General Assembly. Many representatives have long distances to travel and have made reservations during this very heavy travel period which it is important for them to keep. It is clear to me, having examined the remaining agenda items, most particularly those having financial implications, that an intensive schedule of work over the coming weekend will be required. Therefore I address a special appeal, particularly to the members of the Fifth Committee, to exert this Saturday and Sunday that last measure of effort which will be required if the Assembly is to be enabled to conclude the remaining work by Tuesday, 20 December 1977.

AGENDA ITEM 104

Joint Inspection Unit:

(b) Appointment of the members of the Joint Inspection Unit

17. The PRESIDENT: As representatives are aware, the General Assembly by its resolution 31/192 of 22 December 1976 decided that the Joint Inspection Unit would consist of not more than 11 inspectors and that, starting from the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, the President of the Assembly would consult with Member States to draw up, with due regard to the principle of equitable geographical distribution and of reasonable rotation, a list of countries which would be requested to propose candidates.

18. The Assembly decided also that the President of the General Assembly, through appropriate consultations, including consultations with the President of the Economic and Social Council and with the Chairman of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, would review the qualifications of the proposed candidates. After further consultations—if necessary, with the States concerned—the President would submit the list of candidates to the Assembly for appointment.

19. I held the necessary consultations with the Chairmen of the regional groups and was able to announce in my note dated 14 November 1977 [A/32/345] the distribution of seats as well as the list of Member States which had been requested to propose candidates. In this connexion I invite

the attention of representatives to paragraphs 2 and 3 of my note.

20. Since the issuance of the note dated 14 November, I have held further consultations, including consultations with the President of the Economic and Social Council and with the Secretary-General of the United Nations in his capacity as Chairman of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, and I am now in a position to submit the list of candidates to the Assembly for appointment.

21. As indicated in paragraph 2 of document A/32/345/Add.1, the list of candidates is as follows:

Mr. Mark Allen (*United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland*),

Mr. Isaac Newton Kofi Afiase (*Ghana*).

Mr. Maurice Bertrand (*France*),

Mr. Alexander Sergeevich Bryntsev (*Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*),

Mr. Alfred Nathaniel Forde (*Barbados*),

Mr. Sreten Ilić (*Yugoslavia*),

Mr. Sharif Padmadisastra (*Indonesia*),

Mr. Julio C. Rodríguez Arias (*Argentina*),

Mr. Joseph Adolph Sawe (*United Republic of Tanzania*),

Mr. Zakaria Sibahi (*Syrian Arab Republic*),

Mr. Earl D. Sohm (*United States of America*).

May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to appoint those candidates?

It was so decided (decision 32/317).

22. The PRESIDENT: Under article 4 of the statute of the Joint Inspection Unit, the duration of the appointments of the inspectors shall be five years, renewable for one further term. In order to ensure continuity in the membership of the Unit, six of the Inspectors appointed from 1 January 1978 shall serve for a full term; the terms of the others shall expire at the end of three years.

23. Regarding the procedure for choosing the six inspectors to serve for a full term, I should like to inform members that the procedure of drawing by lot has been used in respect of other bodies of the United Nations when a similar choice has had to be made.

24. I therefore propose that I draw lots to determine the names of the six inspectors who will serve for a full term.

It was so decided.

25. The PRESIDENT: This is the result of the drawing of lots. The following six inspectors of the Joint Inspection Unit will serve for a full term of five years: Mr. Zakaria Sibahi, Mr. Sharif Padmadisastra, Mr. Alexander Sergeevich Bryntsev, Mr. Joseph Adolph Sawe, Mr. Julio C. Rodríguez Arias and Mr. Mark Allen.

26. Therefore, the terms of office of the following inspectors will expire at the end of three years: Mr. Alfred Nathaniel Forde, Mr. Earl D. Sohm, Mr. Maurice Bertrand, Mr. Isaac Newton Kofi Afiase and Mr. Sreten Ilić.

27. I wish to congratulate the persons who have been appointed members of the Joint Inspection Unit.

AGENDA ITEM 24

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

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

28. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Benin, who wishes to make a statement on agenda item 24.

29. Mr. HOUNGAVOU (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): I am speaking on behalf of Mauritius, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and my own country, Benin, with regard to draft resolution A/32/L.41, which was introduced by these three countries under agenda item 24. Draft resolution A/32/L.41, entitled "Consequences of the admission of Namibia as a member nation of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations", was introduced on 6 December 1977 by the three sponsors I have just mentioned.

30. In view of certain difficulties encountered by the Secretariat in drawing the proper conclusion in the light of current practices regarding this type of question, the three sponsors decided, in the light of information obtained, to request the General Assembly, under agenda item 24, to take an appropriate decision concerning the inclusion of the name of Namibia on the Secretariat list containing the names of all States. Last Friday the three sponsors were informed by the Secretariat that the offices concerned no longer had any difficulty in implementing the decision of FAO and that the necessary steps had been taken to include Namibia on the Secretariat list containing the names of all States.

31. Since the goal sought by the three sponsors has been achieved, the decision of FAO having been implemented, the sponsors no longer insist that the draft resolution in document A/32/L.41 be put to the vote.

32. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Benin, on behalf of Mauritius, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Benin, the sponsors of draft resolution A/32/L.41 submitted to the General Assembly on 6 December, has just stated that they do not insist on a vote. Accordingly, draft resolution A/32/L.41 will not be put to a vote.

AGENDA ITEM 27

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

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

* Resumed from the 96th meeting.

** Resumed from the 76th meeting.

33. The PRESIDENT: Members will recall that the General Assembly concluded the debate on this item at its 76th plenary meeting, on 21 November 1977. It now has before it the following draft resolutions: A/32/L.20 and Add.1, A/32/L.21/Rev.1 and Add.1, A/32/L.22/Rev.2 and Add.1, A/32/L.23 to A/32/L.33, each of which has one addendum and A/32/L.34/Rev.1, as well as a report by the Special Political Committee [A/32/347] and one by the Fifth Committee [A/32/455].

34. Before calling on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting, I shall call on the representative of Nigeria, who wishes to make an explanatory statement.

35. Mr. HARRIMAN (Nigeria): I have asked to speak in order to introduce two minor technical amendments to draft resolutions now before the Assembly on the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa.

36. The first amendment is in connexion with draft resolution A/32/L.24. In the first preambular paragraph, which begins with the words "Gravely concerned over the continuing repression . . .", the words "and killings" are to be added after the word "torture", so that the paragraph will read:

"Gravely concerned over the continuing repression in South Africa, including the killings of peaceful demonstrators and innocent schoolchildren, mass arrests and bannings, and trials under arbitrary repressive laws, as well as ill-treatment, torture and killings of political detainees".

37. The second amendment, which is of a technical nature, is in connexion with the draft resolution on Bantustans in document A/32/L.33. In operative paragraph 2, the words "scheduled for 6 December 1977" should be deleted. The reason is obvious: the declaration of the so-called "independence" of Bophuthatswana has already occurred.

38. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the sponsors, the representative of Nigeria has just introduced very small, almost technical oral amendments to draft resolutions A/32/L.24 and A/32/L.33. Because of the marginal significance of these changes, I am sure that the General Assembly will take them into account without having revised versions of the two draft resolutions distributed.

39. I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their votes before the vote.

40. Mr. HERZOG (Israel): Three weeks ago during the debate on the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa I stated at length the position of the Government of Israel with regard to racism and *apartheid* [72nd meeting]. That, after all, was the subject of the debate, and I referred representatives to the verbatim records of that meeting for a clear, detailed and unambiguous statement of Israel's policy. In that statement, I pointed out that we are the people who have brought to the world in our Bible the concept that God created man in his own image.

41. That statement notwithstanding, we are asked to vote today on a malicious and irrelevant draft resolution in document A/32/L.23 and Add.1, designed to abort the expression of the universal consensus on *apartheid* that exists in this hall. The concoction of lies and innuendoes contained both in the draft resolution and in the special report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* [A/32/22/Add.3-S/12363/Add.3], on which the draft resolution is based, serve no purpose other than to assuage the consciences of the many States represented here which maintain close relations with South Africa.

42. By singling out Israel for special condemnation, and thereby diverting attention from the massive quantities of foreign trade, investment, tourism, gold purchases and oil supplies flowing to and from South Africa, the Special Committee has betrayed its mandate, sabotaged international efforts to combat *apartheid* and slighted both the General Assembly and the African world.

43. In the light of the recent widespread publication in all the media of details concerning South Africa's international trade, how utterly incomprehensible appears the complete and total failure of the Special Committee to make a full disclosure of all these facts, which are after all available for everybody to read.

44. This body is by now accustomed to the universal use of norms of hypocrisy which are simply unbelievable. But it seems to me that this time the Special Committee has surpassed itself. In the last two months a wealth of material and information, both military and civilian, has been published about the trade of South Africa with many of the countries of the world. Yet, not one word of these revelations has been brought to the attention of this body by the Special Committee against *Apartheid*.

45. It seems to me, in the light of the inordinate waste of money which characterizes the work of the Special Committee, that this Assembly should demand an explanation. Failing that, it should draw the necessary conclusions from what is either the ineffectiveness or the cynical behaviour of this Committee. If the Committee is unaware of the scope of trade between many countries represented here and South Africa after all the material that has been published, then all I can say is that it is the most ineffective, inefficient and wasteful Committee that this Assembly has known. Its members deserve to be censured for such inefficiency and their services should be dispensed with. They are guilty of a disgraceful waste of public money.

46. If, on the other hand, they are aware of all this information, which they have not published, and are guilty of deliberately endeavouring to divert attention from the major trading partners of South Africa by concentrating on Israel, then they are guilty of a cynical cover-up in order to divert attention from the main issue. In these circumstances, this Assembly will be failing in its duty if it will not institute an inquiry into the work of this Committee and if it will not probe deeply in order to discover in the interests of what powerful forces or groupings this Committee is working in this cover-up.

47. For one thing is quite clear. This Committee, by trying to divert attention from the true facts of the case by means of a single, specific resolution singling out Israel of all the countries in the world, is not a Committee against *apartheid* but a Committee acting in the interests of *apartheid*. In short, this Committee is guilty either of the most utter incompetence or of a cynical, flagrant cover-up.

48. When I am annually obliged to reveal the facts and statistics that the Special Committee has consciously ignored and to correct the distortion perpetrated by the Special Committee, I am reminded of Adlai Stevenson's warning, "You will find that the truth is often unpopular and the contest between agreeable fancy and disagreeable fact is unequal".

49. I have no illusion therefore that the Assembly will abandon its long-avowed preference for agreeable fancy. For the record, however, I cannot help but draw attention to a number of significant reports that have been published since the debate on *apartheid* began. Thus, by refusing to investigate the intricate and covert arrangements by which Arab oil is exchanged for South African gold, the Special Committee against *Apartheid* continues in effect to sanction these arrangements. Just a few days ago, on 4 December, *The New York Times* published detailed statistics on investments, sales, assets, loans and credits of major foreign corporations in South Africa. Israel's total investment in South Africa is an infinitesimal percentage of that of any one of the companies listed in that survey.

50. Since the same statistics that were available to *The New York Times* were available to the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, we must assume that they have been deliberately withheld from this Assembly. Israel's relations with South Africa are alleged, in draft resolution A/32/L.23, to constitute "a hostile act against... the entire African continent".

51. I cannot help but refer the representatives to an article published but a few days ago in the *Wall Street Journal* on 9 December. It is a very detailed article describing the economic links between much of the continent of Africa and South Africa. We are informed in that article that the South African Trade Organization estimates that South Africa's dealings with the rest of Africa total a billion dollars in exports and half a billion dollars in imports annually. Indeed, I would draw the attention of the Chairman of the Committee to the statement by Professor Piet Nieuwenhuizen, Chairman of the Department of Economics at Rand Afrikaans University in Johannesburg, in which he describes the clandestine trade between Africa and his own country. Indeed, trade with South Africa is so extensive that it includes "almost every country on the continent". Professor Piet Nieuwenhuizen says:

"I walked into an automobile component manufacturing company's dispatch warehouse and the managing director showed me about 100 wooden boxes ready for dispatch to 64 different countries. There was hardly a country in Africa whose name was not included on that list."

52. That article emphasizes that South Africa's trade extends beyond the continent to socialist bloc countries

that would like to keep such business connexions a secret. The representatives of the Byelorussian SSR and the Ukrainian SSR who have chosen to sponsor this draft resolution will be interested to learn that, according to the *Wall Street Journal* article:

"They seem to do their own shenanigans through Amsterdam and Antwerp, but what they do we don't know and don't care. I don't know what certificates they go out with or come back with; the business is growing."

And this, after the revelations which we read in reports from South Africa and which we saw with our own eyes on a special programme on the subject broadcast by the Columbia Broadcasting System network but a few weeks ago which showed that 50 per cent of certain types of the small arms supplied to South Africa are supplied by the Communist countries of Eastern Europe. On that programme we saw with our own eyes, only a few weeks ago, large numbers of crates of small arms with Russian markings and Russian instruction manuals being unloaded in South Africa and being opened up. And yet, Byelorussia and the Ukraine are sponsoring the condemnation of Israel in their time-honoured anti-Semitic tradition.

53. I can appreciate the reasons for their failure to condemn the trade of the countries of the Soviet bloc with South Africa. I have a feeling that for them to betray any indication of independent thought might prove to be somewhat embarrassing, if not the height of folly. But why be so foolhardy as to condemn Israel for what they are doing? Surely, even if there is no limit to their hypocrisy, at least self-interest and expediency should dictate a lower profile not only to the countries of the Soviet bloc, but also to the bulk of countries represented in this hall.

54. The article in the *Wall Street Journal* goes on to say that "as long as you don't embarrass the Governments concerned you can do anything you like from Rhodesia or South Africa. Sanctions are a farce".

55. I have to warn the Governments that have sponsored this draft resolution A/32/L.23 and Add.1 that by doing so they are laying themselves open to a very considerable measure of embarrassment. We have thoroughly researched the records of these countries on this issue. They are guilty of the most unbelievable degree of hypocrisy and discrimination, and we do not propose to be silent when we are attacked. Let us look at the facts. African trade with South Africa, which includes the trade of many of the countries which are sponsors of this draft resolution against Israel, amounts to \$1.5 billion annually or 16 per cent of South Africa's trade.

56. Israel's trade with South Africa is two fifths of 1 per cent of South Africa's trade; yet Israel is singled out for condemnation. The investment of Europe in South Africa is \$13.5 billion. The investment of Asia in South Africa is \$400 million. The investment of Africa in South Africa is \$550 million. Israel's investment in South Africa is one eighth of 1 per cent of the investment of Asia; yet Israel is to be condemned. Israel's investment in South Africa is one tenth of 1 per cent of the investment of Africa; yet Israel is to be condemned. Israel's investment in South Africa is a tiny percentage of that of any single medium American

corporation, let alone the large ones; yet Israel is to be condemned. Kuwait controls one of the largest mining corporations in southern Africa which operates extensively in South Africa and Rhodesia; yet Israel is to be condemned by a draft resolution of which Kuwait is a sponsor. One third of the global supply of gold this year was purchased from South Africa, according to the *Metal Bulletin*, in direct shipment by Arab countries. These are countries which have all joined in sponsorship of this draft resolution; yet Israel is to be condemned.

57. We have denied allegations about nuclear co-operation, in regard to which no evidence has been adduced. The South African source for nuclear facilities and fuel has been adequately publicized over the past few months. In no case has Israel ever been mentioned; yet Israel is to be condemned.

58. The absurdity of singling out Israel has reached new heights in the accusations levelled against us in the matter of arms supplies. We had understood this issue to have been resolved by the recent Security Council resolution declaring a mandatory arms embargo because, in formulating our policy after the adoption of Security Council resolution 418 (1977), we shall, as we informed the Secretary-General, act in accordance with that resolution. And yet, of all the countries in the world that have so far acceded to the call of the Security Council, Israel is to be singled out and to be condemned. Why? You know as well as I do, and the answer is an ugly one.

59. If ever there has been a case of ugly, undisguised discrimination, you have it here before you. What is happening is a disgrace to the United Nations. What is happening is yet another move in the destruction of the United Nations by its own Members. We are witness to the cowardice of countries which bow to an extreme Arab dictate in order to go along with an obviously false, lying, biased draft resolution, sponsored as it is by those who are most active in the trade with South Africa.

60. Unlike the sponsors of this draft resolution, we have never tried to deny our trade with South Africa. The figures are open for all to see. Israel, as a country which has been subjected to an international Arab boycott for the past 30 years, rejects in principle the concept of utilizing the economic boycott as a means of conducting international relations. Indeed, I venture to suggest that if the preservation of human rights were to be the criterion for international trade, the world would be in a sorry state economically, for there would be very little trade indeed. Furthermore, an economic boycott in the final analysis is counter-productive, as the representative of the United States, Mr. Andrew Young, was quoted as saying recently in the *Washington Post*. Boycotts are not the way to solve international problems. Rather, Israel's position is that change can best be effected through persuasion and constructive dialogue, in which trade and economic relations can play an important role. We have always maintained that relations with Governments which have different policies and ideologies in no way imply acquiescence in those ideologies. If they did, we would all find ourselves in an embarrassing and untenable position—all of us, without exception.

61. This debate is an international disgrace. It is unworthy of any serious organization. By their craven submission to the dictates of those intransigent elements in the Arab world which oppose the process of peace-making which is taking place today in the Middle East, the sponsors of this draft resolution have struck at the heart of the cause they are supposed to be espousing. They have actively sponsored the case for *apartheid*, because they have rendered the discussions here totally irrelevant by making them such a mockery. We shall not participate in this cynical exercise in international hypocrisy. Accordingly, because Israel has been singled out as the only country in the world for specific condemnation on its own in a special draft resolution, my delegation will not participate in any of the votes on this issue. Our position on *apartheid* has been clear and unequivocal. We do not need to be lectured by those in this Assembly who preach a great deal and practise very, very little, if at all.

62. I request that this non-participation be duly reflected in the record of the voting. However, in order to identify with our opposition to *apartheid*, we shall make one exception and vote for the draft resolution on International Anti-Apartheid Year, A/32/L.21/Rev.1. If there is a consensus, we shall support that consensus, but on all other draft resolutions we shall not participate in the vote and thereby we shall express our abhorrence, our condemnation and our disgust at the farcical level to which this discussion on *apartheid* has been debased, by allowing cynical hypocrisy and double standards to prevail.

63. Mr. MATANE (Papua New Guinea): My delegation did not make any statement when the debate on agenda item 27 was in progress, mainly for two main reasons. First, our Government's position has been made clear by my Prime Minister on 11 October of this year, when he said:

"Papua New Guinea condemns the situation in southern Africa, where the rights of the people are totally suppressed by small white minorities. Full pressure should be brought to bear on these minority régimes to ensure an equitable settlement in southern Africa. Papua New Guinea fully supports the present sanctions imposed upon South Africa and Rhodesia. However, we have serious reservations about their effectiveness, particularly when influential Members of this Organization do not play their part by enforcing them.

"My country recently banned trade with South Africa. Although trade between Papua New Guinea and South Africa was very small, we wish to play our part in enforcing the sanctions. We call upon other more influential Members of the United Nations to be totally honest in enforcing the agreed sanctions. We feel that the racist régime will continue to oppress the majority of the people of South Africa as long as Members of this Organization continue illegally to trade or associate with this racist régime." [28th meeting, paras. 18-19.]

64. Secondly, the majority of speakers have repeatedly said mostly the same things, most of which my delegation agrees with. We believe there is no need to repeat them.

65. My delegation has some reservations regarding draft resolutions A/32/L.23 and A/32/L.25, for obvious reasons.

However, we shall vote in favour of all the draft resolutions because of the principles they contain.

66. Mr. TEMPLETON (New Zealand): We approach the vote on the draft resolutions submitted under this item in the face of a new wave of repressive measures by the South African authorities designed to silence all internal criticism of the pernicious and evil system of *apartheid*. The arrest of black leaders, the banning of anti-*apartheid* organizations and the suppression of black newspapers in October last are clearly acts of desperation, for the system of *apartheid*—founded, as it is, on racial discrimination, economic exploitation and the withholding from the majority of South Africans of their basic human rights—is doomed.

67. In commenting recently on the world-wide rejection of the verdict in the inquest on the death of Steven Biko, the New Zealand Minister of Foreign Affairs said that there could be no clearer demonstration of the tragic blindness of South Africa's leaders. It was not surprising, he said, that the world should take a verdict so totally at variance with the evidence as a gesture of defiance. New Zealand could only express its sorrow that South Africa had taken one more step towards the maelstrom of racial violence.

68. In this situation of growing repression the international community should seek to consolidate the consensus achieved at the World Conference for Action against *Apartheid* in Lagos and to demonstrate through increased pressure on the South African Government that it will not tolerate the continuing affront to the dignity and humanity of mankind that the *apartheid* system represents. But in the opinion of my Government it should direct this pressure to persuading the South African Government that in the interests of all the people of South Africa constitutional change is still possible and desirable.

69. It is with these considerations in view that New Zealand has determined its position on the *apartheid* draft resolutions this year. Our starting-point has been the Lagos Declaration for Action against *Apartheid*,¹ which New Zealand supported without reservation. We believe that the achievement of this international consensus was a significant step forward in the struggle against *apartheid* and that General Assembly endorsement of the Lagos Declaration will further reinforce that consensus. We were therefore glad to be a sponsor of draft resolution A/32/L.31 and Add.1, adopting the Declaration. We have also sponsored three other draft resolutions: A/32/L.20 and Add.1, on the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa; A/32/L.24 and Add.1, on political prisoners in South Africa; and A/32/L.34/Rev.1, on investments in South Africa.

70. We keenly regret that we are not able to support draft resolution A/32/L.25, on military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa. New Zealand supported calls for a mandatory arms embargo even before the adoption by the Security Council of its historic resolution 418 (1977). In our view it would have been appropriate for the Assembly to adopt a consensus approach on the question. Instead, draft resolution A/32/L.25 attempts to rewrite Security Council resolution 418 (1977) while singling out for spe-

¹ See *Report of the World Conference for Action against Apartheid* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.77.XIV.2), chap. X.

cific criticism three countries which supported that resolution. Similarly, we find ourselves unable to support draft resolution A/32/L.29, on assistance to the national liberation movement of South Africa, because, as will be clear from my remarks so far and from earlier statements on this subject by my delegation, New Zealand does not agree that there is no alternative to armed struggle as a means of achieving the legitimate rights of the disenfranchised majority of South Africans.

71. With regard to draft resolution A/32/L.26, on economic collaboration with South Africa, my delegation would again like to point out that New Zealand's trade with South Africa is small. We shall, nevertheless, abstain in the vote on the draft because it is our view that the imposition of sanctions is a matter for the Security Council to decide. Should the Council impose sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter, New Zealand would, as a responsible Member of the United Nations, comply faithfully with that decision, as we have complied with mandatory decisions of the Council in the past. We would hope, however, that the Security Council would avoid actions that might severely disrupt the economies of certain African States which are neighbours of South Africa or that might bring about increased suffering and hardship for the black majority in South Africa.

72. With regard to draft resolution A/32/L.32, I would recall that in June of this year the New Zealand Prime Minister joined with other Commonwealth Heads of Government in drawing up and adopting what is now known as the Gleneagles Agreement.² The fundamental aim of that document was the same as that of the proposed United Nations Declaration: to advance the fight against *apartheid* by eliminating that evil from the world of sport.

73. The Gleneagles document recognized that it was for each Government to determine in accordance with its laws the methods by which it might best discharge these commitments, and New Zealand has faithfully fulfilled these commitments within the framework of its own laws and policies. My Government has been encouraged by the firm and increasing support given by New Zealand sporting bodies to the aims common to both the Gleneagles Agreement and the proposed United Nations Declaration as they have made their own decisions on forthcoming events. If the Declaration attached to draft resolution A/32/L.32 causes New Zealand difficulties, it is only because in certain of its provisions the proposed Declaration seeks to achieve its fundamental aims in ways which do not accord with our laws and administrative practices or take account of the limited authority of our Government to intervene in the private affairs of its citizens, among which sporting activities are included. It is, therefore, with considerable regret that my delegation is obliged to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/32/L.32.

74. Of the remaining drafts, we consider draft resolution A/32/L.23 unbalanced in its singling out and condemnation of one State, and we shall therefore vote against it. Nor can we agree with some of the language and approach in draft

resolution A/32/L.30, and we must therefore abstain in the vote on that draft.

75. In addition to the four draft resolutions of which New Zealand is a sponsor we will support draft resolutions A/32/L.21/Rev.1, on the International Anti-*Apartheid* Year; A/32/L.22/Rev.1, on trade union action against *apartheid*; A/32/L.27, on the dissemination of information on *apartheid*; A/32/L.28, on the programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*; and A/32/L.33, on the so-called bantustans.

76. Mr. HARRY (Australia): The year 1977 has been marked by serious developments in South Africa. We cannot fail to mention the arrest and banning of journalists, editors and leaders of political movements within South Africa who have been effective and moderate advocates of change and an end to the *apartheid* system. Perhaps the most tragic example of this repression was the death in detention of Steven Biko.

77. While voices within South Africa itself have been silenced, the international community has reacted to recent developments with new vigour. In August, over 100 countries met in Lagos to state their common opposition to *apartheid* and to adopt a programme of action to end it. In November, the Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 418 (1977), which determined that "the acquisition by South Africa of arms and related *matériel* constitutes a threat to the maintenance of international peace and security". With the adoption of that resolution the United Nations took action for the first time against a Member State under Chapter VII of the Charter.

78. The year 1977 could well prove to be a turning-point in the efforts of the international community against *apartheid*, demonstrating that the influence of the United Nations is strongest and most effective when we speak with a united voice.

79. The Australian Government continues to hope that *apartheid* can be ended by peaceful means, and Australia will maintain its efforts to help achieve that objective.

80. It is primarily this concern which will cause us to refrain from supporting some of the draft resolutions before us, although in some cases there are other aspects which also give us difficulty. Nevertheless, my delegation will vote in favour of the majority of the draft resolutions.

81. In explaining our vote I should like to make these brief comments.

82. I shall take up first draft resolution A/32/L.25, entitled "Military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa". We have stated many times in the past that the Australian Government cannot support reliance on the use of force to end *apartheid*. But we are equally concerned that *apartheid* should not be maintained by force. We are, of course, deeply concerned that South Africa should not develop a nuclear-weapons capability. For over a decade Australia has refused to supply military equipment to South Africa and we shall continue this policy in keeping with the formal obligations now imposed by Security Council resolution 418 (1977). We have carefully studied

² Commonwealth Statement on *Apartheid* in Sport. See *Final Communiqué of the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting in London, 8-15 June 1977* (London, Commonwealth Secretariat, 1977), pp. 21-22.

draft resolution A/32/L.25. We are concerned, first, that it does not appear to take full account of the terms and impact of Security Council resolution 418 (1977). Indeed there is an unfortunate reference to three countries which participated in the unanimous adoption of that important resolution. Some of its other provisions are sweeping and could prove impossible to implement. The Australian delegation will therefore abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/32/L.25.

83. The Australian delegation will also abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/32/L.26, entitled "Economic collaboration with South Africa", though we shall vote for the draft resolution in document A/32/L.34/Rev.1, entitled "Investments in South Africa". The scope of draft resolution A/32/L.26 continues to raise practical difficulties and problems of implementation which cannot be lightly skimmed over.

84. I have mentioned already the Australian Government's hope that peaceful change in South Africa still remains possible. Nevertheless, we recognize that, if there is not early change, the prospects for peace must diminish. No people can be expected to bear indefinitely oppression and indignity on the scale which the majority of South Africans at present suffer. We view with dismay and concern the recent action by the South African Government to stifle the legitimate expression of views. Such actions only narrow further the options available to the majority of South Africans. While we have taken these considerations into account, our fundamental desire for peaceful change and our recognition of the cost in human terms of the resort to armed struggle will, however, lead us to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/32/L.29, entitled "Assistance to the national liberation movement of South Africa", and draft resolution A/32/L.30, entitled "Situation in South Africa".

85. The Australian delegation will vote against draft resolution A/32/L.23.

86. The Australian delegation will vote for draft resolution A/32/L.32, entitled "International Declaration against *Apartheid* in Sports". The Australian Government has aimed through practical restrictions to influence South Africa to move away from racial discrimination in sports and it accepts the duty of discouraging contacts between its nationals and sportsmen representing South Africa or its organizations. It has refused and will continue to refuse visas to teams from South Africa and individuals from South Africa representing that country while sports in that country are organized on the basis of ethnic origin. The Australian Government is not, however, in a position to place restrictions on the travel abroad of individual Australian citizens or to impose its views on sporting bodies and individuals; but it does look to them to take into account the opposition of the Australian Government to *apartheid* in sports and has drawn the attention of all sporting organizations in Australia to the relevant United Nations resolutions on this subject and to the Commonwealth Statement on *Apartheid* in Sport. The Government's active approach on this issue has attracted a positive response from sporting bodies in Australia and from individuals. There are a number of examples of Australian sporting bodies which, after consultation with the Govern-

ment, have decided not to visit South Africa. Some of those cases are recorded in this year's report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*.

87. In the field of sports, as in other aspects of our policy towards *apartheid*, our objective has been to devise practical measures to secure an early and peaceful end to the *apartheid* system. We remain firmly committed to that objective.

88. Mr. LAPOINTE (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): The Secretary of State for External Affairs, in his statement made on 26 September last in the general debate [6th meeting], deplored the proliferation of General Assembly resolutions and the tendency to repeat them almost verbatim from previous years. In this instance, the process of accumulation has meant that the 7 resolutions on *apartheid* of 1975 became 9 in 1976, and have now grown to 15.

89. Does this mean they carry more weight in forming world public opinion or in influencing events? In 1975, 6 of 7 resolutions were adopted without objection; this year, approximately 8 of the 15 will no doubt have to be put to the vote.

90. Our delegation, for its part, considers that, when it comes to *apartheid*, resolutions which are adopted unanimously or by consensus have a far greater effect in moulding international opinion in favour of the struggle of the people of South Africa to obtain justice and equality than do those which provoke opposition or reservations. We all agree on the main objective: equality and racial justice in South Africa. We all agree that it is only the people of South Africa who can bring about the fundamental change which is required to that end, and we agree that they deserve our fullest support. The areas of disagreement are minor in comparison. We consider that the Lagos Declaration for Action against *Apartheid* is and will remain an extremely important instrument in the struggle against *apartheid* because it is comprehensive and comprehensible. It directs attention to the key elements of the problem of *apartheid* and reflects a unanimous international approach. It has already had an important practical effect. It is to be noted that, while a few reservations were registered by a number of countries following the adoption of the Declaration, the great majority of those have been overtaken by recent deliberations and decisions of the Security Council.

91. More is the pity, therefore, that we now have before us a number of unnecessarily divisive draft resolutions. Canada's approach to the question of action against *apartheid* has been fully detailed in statements made in the debate here, at the Lagos Conference and in debates of the Security Council in recent months. The authors of those documents already know in detail the reasons why we and others will be obliged to abstain or vote against some of these texts.

92. To sum up, of the 15 draft resolutions in documents A/32/L.20 to A/32/L.34/Rev.1 our delegation supports nine: A/32/L.20, A/32/L.21/Rev.1, A/32/L.22/Rev.2, A/32/L.24, A/32/L.27, A/32/L.28, A/32/L.31, A/32/L.32 and A/32/L.33. With regard to A/32/L.28, entitled "Programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*,"

heid", we reserve our position on operative paragraph 8 (a) as it touches on economic and political relations.

93. We shall vote against draft resolution A/32/L.23, regarding relations between Israel and South Africa. We have taken note of the intention of the Government of Israel, as stated in its reply³ to the Secretary-General's note of 10 November 1977, to act in accordance with the terms of Security Council resolution 418 (1977), which imposed a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa and required States to refrain from any co-operation in the manufacture and development of nuclear weapons. In the circumstances, we consider the draft resolution in question to be inappropriate, as we believe would be any resolution singling out any country in respect of normal economic and political relations with South Africa.

94. We shall abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/32/L.25, entitled "Military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa". It has a number of shortcomings; in particular, it scarcely recognizes the above-mentioned decision of the Security Council on 4 November under Chapter VII of the Charter, a historic decision which is binding on all Governments under international law. Furthermore, we consider it inappropriate for the General Assembly to suggest, as it would in operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/32/L.25, that the Security Council should establish a particular machinery. The substance of operative paragraph 3 causes us no problems; I believe I can safely say that present Canadian practice fully respects the objectives of virtually all its subparagraphs. We believe, however, that it would be difficult, if not impossible, for the Security Council effectively to define measures to implement certain of those subparagraphs—some of which would require the violation of fundamental freedoms. As for the references in the eighth preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 2 to some Member States, we consider them, as we have already said in another context, to be unacceptable.

95. We shall vote against draft resolution A/32/L.26, entitled "Economic collaboration with South Africa", and we shall abstain in the vote on the related draft resolution A/32/L.34/Rev.1 entitled "Investments in South Africa". Measures of the nature of those specified in those draft resolutions can be effectively implemented only through Security Council action. In our statements in the Security Council we have expressed the view that each such proposal must be considered in the light of Charter provisions and of circumstances existing at a given time.

96. We shall abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/32/L.29, on the question of assistance to the national liberation movement of South Africa. Canada fully supports international programmes designed to provide education and training and other humanitarian assistance to the people of South Africa and is a major contributor to United Nations funds designed for that purpose. Furthermore, we believe that South Africans must work together to reshape their society in order to prevent that society from being overwhelmed by racial violence. Accordingly, we have serious reservations concerning operative paragraph 3 of

that draft resolution and, for the same reason, operative paragraph 4.

97. We shall similarly abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/32/L.30, entitled "Situation in South Africa". We do not support its operative paragraphs 1 and 5, and we have reservations on operative paragraphs 3 and 7. Although it is evident that the Government of South Africa is unrepresentative, we do not consider it to be, as the draft resolution says, "illegitimate". Furthermore, we continue to believe that there is merit in maintaining contact with South Africa and in attempting to use any contact to encourage change. We also believe that it is important that international support should go to all the oppressed people of South Africa and to all their organizations and liberation movements which are struggling to obtain equality and justice and to eliminate *apartheid* and racial discrimination in that country.

98. I wish to comment on the subject of draft resolution A/32/L.32 concerning *apartheid* in sports. All States Members of the United Nations have committed themselves to take practical and appropriate steps to discourage contact or competition by their nationals with sporting organizations, teams or sportsmen from South Africa or from any other country guilty of racial discrimination. Such contacts between their nationals and those of countries which practise segregation in sports suggest that those concerned tolerate, even implicitly, the ignoble policy of *apartheid*, or are less than fully committed to the Olympic principle of non-discrimination.

99. It is in that spirit that my Government approaches the International Declaration against *Apartheid* in Sports which is now before the General Assembly. Our participation in the working group which elaborated that draft bears witness to the seriousness with which my Government views this issue. Obviously the drafting of a text on so complex an issue required considerable goodwill on the part of all concerned. The drafters of that declaration were faced with a complex situation, in that no two Member States have precisely the same approach to the organization of sporting activities, whether on a national or an international level. In some countries, sports are as much a national activity as is national development; they are organized and funded by the Government, which provides facilities and awards prizes. The Government consequently directly controls or strongly influences all sporting activity whether on a national, regional or international level. In other countries, on the other hand, sports are in no way a governmental activity; they are organized and funded privately, without state participation, except when it comes to major national or international events.

100. Member States also differ greatly in terms of their approach to tourism. For some, travel is undertaken in either direction only with the approval of the Government concerned; in others, the right of citizens to travel freely abroad is a fundamental right, while visitors from abroad are traditionally welcomed just as freely.

101. Tailoring a declaration to fit those widely divergent circumstances is difficult. While one Government will achieve its objectives by direct means, other Governments will exert their best efforts to the same end by using the moral, political and financial influence at their disposal.

³ Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-second Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1977, document S/12475.

102. We hope, therefore, that Member States will not decline to support that draft resolution as a result of a narrow or too exclusively legalistic interpretation. It should be taken as a framework within which States can work to support the objectives of the Declaration, taking into account their particular constitution, their legal system or, for that matter, prevailing political factors. We consider that the adoption by consensus of that important text would be the best support for the efforts of all who seek the achievement of respect for the Olympic principles in every country.

103. Miss DEVER (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): I shall speak on behalf of the nine countries of the European Community.

104. Since the session last year, political developments have acquired a new momentum in South Africa. The nine countries of the European Community have acknowledged this quite clearly in their statement of 15 November [70th meeting]. The international community drew important conclusions from these developments, notably in Security Council resolution 418 (1977), imposing an arms embargo against South Africa—a decision that we fully endorse and strictly apply.

105. We also welcome the Declaration of Lagos, which will go down in the annals of the international community as one of the most important milestones in the struggle against the odious system of *apartheid*. The reservations expressed by several States, including certain members of the European Community, in no way imply that they fail to recognize the historic role of that Declaration.

106. In this context, the solutions recommended within the international community deserve our urgent attention. In this spirit, the nine countries wish to emphasize that they look favourably upon the draft resolutions submitted to the Assembly this year. These draft resolutions, which reflect the urgency of the situation, reveal the desire to bring about fundamental revision of the South African policy of *apartheid* in the very near future.

107. That is why the nine countries of the Community would have preferred to be able to support all the draft resolutions submitted without reservations. However, several of the texts to be voted on contain paragraphs or wording that the nine members of the Community cannot accept as they stand, either because they are legally or factually unfounded or because they go beyond the aim in question. This is why we shall not be able to vote for all these draft resolutions; and our delegations will be obliged to abstain in the vote or to vote against several of them.

108. Moreover, we regret to note that the authors of these draft resolutions have lost sight of the distribution of responsibilities as organized under the United Nations Charter.

109. Since the Security Council has adopted resolution 418 (1977) imposing a mandatory embargo on arms sales to South Africa, and since efforts are still being made by certain members of the Council to find a way out of the deadlock in southern Africa, the nine countries regret that the authors of certain draft resolutions did not choose the

sort of language that would have been more likely to achieve unanimity in the United Nations.

110. In particular, we regret the reference in draft resolution A/32/L.25 to three permanent members of the Security Council, which is totally unfounded. It seems to us that the cause of the struggle against *apartheid* deserves the effort of seeking a consensus.

111. As an example of a questionable formulation, I will point to the statement that the South African Government is illegitimate. South Africa is, in fact, an independent Member of the United Nations. Any suggestion to the contrary would be in contradiction with the principle of the universality of our Organization.

112. This is why the nine countries, without minimizing the role played by political organizations formed from the ranks of the oppressed, consider that their efforts are primarily aimed at the establishing of equal rights for all the inhabitants, regardless of race or colour. For the nine countries, the call for “the seizure of power by all available . . . means . . . including armed struggle” as envisaged in draft resolution A/32/L.29 is not acceptable, because of the well-known views of our countries on the subject.

113. Moreover, as we pointed out in our joint statement, we feel that it is our responsibility not to close all channels of communication, and to continue to make our views known to South Africa. We hope that this critical dialogue will finally contribute to the abolition of *apartheid*, without resort to violence.

114. To enter into detail, the countries of the Community have specific reservations in respect of other draft resolutions.

115. The resolution adopted by the Second International Trade Union Conference for Action against *Apartheid*, covered by draft resolution A/32/L.22/Rev.2, is commendable in its aims. However, although some of its provisions are acceptable to the nine countries, others fail, in varying degrees, to meet with their approval. Moreover, the countries of the Community cannot vote in favour of draft resolution A/32/L.26. Indeed, some of the provisions of this draft resolution are in conflict with the concern expressed by the nine countries in their joint statement of 15 November.

116. The nine members of the Community cannot support draft resolution A/32/L.23, which constitutes an arbitrary and biased attack on a particular Member State that has been singled out.

117. The disapproval of the nine countries also extends to *apartheid* in sports, all the more so as they have always adhered totally to the Olympic rule of non-discrimination. Those countries accept that rule on which the draft resolution is based.

118. Nevertheless, the nine countries are obliged to draw the attention of the Assembly to institutional variety that exists in the practice of sports activities. In the countries of the Community, in fact, sports are a non-governmental

activity, organized by the private sector. Moreover, our countries could not question the right to travel abroad without hindrance.

119. We are bound by certain internal legal obligations that do not allow us to subscribe without reservation to all the provisions of the proposed Declaration.

120. Having said this, we should like to make it clear that we are none the less prepared resolutely to discourage sports initiatives and meetings that would be sullied by racial discrimination.

121. As regards the bantustans, the countries of the European Community would like to recall that they did not recognize Transkei, nor do they intend to recognize Bophuthatswana. However, they feel that they cannot prejudge the way in which each of them will deal, in accordance with their constitutional obligations, with the specific problems of a legal and practical nature that will come up regarding these territories and their inhabitants.

122. The nine members of the European Community wish to reiterate their conviction that the policy of bantustanization aims, in fact, at ensuring the perpetuity of the system of *apartheid*.

123. Mr. KAUFMANN (Netherlands): Since the representative of Belgium has just made an explanation of vote on behalf of the nine members of the European Community, I shall make only a brief statement in further explanation of the position of my delegation.

124. In general, my delegation regrets the use of expressions suggesting that the situation in South Africa is to be regarded as a colonial one. In our view, the struggle in South Africa is not a struggle for liberation from a colonial situation, but one for equal rights for all inhabitants, irrespective of their racial background or the colour of their skin.

125. With regard to draft resolution A/32/L.25 on military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, my delegation wishes to emphasize that the Netherlands is as convinced as anybody else of the necessity for a comprehensive and compulsory arms embargo against South Africa. My Government is no less apprehensive about the prospect of South Africa acquiring nuclear arms. We nevertheless feel, much to our regret, constrained to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/32/L.25 because, in our view, the importance of the recent adoption by the Security Council of its resolution 418 (1977) is insufficiently reflected in the text. That is particularly apparent in the unwarranted accusation in the eighth preambular paragraph that France, the United Kingdom and the United States have continued to resist a comprehensive embargo against South Africa in spite of the fact that those countries, as permanent members of the Security Council, were instrumental in enabling that resolution to be adopted. The Netherlands also regrets the wording of operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/32/L.25, in which France, the United Kingdom and the United States are singled out for special attention. In the view of my Government the call for effective action to avert the grave menace to peace posed by South Africa should have been addressed to the entire international community.

126. With regard to draft resolution A/32/L.26 on economic collaboration with South Africa, my Government would have preferred to have been able to vote in favour of this text, especially since the Netherlands is convinced that economic measures against South Africa are called for in view of the rapidly deteriorating situation in that country. However, my delegation will have to abstain in the vote on this draft resolution because of the unrealistic and ill-conceived recommendations which it contains. In the view of my Government, effective action in the economic field must consist of measures supported by the entire international community, namely, decisions by the Security Council acting under the powers entrusted to it by virtue of Chapter VII of the Charter. It is for that reason that the Netherlands sponsored draft resolution A/32/L.34/Rev.1 on investments in South Africa, urging the Security Council to consider steps to achieve the cessation of further foreign investments in South Africa. The third preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/32/L.26, requesting the Security Council to consider mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa, are in line with that approach. The call in operative paragraph 2 of that draft resolution to cease economic collaboration with South Africa, however, followed by a number of requests for measures in various fields of economic activity in operative paragraph 3, can result only in arbitrary and incoherent actions by individual members of the international community instead of yielding an effective pattern of economic pressure on South Africa.

127. Mr. TOBGYE DORJI (Bhutan): The United Nations Charter seeks to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small. In pursuance of such a commitment, the General Assembly adopted resolutions such as General Assembly resolution 3411 C (XXX) which declared that:

“... the United Nations and the international community have a special responsibility towards the oppressed people of South Africa and their liberation movements, and towards those imprisoned, restricted or exiled for their struggle against *apartheid*”.

128. International instruments like the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* [resolution 3068 (XXVIII)] have also been created; and yet today before our very eyes the Pretoria régime continues to oppose the will of the international community by its oppression of the people of South Africa.

129. The fact that we in Bhutan are totally against the abhorrent policy of *apartheid* is eloquently made clear in the message of the King of Bhutan to the World Conference for Action against *Apartheid* held in Lagos in August of this year, from which I wish to quote. His Majesty said:

“It is fortunate that the conscience of the international community has been aroused against the heinous crime of *apartheid*, and support is mounting steadily in favour of the oppressed peoples of southern Africa in their struggle for freedom and justice. At this critical juncture, we, in Bhutan, are happy that the efforts made by the liberation movements are steadily gaining momentum, and are receiving increasing support of all peace-loving States

Members of the United Nations. We wish the Conference every success and we hope that it will give further impetus to the realization of the legitimate and just aspirations of the downtrodden and oppressed peoples of southern Africa.”⁴

130. Although my delegation was unable to attend the Conference, we endorse fully the Lagos Declaration for Action against *Apartheid*. The situation in southern Africa is against the norms of human conscience and dignity. Not only does repression continue unabated, but the Pretoria régime now also poses a threat to the security of neighbouring States. Thus, the situation in southern Africa today poses a grave threat to international peace and security.

131. In view of that ominous situation the delegation of Bhutan welcomed the recent Security Council resolution 418 (1977) and hopes that all peace-loving Member States will adhere to it without any reservation. Thus, with a view to strengthening international action against *apartheid*, my delegation will support all the draft resolutions before us.

132. Before I conclude I should also like to commend the work of the Special Committee as reflected in its report in document A/32/22.

133. Mr. PFIRTER (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Argentina will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/32/L.23, because we believe that it does not have substantive relevance to the basic issue under discussion. The other 14 draft resolutions will have our support. Without prejudice to our position, we should like to enter certain reservations to draft resolutions A/32/L.25, A/32/L.26 and A/32/L.29.

134. As regards draft resolution A/32/L.25, although we support the adoption of measures intended to put an end to military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, we have reservations on operative paragraph 3 (*d*) since that subparagraph relates to an assumption which does not necessarily imply the existence of such collaboration.

135. Regarding draft resolution A/32/L.26, it would seem obvious that the adoption of sanctions, as provided for in operative paragraph 3, would require a prior decision by the Security Council. That does not prevent us, in accordance with the position taken by Argentina in the Fourth Committee in the resolution on agenda item 94,⁵ from eventually, within the context of the question of Southern Rhodesia, being able to support provisions such as those contained in operative paragraph 3 (*d*).

136. With respect to draft resolution A/32/L.29, we should like to reserve our position on operative paragraph 3, since we do not believe that the United Nations should endorse a course of action—armed struggle—which is not in accordance with the principles and purposes of the Charter.

⁴ See *Report of the World Conference for Action against Apartheid* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.77.XIV.3), p. 21.

⁵ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-second Session, Fourth Committee*, 9th meeting, para. 65, and *ibid.*, *Fourth Committee, Sessional Fascicle*, corrigendum.

137. Having made those reservations, we should also like to state that the commitment of the Argentine Government to implement draft resolution A/32/L.32 must be interpreted within the limits set by our Constitution and our laws.

138. Mr. NEIL (Jamaica): The Jamaican delegation will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions on item 27.

139. However, my delegation has some reservations with regard to draft resolution A/32/L.23, entitled “Relations between Israel and South Africa”. We should prefer it if a particular country was not identified for specific condemnation, especially since other cases of collaboration with South Africa deserving of similar condemnation have not been identified. We are opposed to all forms of collaboration which enable the racist régime of South Africa to persist in its criminal policies. It is on the basis of this strong position of my Government on the question of *apartheid* that my delegation, despite the concern expressed earlier, will vote in favour of draft resolution A/32/L.23.

140. Mr. MAGONGO (Swaziland): The General Assembly has been considering the question of the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa for a number of years now. It is regrettable that the Government of South Africa has continued to defy the numerous well-meaning resolutions adopted here and supported by the international community. It is because of this defiance that there has been no significant change within South Africa itself and that a mockery has been made of the international community’s efforts to bring equality to all mankind, irrespective of the colour of one’s skin.

141. My delegation has on numerous occasions indicated from this very podium that whatever happens in that part of the world affects Swaziland as well: The black people of South Africa are not different from us; we share the same aspirations. The basic human rights and fundamental freedoms they are denied are denied us as well.

142. My delegation will never condone *apartheid*. Therefore, the draft resolutions before the Assembly command our sympathy and firm support.

143. After careful consideration of the draft resolutions, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/32/L.25 but must indicate that the eighth paragraph of the preamble causes us some difficulties. Accordingly, we should like to express our reservations on that paragraph.

144. We have a similar position with regard to draft resolution A/32/L.29: my delegation will cast an affirmative vote on that draft resolution but reserves its position on operative paragraph 3.

145. Mr. HOUNGAVOU (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): My country was an enthusiastic sponsor at the last session of the Assembly of a draft resolution submitted by the Nordic countries on the subject of investments in South Africa. That draft resolution was adopted by the Assembly as resolution 31/6 K of 9 November 1976.

146. This year again my country became a sponsor of a similar draft resolution, in document A/32/L.34. However,

when the French text was circulated, my delegation realized that the draft resolution contained provisions unacceptable to us, in view of the position we have always held here. My delegation has been in touch with the other sponsors of the draft resolution, but we have not obtained satisfaction. That is why my country is no longer a sponsor of the new text, contained in document A/32/L.34/Rev.1.

147. Like many other delegations, my delegation is particularly concerned about the provisions of the second and third paragraphs of the preamble. If the text remains as now worded, my delegation will be obliged to reconsider its position in regard to the vote on this draft resolution.

148. Mr. MULLOY (Ireland): The delegation of Ireland proposes to support nine of the 15 draft resolutions before us today. It has been happy to be a sponsor of four of them. These positive votes will accord with my Government's unwavering opposition to the intolerable system of *apartheid*, which my delegation has already covered in our statement before this Assembly on 18 November [75th meeting]. It is therefore with regret that we find ourselves obliged to abstain in the vote on five of the draft resolutions before us today and to cast a negative vote on one of them. The representative of Belgium, speaking today on behalf of the nine countries members of the European Community, has mentioned some of our problems, but I should like to take this opportunity to make some additional remarks on behalf of the Irish delegation.

149. Our abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/32/L.25—entitled “Nuclear and military collaboration with South Africa”—is inspired by the belief that criticism of three of the permanent members of the Security Council in this context is particularly inappropriate at a time when the Security Council, by unanimous vote, has recently introduced a mandatory arms embargo, in compliance with the wishes of the world community. Our abstention on this draft resolution is for us particularly difficult in view of Ireland's long-standing support for such mandatory action and for its full and effective implementation.

150. With regard to draft resolution A/32/L.26—“Economic collaboration with South Africa”—my Permanent Representative expressed confidence in his statement in the debate on 18 November that the Security Council would keep the situation under close review and carefully consider the attitude which it should adopt in the light of developments and attitudes taken by the South African Government. Economic sanctions as proposed in document A/32/L.26 will clearly be one of the possibilities to be considered, and my Government has shown its willingness to move in this direction by becoming a sponsor of draft resolution A/32/L.34 regarding new investment in South Africa. However, my Government feels obliged to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/32/L.26 because of the inherent contradiction and inconsistency in that text. On the one hand, the draft resolution calls for consideration of mandatory economic sanctions but, on the other, it calls on States to take unilateral action, action which is not likely to be effective and is in some instances in conflict with existing international obligations.

151. Although we support the work of the Special Committee and will vote in favour of draft resolution

A/32/L.28—“Programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*”—we none the less have reservations about some of its provisions and, in particular, operative paragraph 5.

152. We are pleased to note the statement in draft resolutions A/32/L.29 and A/32/L.30 that South Africa belongs to all its inhabitants regardless of race, colour or creed, and to support many other aspects of these draft resolutions. However, we feel that we have no choice but to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/32/L.29 because we consider it unacceptable for the General Assembly to call on the international community to provide assistance towards a “struggle for the seizure of power by all available and appropriate means, including armed struggle”.

153. My Government also feels obliged to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/32/L.30 primarily in view of the formulation of operative paragraphs 1 and 3. While we strongly condemn the policies of the South African Government, we remain attached to the principle that independent States—and we consider South Africa to be independent—can be formally represented only by their Governments. The Government of South Africa is chosen by a minority of the population since only the white population can vote or stand for election. We think that this is deplorable and, indeed, ultimately very dangerous. We are, furthermore, committed to support the objective renewed by the Organization of African Unity [OAU] in its declaration of April 1975 in Dar-es-Salaam: “the ending of *apartheid* and the total elimination of racial discrimination” in South Africa. We hope to see this objective realized at an early date so that all the people of South Africa can participate freely in the choice of their Government. We are, however, obliged to abstain in the vote on this draft resolution for the reason I have given and because, in our view, it is not for this Assembly to determine who are the authentic representatives of South Africa, but rather for the people of South Africa as a whole. We hope that they will be able to do so before long on a basis of genuine equality and universal suffrage.

154. In connexion with draft resolution A/32/L.32—“International Declaration against *Apartheid* in Sports”—my Government wishes to reaffirm its unequivocal support for the Olympic principle of non-discrimination. We believe that participation in sports should be without regard to race, religion or political affiliation and that selection should be on the basis of merit alone. My Government attaches the greatest importance to action in this field by the world community both because of the general principle involved and because of the impact that such action can have on white South African opinion. My Government has demonstrated its particular concern by clear statements of its policy in this area, which have been conveyed to the sporting organizations of Ireland. My Government will continue to make known its views to these organizations. We were also glad to endorse United Nations action in promoting the elimination of *apartheid* in sports by becoming a sponsor of the draft resolution on this subject at the thirtieth session of the General Assembly in 1975.⁶ It is therefore clear that the Government of Ireland is

⁶ *Ibid.*, Thirtieth Session, Annexes, agenda item 53, document A/10342, paras. 20-21.

basically in sympathy with the intentions of the drafters of the International Declaration against *Apartheid* in Sports contained in draft resolution A/32/L.32. We propose, moreover, to act in accordance with the spirit of the Declaration and some of its provisions. However, we feel the need to give further consideration to certain of these provisions, some of which in our system are a matter for private organizations and others of which may give rise to legal and other difficulties. In these circumstances, we reluctantly find it necessary to abstain.

155. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions on *apartheid* under agenda item 27 with one exception.

156. My country finds repugnant the very concept of racial discrimination, which constitutes in itself a crime punishable under our law. The very idea of discrimination in our interdependent world, which is becoming so much more closely identified in all human sectors, is inhumane, odious, intolerable and completely out of step with the times. Ecuador is among those multiracial South American countries forged of the merging of various races, both those indigenous to the Americas, with their age-old roots, and those of the Mediterranean peoples of Europe. This racial mixture has been a solution which gives vigour to our social reality and characterizes our human resources, and we have in actual fact abolished all racial prejudice, which in our country has no reason for being.

157. Ecuador was therefore the first Latin American country to ratify the International Convention for the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* on 12 May 1975.

158. A few weeks ago, in the presence of several African Foreign Ministers and Ambassadors visiting Quito, the Head of State of Ecuador, Admiral Alfredo Poveda Barbano, said:

"By its very mission and its deepest convictions Ecuadorian society has been and remains anti-racist and is, therefore, opposed to racial segregation, discrimination and colonialism, as it so amply demonstrated in supporting the resolutions adopted by the United Nations against the racist and colonialist régimes of South Africa."

159. I should also point out that, on the occasion of the World Conference for Action against *Apartheid* in August this year, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ecuador reiterated:

"... on behalf of the Government and the people of Ecuador our rejection and condemnation of the practice of *apartheid*, which contravenes the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and violates the solemn undertakings entered into by its Member States to ensure universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms of all without distinction as to race."

He thereby expressed:

"... our firm hope that the Conference in Nigeria will adopt effective measures to help the oppressed people of

southern Africa in their legitimate struggle to establish equality among all men and the unrestricted right of the human person and respect for his dignity and freedom."

160. Ecuador has been attentively following the process of this world pressure to prevail upon the Pretoria régime to put an end to its inhumane policy of *apartheid*, which it carries so far as to segregate its citizens even beyond the grave in different cemeteries. Our country trusts that the international community has achieved a degree of political maturity such that, acting on United Nations resolutions, States will succeed in going beyond theoretical pronouncements and in embodying the actual manifestations of opinion in realizing genuine progress in concrete measures such as those sought by the draft resolutions which we shall be supporting.

161. My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/32/L.33, among others, because it believes that the creation of sham States in the case of South Africa is a subterfuge on the part of the Pretoria Government to divide the indigenous population and prevent it from exercising sovereignty in its ancestral land and to disguise the true policy of political domination under so-called independence in order to perpetuate the exploitation of cheap labour, which would then appear to be imported for purposes of commercial and political accounting.

162. For all these reasons, the Government of Ecuador condemns such an obvious fraud perpetrated to deceive international public opinion and the international community and rejects the creation of bantustans, which will never be accepted. Our country has never established, nor does it intend to establish, any official or diplomatic, consular or commercial relations with South Africa, still less with its bantustans.

163. We wish to repeat that Ecuador does not recognize the so-called independence of Transkei or the recently announced independence of Bophuthatswana, which we consider to be totally invalid, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations which have had, and continue to have, the unreserved support of Ecuador.

164. We voted in the Fourth Committee for the condemnation of all countries which maintain any kind of relations with South Africa in connexion with the draft resolution on foreign interests in that country. We therefore do not think it is necessary or expedient to have a special resolution for the case of Israel. This is the reason why we shall abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/32/L.23. With this exception, as we have said, we shall vote in favour of all the other draft resolutions under item 27.

165. Mr. FUENTES IBÁÑEZ (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to offer a few clarifications before casting our vote on the draft resolutions under agenda item 27.

166. In accordance with established practice in my country, whenever the freedom of peoples subjected to the yoke of colonialism or any other system that offends human dignity, such as *apartheid*, has to be defended, the Government of Bolivia cannot be indifferent.

167. Bolivia has also suffered the rigours of colonialism. We managed to overcome and defeat that negative force in our history by engaging in sacrifice and struggle in concert with our brothers in South America, in a war which cost thousands of lives and caused great bloodshed. Early in the nineteenth century the fight for freedom was not waged with the assistance of the international community, nor was there an organization like the United Nations upholding the basic principles of coexistence among peoples without any distinction as to race, colour or religion. Our rejection of *apartheid* is, then, not determined by racist, political or economic considerations or the result of any commitments. We are guided solely by a sense of justice and of solidarity with the suffering peoples of the world. But because this is our position, we consider that, when we have to deal with situations which involve the conduct of States and the actions of their Governments, there must be no selective or preferential discrimination. If an evil is to be condemned, then all those who accept or further that evil should be condemned. We should not tolerate some and not others.

168. Geographical situation and the need to trade in certain products or goods which are vital to the existence of certain peoples or any other overriding consideration which compels a Government to give less than total support to the resolutions of the General Assembly must be considered either equally valid or equally invalid for everyone. Not to act in this manner is to grant certain privileges which not only undermine the principle of equality but weaken the decisions of the United Nations.

169. My delegation would like to refer to two matters which were raised in the voluminous documentation of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. In section III, paragraph 24 of document A/AC.115/L.467, which contains the General Declaration and Programme of Action of the World Conference against *Apartheid*, Racism and Colonialism in Southern Africa, held in Lisbon from 16 to 19 June 1977, in the passage relating to South Africa, Bolivia is mentioned as one of those Latin American countries which are making "efforts to establish new settlements of migrants from southern Africa based on the principles of *apartheid* . . .".

170. This reference made by some irresponsible individual is an outrage. Not only the Bolivian Government but the Bolivian people themselves are mature enough not to allow, for any reason, the settlement of any immigrant who wishes to introduce odious systems which are alien and which might undermine the harmonious relations between our various population groups. We may have certain differences in ethnic origin or language, but never are differences based on discriminatory practices. Ours is a mixed egalitarian society where people are only singled out from the rest by a desire to excel, by their creative capacity and by their efforts to serve the community and the nation.

171. Of course, there are always individuals who offer plans and recommendations to Governments. That is not surprising. That is the kind of thing that happens in any country where any thinking individual is allowed to express his ideas, no matter how eccentric they might be and where there is a press to publish those ideas. But there is a world of difference between that and a situation where

such initiatives form the opinion of the Government and are considered to be the official ideas of the Government.

172. It is particularly noteworthy for that reason that the World Conference against *Apartheid*, Racism and Colonialism, which was held in Lisbon, should have been surprised by a report of this kind and, what is more regrettable, that, on the basis of that report, the statement that is to be found in document A/AC.115/L.467 should have been made. We deny the validity of that report. It is entirely inaccurate, and the delegation of Bolivia said as much in Geneva.

173. We also have reservations about the fact that the categorical statement by the Federal Republic of Germany, which appears in the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* [A/32/22] was not taken into account. In spite of that, there is a condemnation included in operative paragraphs 6 and 7 of draft resolution A/C.4/32/L.1 and Corr.1. My delegation has already entered formal reservations in connexion with those condemnations.

174. We shall vote in favour of all the draft resolutions under item 27, with the exception of A/32/L.23. It is a singling out of the State of Israel when there are others in a similar situation, and in the opinion of my delegation it is a one-sided accusation which calls for our abstention.

175. Finally, my delegation would like to state for the record that we have reservations regarding certain paragraphs that encourage armed struggle which we feel are in open contradiction with the principles of the Charter. The same applies to those requiring the application of sanctions, which we feel is the special privilege of the Security Council. The matter of sanctions has already in part been considered by the Council and we believe that in all likelihood further progress will be made in due course.

176. Mr. CROQUER (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to take this opportunity to reiterate its determined and firm position in connexion with item 27.

177. Ever since the United Nations has been examining the despicable policy of *apartheid* practised under its laws by the Government of Pretoria, Venezuela has clearly expressed its views on this matter. We categorically condemn all forms of discrimination and most particularly that cruel and inhuman form pursued by Mr. Vorster, because we believe that it is a barbarous aberration, contrary to the most elementary human rights and the very Charter of our Organization.

178. We believe that it is the inescapable duty of the United Nations to devote itself whole-heartedly and with determination to the search for and application of effective measures to pressure the minority Government of South Africa into desisting from its policy of discrimination against the majority of the population of that country. It is true, however, that Vorster, with the direct or indirect assistance which he receives from certain Governments and transnational corporations, feels stronger with every passing day and is openly defying the numerous resolutions of our Organization.

179. In this regard, the President of Venezuela, Mr. Carlos Andrés Pérez, in a message which he sent to the Lagos Conference said that Venezuela

"...repudiates and deplores the abhorrent policy of *apartheid*. . . . This constant violation of basic human rights is a challenge to the sincerity of those great nations which in one way or another are responsible for the persistence of such systems, which offend the dignity of all mankind."⁷

180. We should like once again to assure our brothers from southern Africa that we are with them and that they can count on the total support of Venezuela. For that reason we went this year to Maputo and Lagos, and we shall always stand shoulder to shoulder with them until justice triumphs in that part of the world.

181. As an expression of the sincerity of Venezuela's position with regard to the racist Government of South Africa, we should like to stress that in our country at the governmental level relevant instructions have been issued to prevent any economic or commercial contacts with the Pretoria régime with which, furthermore, we do not have diplomatic relations. Similarly, we are ready to take all necessary measures to prevent Venezuelan oil from reaching the Government of Mr. Vorster.

182. For all these considerations, my delegation will vote in favour, without any reservations whatsoever, of all the draft resolutions which we have before us.

183. Mr. BOCALANDRO (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of my country wishes on this occasion to explain its vote on the draft resolutions which are about to be voted upon.

184. Uruguay has always upheld the principle that all human beings are equal, and we therefore strongly condemn all forms of discrimination based on difference of race. Accordingly, we shall cast our vote in favour of most of the drafts before the Assembly, which we believe express this condemnation.

185. However, as regards draft resolution A/32/L.25, although we shall be voting in favour of it, we should like to say that we have reservations on subparagraphs (d) and (j) of operative paragraph 3. We feel that this is a matter which should be left to the discretion of each State.

186. We shall vote against draft resolution A/32/L.29 in the conviction that some of its provisions are not in keeping with the principles of the Charter. That stand is in keeping with Uruguay's traditional view that the use of force is not an appropriate means of settling disputes among peoples.

187. Mr. PINTO-BAZURCO (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Peru, as a member of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, will vote this year as we have always done in favour of all the draft resolutions on the item. We shall be voting in that way although, as we said in the debate on

this item [76th meeting], we do not agree with the language in some of the drafts. It is our belief that the United Nations must do everything in its power to stamp out the heinous system of *apartheid*, in keeping with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

188. In this context, the Peruvian delegation believes that it is essential to eliminate the foreign support the South African régime has been receiving from many sources and in many ways, since it is this which makes possible the continued application of its abhorrent racist policies. Although we believe that action by the world Organization should not be selective or discriminatory, we are convinced that a heavier responsibility lies with those who collaborate directly with South Africa in such areas as the political and military sphere, where support undoubtedly strengthens the power of the South African régime.

189. Peru is a multiracial society of different cultures. We are pursuing our fight against *apartheid* in keeping with our unswerving position of principle resulting from our express and continuing support for the peoples of South Africa and our firm conviction that the United Nations must face squarely the problem of eliminating racism and *apartheid*, not merely in terms of making statements diluted by time and space, but as a historic and inescapable responsibility making solidarity with the African peoples, our brothers in the third world, which is so often proclaimed in this building, both real and effective.

190. Mr. DOLGUCHITS (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR will support all the draft resolutions on the question of *apartheid*, including that in document A/32/L.21/Rev.1 and Add.1, on the International Anti-*Apartheid* Year. In this we are guided by our position of principle of affording all possible support to the oppressed peoples of southern Africa in their struggle against the practice and system of *apartheid*. We have actively and consistently favoured, and we shall continue to favour, the total elimination of all vestiges of the system of colonial oppression, infringements of equality and the independence of peoples, and all hotbeds of colonialism and racism.

191. As far as draft resolution A/32/L.21/Rev.1 and Add.1 is concerned, we should like to stress that the inclusion in operative paragraph 8 of provision for a special allocation of \$300,000 for the holding of the International Anti-*Apartheid* Year was undertaken without observance of the usual procedure of prior consideration by the Fifth Committee to justify the financial implications of a proposal before it is put to the General Assembly. In our view, the procedure followed in this case is generally out of keeping with the well-organized established practice for the adoption of decisions.

192. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR wishes to avail itself of this opportunity to make the following statement on the subject of the slanderous fabrications expressed by one speaker against the Soviet Republics, the sponsors of a number of draft resolutions on the item under consideration by the Assembly.

193. Everything that speaker said in this regard was from beginning to end nothing but a malicious fabrication and a

⁷ See *Report of the World Conference for Action against Apartheid* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.77.XIV.3), corrigendum.

bare-faced lie. Everyone is very well aware that the Soviet Republics and the Soviet Union have never supported, do not support and will not support any relations of any kind with the racist régime of Pretoria. They do not trade with South Africa. Still less do they provide it with weapons or military technology. That was firmly and unambiguously stated in the replies of the Byelorussian SSR,⁸ the Ukrainian SSR⁹ and the USSR¹⁰ to the relevant questionnaire of the United Nations Secretary-General relating to Security Council resolution 418 (1977).

194. Anti-Sovietism and slander have never been instruments of honest political activity. It is of no use for the slanderer to count on his fabrications compromising the policy of international solidarity with those fighting against racism and *apartheid* that has been unswervingly pursued by all the countries of the socialist community.

195. The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the vote.

196. The representative of Sweden wishes to speak in order to make an explanatory statement before we proceed to the vote. I call upon him.

197. Mr. THUNBORG (Sweden): In order to allow more time for the sponsors of draft resolution A/32/L.34/Rev.1 to engage in further consultations on the draft, I propose that the vote on that draft resolution should not be taken today.

198. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/32/L.34/Rev.1, the representative of Sweden has declared that to allow further consultations on the text of that draft resolution the vote on it should be postponed. Consequently the vote on draft resolution A/32/L.34/Rev.1 will be postponed until a later date.¹¹

199. The Assembly will now proceed to take a decision on the various draft resolutions before it. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of these draft resolutions is contained in document A/32/455.

200. We turn first to draft resolution A/32/L.20 and Add.1, entitled "United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa". Last year a similar resolution was adopted without a vote. I have not received any request for a vote on this draft resolution. May I take it that the General Assembly decides to adopt that draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 32/105 A).

201. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution A/32/L.21/Rev.1 and Add.1, entitled "International Anti-Apartheid Year". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

⁸ Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-second Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1977, document S/12473.

⁹ Ibid., document S/12474.

¹⁰ Ibid., document S/12457.

¹¹ See the 104th meeting, para. 12.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, 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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

The draft resolution was adopted by 141 votes to none (resolution 32/105 B).¹²

202. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution A/32/L.22/Rev.2 and Add.1 entitled "Trade union action against *apartheid*." A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Ni-

¹² The delegation of Equatorial Guinea subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

geria, 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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

The draft resolution was adopted by 138 votes to none (resolution 32/105 C).¹³

203. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on draft resolution A/32/L.23 and Add.1, entitled "Relations between Israel and South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahamas, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Central African Empire, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Greece, Honduras, Iran, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Malawi, Mexico, Nepal, Nicaragua, Panama, Portugal, Singapore, Surinam, Swaziland, Thailand, Uruguay.

The draft resolution was adopted by 88 votes to 19, with 30 abstentions (resolution 32/105 D).¹⁴

¹³ The delegation of Equatorial Guinea subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

¹⁴ The delegation of Equatorial Guinea subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

204. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on draft resolution A/32/L.24 and Add.1, which is entitled "Political prisoners in South Africa". Last year a similar resolution was adopted without a vote. There is no request for a vote on that draft resolution. May I take it that the General Assembly adopts that draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 32/105 E).

205. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/32/L.25 and Add.1, entitled "Military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Canada, Central African Empire, Costa Rica, Denmark, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Surinam.

The draft resolution was adopted by 113 votes to 7, with 17 abstentions (resolution 32/105 F).¹⁵

206. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/32/L.26 and Add.1, entitled "Economic collaboration with South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin,

¹⁵ The delegation of Equatorial Guinea subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, 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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Botswana, Central African Empire, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Uruguay.

The draft resolution was adopted by 111 votes to 7, with 22 abstentions (resolution 32/105 G).¹⁶

207. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/32/L.27 and Add.1, entitled "Dissemination of information on *apartheid*". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.¹

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

Romania, Rwanda, 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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

The draft resolution was adopted by 140 votes to none (resolution 32/105 H).¹⁷

208. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/32/L.28 and Add.1, entitled "Programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*." A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, 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, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

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

The draft resolution was adopted by 136 votes to none, with 4 abstentions (resolution 32/105 I).¹⁸

¹⁷ The delegation of Equatorial Guinea subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

¹⁸ The delegation of Equatorial Guinea subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

¹⁶ The delegation of Equatorial Guinea subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

209. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/32/L.29 and Add.1, entitled "Assistance to the national liberation movement of South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, 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, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Italy, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

The draft resolution was adopted by 112 votes to 9, with 17 abstentions (resolution 32/105 J).¹⁹

210. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/32/L.30 and Add.1, entitled "Situation in South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador,²⁰ Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea,

Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, 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, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

The draft resolution was adopted by 113 votes to none, with 27 abstentions (resolution 32/105 K).²¹

211. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/32/L.31 and Add.1, entitled "World Conference for Action against Apartheid". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

¹⁹ The delegation of Equatorial Guinea subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

²⁰ The delegation of El Salvador subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as an abstention.

²¹ The delegation of Equatorial Guinea subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

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

Against: None.

The draft resolution was adopted by 140 votes to none (resolution 32/105 L).²²

212. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/32/L.32 and Add.1, entitled "International Declaration against *Apartheid* in Sports". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, 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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

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

The draft resolution was adopted by 125 votes to none, with 14 abstentions (resolution 32/105 M).²³

²² The delegation of Equatorial Guinea subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

²³ The delegation of Equatorial Guinea subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

213. The PRESIDENT: Lastly, we come to draft resolution A/32/L.33 and Add.1, entitled "Bantustans". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, 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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

The draft resolution was adopted by 140 votes to none (resolution 32/105 N).²⁴

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

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

216. Our countries have always taken a firm stand against the repulsive system of *apartheid* in South Africa, the racial discrimination of the Pretoria régime, the increasing oppression of its dissidents, its illegal occupation of Namibia, its support for the Smith régime in Southern Rhodesia, and its aggression against neighbouring countries.

217. Against the background of recent developments in South Africa, it is now more important than ever that the United Nations should be unrelenting in its efforts to bring the *apartheid* system to an end. For that purpose we must apply ever increasing pressure against the Pretoria régime.

²⁴ The delegation of Equatorial Guinea subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

218. Recently the Security Council took a major step forward in deciding on a mandatory weapons embargo against South Africa; but there are also other ways and other steps that must be explored to maintain and intensify that pressure.

219. The Nordic countries have voted in favour of most of the resolutions; however, we have some reservations on certain points. We have not been able to support draft resolution A/32/L.23, on relations between Israel and South Africa, the reason being that we consider it inappropriate to single out one country in this context.

220. The Nordic countries have for many years favoured the adoption of a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa. We therefore welcome the important decision taken by the Security Council in adopting resolution 418 (1977).

221. We all support the general objectives and goals of draft resolution A/32/L.25 on military and nuclear collaboration, but would have liked to see a clearer recognition in the resolution of the important decision taken by the Security Council to impose a mandatory weapons embargo on South Africa. Besides, our Governments have some reservations in regard to certain operative paragraphs in the draft resolution, as the text fails to take fully into account basic Charter positions with regard to the division of competence between the General Assembly and the Security Council.

222. We have similar difficulties with a number of paragraphs in draft resolution A/32/L.26, which deals with economic collaboration with South Africa, and that is why we abstained in the vote on that draft resolution.

223. We have abstained also in the vote on draft resolution A/32/L.29, concerning assistance to the national liberation movement of South Africa, in spite of our strong and long-standing support for its cause, which has been demonstrated not least through substantial humanitarian and educational assistance to that movement. Our abstention was motivated by the wording of operative paragraph 3. It has consistently been the stand of the Nordic countries not to condone paragraphs containing expressions of explicit support for the use of armed force.

224. As for draft resolution A/32/L.30 regarding the situation in South Africa, we should like to recall that the Nordic countries have always steadfastly supported the principle of the universality of the United Nations. Furthermore, the draft resolution contains certain unqualified generalizations that we cannot endorse.

Mr. Albornoz (Ecuador), Vice-President, took the Chair.

225. Concerning draft resolution A/32/L.32 on the International Declaration against *Apartheid* in Sports, our Governments agree that the Assembly is fully justified in devoting continued attention to this matter, and fully understand and support the general objectives of the Declaration. We should like to point out, however, as we have done on previous occasions, that the sports organizations of the Nordic countries are private entities. Also, for constitutional reasons we cannot prevent our nationals from travelling freely abroad to any destination of their

choice, nor can we generally refuse visas to nationals of States that our Governments recognize.

226. The fact that the Nordic countries have supported most of the draft resolutions now before us and have also joined in sponsoring a number of them testifies to our firm opposition to the *apartheid* system in all its forms and manifestations. We reiterate our wish to see international pressure increase against South Africa. One important step could consist of a decision by the Security Council to achieve a cessation of further foreign investments in South Africa. The Nordic countries wish to state their desire to take an active part in all United Nations efforts aimed at eliminating the *apartheid* system in South Africa and to voice once again their deep concern over the dangerous and worsening situation in southern Africa which results from the policies of the Pretoria régime.

227. Mr. GARRIGUE-GUYONNAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Belgium has already explained on behalf of the nine countries members of the European Community why these countries were unable to support all 15 of the draft resolutions concerning *apartheid* that the General Assembly has just adopted. My delegation fully associates itself with that statement. We particularly regret that the unacceptable or excessive provisions contained in certain draft resolutions precluded a unanimous vote by the Assembly on the serious question of *apartheid*.

228. It is the duty of the international community, as, indeed, it is the duty of each one of our States, to do everything necessary to put an end as soon as possible to a régime that tramples underfoot the dignity of man. These efforts should not, however, be allowed to encourage us to forget the rules by which we have elected to be governed under our Charter. The indignation we all share should not lead us to recommendations that will in the last analysis be counter-productive.

229. The French delegation feels that some of the texts submitted are contrary to the provisions of Article 12 of the Charter which provides that, while the Security Council is exercising in respect of any dispute or situation the functions assigned to it in the Charter, the General Assembly shall not make any recommendation with regard to that dispute or situation.

230. In the same spirit, my delegation believes that it is neither timely nor legally justifiable to assign to a committee created by the General Assembly responsibilities that it cannot properly assume under the Charter.

231. It is not, in the view of my delegation, the role of the United Nations to recommend armed struggle or to call for civil war. Nor is it in keeping with the spirit of this Organization to advocate isolation rather than to explore the difficult path of persuasion, discussion and critical explanation. In the circumstances, my delegation had to vote against several draft resolutions and to abstain in the vote on others. Certain draft resolutions which we voted for because they seemed in essence to reflect legitimate concern nevertheless contain provisions on which we wish to enter the most explicit reservations. This applies in particular to draft resolutions A/32/L.21/Rev.1, A/32/L.23 and A/32/L.24.

232. Mr. WHALEN (United States of America): The institution of *apartheid*, a matter of great and growing international concern, is a system grossly offensive to the values and beliefs of the American people. As a member of the United States House of Representatives, I was recently one of the sponsors of a resolution in the United States Congress whose passage clearly demonstrated the outrage that Americans feel towards *apartheid*. The resolution was brought before Congress in the wake of Steven Biko's death and the bannings and detentions of 19 October. It denounced the South African Government for those acts and urged President Carter "to take effective measures against the Republic of South Africa in order to register the deep concern of the American people about the continued violation of human rights in that country". What I believe was so significant about that resolution was the fact that it was passed, not by a simple majority, but by an overwhelming majority—by 347 to 54. Such a vote can only be interpreted as a loud and clear statement of the outrage over *apartheid* that is felt by the American people. Too, this vote clearly repudiates Prime Minister Vorster's frequent statement that the United States policy of opposition to *apartheid* reflects only the view of leaders out of touch with their people. Let there be no mistake about it: the United States demand for progressive movement towards full political participation of all South Africans carries with it the support and conviction of the American people.

233. Having been directly involved in the passage of that resolution, I am now pleased to have represented my Government in supporting seven of the draft resolutions that have been voted on today in the General Assembly—by far the most positive vote on draft resolutions on this subject that my Government has ever cast.

234. With regard to these and other draft resolutions that have been voted on today, I now would like to make a few comments in explanation of our voting.

235. On four of these 15 draft resolutions, my Government voted "No". With regard to the draft resolutions entitled "Military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa" [A/32/L.25] and "Economic collaboration with South Africa" [A/32/L.26], our opposition is based on views well-known to this body. With regard to the draft resolution entitled "Relations between Israel and South Africa" [A/32/L.23], we voted "No" because of our objection to the singling out of Israel for condemnation. The citing of Israel alone in this context is particularly inappropriate in light of the fact that less than 1 per cent of South Africa's total world trade last year was conducted with Israel.

236. Let me comment more fully concerning the draft resolution entitled "Assistance to the national liberation movement of South Africa" [A/32/L.29]. As my Government has made clear on numerous occasions, we are totally opposed to the system of *apartheid*. We fully share the view expressed by other members of this Assembly that *apartheid* must go. The question really boils down to one of means: peaceful means or armed force. The dilemma which has led us to oppose this draft resolution is that we clearly wish to vote for the inalienable right of all South Africans to seek, obtain and enjoy full political participation in the government of South Africa. We cannot, however, accept

the view that Member States should endorse or provide assistance to a violent seizure of power within another State. We fully understand the situation in which non-violent leaders of the anti-*apartheid* movement in South Africa find themselves cut off from the normal means of expression, being subjected to repression and—as in the case of Steven Biko—subjected to cruel and inhuman treatment leading to death. At the same time, we believe that it is inappropriate for the United Nations, a body dedicated to the peaceful settlement of disputes, to advocate the use of armed force to solve political problems.

237. On three of the draft resolutions before us, my Government has abstained. These abstentions are meant to reflect our agreement in principle with the over-all thrust of the resolutions but our disagreement with specific aspects of them. For example, with respect to the draft resolution entitled "Programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*" [A/32/L.28] we support the Special Committee and its work in general. However, we cannot support operative paragraphs 1 and 2 and cannot encourage the Special Committee to promote campaigns for the cessation of nuclear, economic, and other relations with South Africa.

238. Turning to the draft resolution entitled "Situation in South Africa" [A/32/L.30], let me make several comments. First, the South African system of *apartheid* clearly prevents the Government of South Africa from being representative of all of the people of that nation. Nevertheless, the United States Government regards the Government of South Africa as legitimate in the legal sense and would not accept any interpretation, based on this resolution, which held that the Government of South Africa's rights under international law had been in any way abridged. Secondly, we recognize that the national liberation movement, in all its facets, represents that portion of the South African population which is now deprived of full political participation in South Africa. We do not, however, regard the movement as "the authentic" representative of the South African people but rather as one authentic voice. Thirdly, we do not consider the maintenance of normal diplomatic and economic relations with South Africa as "collaboration" as operative paragraph 5 implies.

239. The remaining draft resolution on which we abstained is entitled "International Declaration against *Apartheid* in Sports" [A/32/L.32]. Let me express again the United States' opposition to *apartheid* in sports and reiterate our support of the Olympic principle that sporting events should be free of discrimination on the grounds of race, religion, or political affiliation. My Government has abstained because it would be impossible for us to implement and enforce several key elements of this resolution under United States law.

240. Finally, let me briefly note several reservations which my Government has concerning those draft resolutions which we have endorsed. These reservations include: our inability to support in its entirety the programme for the International Anti-*Apartheid* Year, and, our previously stated reservations regarding the Lagos Declaration for Action against *Apartheid* and the resolution adopted by the Second International Trade Union Conference for Action against *Apartheid*. In addition, the United States' position

on depoliticization of specialized agencies is well known, as is our constitutional inability to eliminate travel and personal contacts with areas of the world even when we do not officially recognize régimes in those areas.

241. In conclusion, let me simply express my hope that the positive votes of the United States on seven of the resolutions before us today will be seen by the international community as further evidence of the United States' commitment to positive change in South Africa through the eradication of *apartheid*.

242. Mr. VAYENAS (Greece): The Greek delegation has voted in favour of draft resolution A/32/L.25 together with other resolutions that have just been adopted by the General Assembly.

243. We wish, however, to place on record that we do not agree with the wording of the eighth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/32/L.25, which single out individual States, and that we would have abstained had a separate vote been taken on those paragraphs.

244. As regards our abstention on draft resolution A/32/L.30, may I add that again the formulation of certain paragraphs has prevented us from casting a positive vote, whereas the substance of the draft resolution corresponds fully with our views on the matter since our condemnation of *apartheid* is and remains unchanged.

245. Mr. DAWADI (Nepal): My delegation has always supported resolutions which strongly condemn all States collaborating with the *apartheid* régime in South Africa. In our view it will be difficult to eliminate the crime of *apartheid* so long as the racist régime is assisted by some States for their selfish interests in economic, trade and other fields.

246. Although the *apartheid* régime has been increasingly isolated, there are still some countries which continue to collaborate with it. As innumerable resolutions of the United Nations have, time and again, called upon all States to sever all relations with the *apartheid* régime, no arguments whatsoever to maintain such relations can be condoned.

247. As a founding member of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* my delegation is fully aware of our obligation. We have joined in sponsoring many of the draft resolutions relating to the item. However, we were unable to sponsor draft resolution A/32/L.23 because we continue to hold the view, as we have done in the past, that the practice of singling out one State for any action is not healthy. In our opinion, to try to isolate and condemn only one State is not justifiable. Therefore, my delegation could not support draft resolution A/32/L.23 and abstained in the vote on it. However, our abstention in no way should be interpreted or misunderstood as meaning that we approve of any activity contrary to United Nations resolutions by any State.

248. Mrs. ÜNAYDIN (Turkey): The Turkish delegation has voted in favour of all the draft resolutions just adopted concerning the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa.

249. We are disturbed, however, by the wording and nature of some of those draft resolutions. We are not convinced that any useful purpose is served by condemnatory language or by singling out one among several countries pursuing policies which contradict the resolutions of the United Nations.

250. Our purpose, nevertheless, in voting in favour of all the draft resolutions just adopted was to stress unambiguously our adamant opposition to the degrading and inhuman policies of *apartheid* and our strong support for effective measures against those policies.

251. Mr. DAYRELL DE LIMA (Brazil): My delegation has already reiterated on several occasions, from this very rostrum, the commitment of the Brazilian Government to the international community's struggle against the policies of *apartheid* followed by South Africa. We firmly reject in words and deeds the perpetuation of this iniquitous racist régime, whose nefarious consequences for peace and security in the area cause us most serious concern.

252. For that reason my delegation has sponsored several draft resolutions relating to the situation now prevailing in the southern African region, as dealt with under various items in this session's agenda, and has cast an affirmative vote on the draft resolutions directly pertaining to the question of *apartheid*—that is, draft resolutions A/32/L.20, A/32/L.21/Rev.1, A/32/L.22/Rev.2 and A/32/L.24 to A/32/L.33.

253. With reference to draft resolution A/32/L.26, entitled "Economic collaboration with South Africa", on which we voted in favour, my delegation would like to place it on record that the General Assembly's request in Operative paragraph 3 (e) of this draft resolution will receive the Brazilian Government's careful consideration, as its implementation is contingent upon a review of existing agreements.

254. Mr. AUKEN (Denmark): Denmark's position on the *apartheid* draft resolutions is presented in two general explanations of vote in which we participate—namely, the explanation of vote given by the representative of Belgium on behalf of the nine members of the European Community and the explanation of vote given by the representative of Sweden on behalf of the five Nordic countries. But in addition to those two regional statements, I should like to present the following reasons for the position Denmark has taken on the International Declaration against *Apartheid* in Sports [A/32/L.32 and Add.1, annex].

255. There can be no doubt about Denmark's stand on *apartheid*. Denmark has for many years and on many occasions condemned *apartheid* in strong and unequivocal terms. We consider *apartheid* to be an institutionalized and flagrant violation of basic human rights. It is a disgrace to mankind that a country still exists where citizens are deprived of fundamental human rights and forced into an inferior position solely because of the colour of their skin. The *apartheid* system not only is anachronistic and morally bankrupt, but it is also doomed to fail and constitutes a threat to peace. The international community must increase the pressure on South Africa to make it abandon its abhorrent policies before a catastrophe takes place.

256. But the measures proposed must take due account of the legal situation in all countries. The Government of Denmark has shown its clear stand on *apartheid* in sports by voting in favour of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly in 1975 and 1976, in which it was strongly recommended that relations with sporting teams and sportsmen of the *apartheid* system of South Africa be ended. But this year's Declaration against *Apartheid* in sports is more than a recommendation: we see it as a moral obligation for us to use the economic and political power of States to intervene in the decisions of sportsmen and sports organizations. Such steps would violate the existing legal system in Denmark and the traditional full independence of Danish sportsmen and their organizations. In Denmark it is up to the sportsmen and their organizations to decide with whom they will co-operate: it is their decision and their responsibility. It goes without saying that my Government would welcome it if they came to the conclusion that it would be in their own best interest to terminate co-operation in sports with South Africa.

257. There are instances where Denmark votes in the United Nations for draft resolutions even if it knows that it cannot fully implement them. We then state our reservations in an explanation of vote. But in the case of the Declaration against *Apartheid* in Sports, the gap between the moral obligations which this Declaration in our view imposes on States, on the one hand, and the severe limits on what my Government can do, on the other, led us, much to our regret, to the conclusion that we had to abstain.

258. This abstention changes nothing in our strong condemnation of *apartheid*; it is only a reflection of the fact that the Danish Government's possibilities of intervention in the field of sports are very limited.

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

260. With regard to the draft resolutions entitled "International Anti-*Apartheid* Year" and "Trade union action against *apartheid*", contained in documents A/32/L.21/Rev.1 and A/32/L.22/Rev.2, respectively, on which we voted in favour, I wish to state that there are some proposals in the programme for the International Anti-*Apartheid* Year and in the resolution adopted by the Second International Trade Union Conference for Action against *Apartheid* which we find difficult to support.

261. My delegation supported the adoption by consensus of the draft resolution entitled "Political prisoners in South Africa", contained in document A/32/L.24. In doing so, we interpreted its fourth preambular paragraph in the context of the judgement given by Security Council resolution 418 (1977).

262. My delegation also voted in favour of the draft resolution entitled "Military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa", contained in document A/32/L.25, because of our support for its essential objective. However, we consider that effective enforcement of some of the proposals is doubtful, and that the naming of specific countries is not desirable.

263. With regard to the draft resolution entitled "Economic collaboration with South Africa", contained in document A/32/L.26, my country has already been taking a number of measures to restrict our relations with South Africa, including in particular the prohibition of direct investments, as was explained in my delegation's statement at the plenary meeting on 14 November this year [68th meeting]. However, we find it difficult to support several proposals set forth in the draft resolution and therefore abstained in the vote on it.

264. With regard to the draft resolution entitled "Programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*", contained in document A/32/L.28, on which my delegation voted in favour, my delegation reserves its position regarding General Assembly resolution 31/6 J and other resolutions referred to in the programme of work, inasmuch as my delegation abstained in the vote on them. Regarding operative paragraph 8 (a) of the draft resolution, my delegation takes the same position as it has taken on draft resolution A/32/L.26.

265. My delegation voted against the draft resolution entitled "Assistance to the national liberation movement of South Africa", contained in document A/32/L.29, because the concept of the problem, as set forth in the draft resolution runs counter to my delegation's basic position, which is to support all efforts by appropriate peaceful means, for the eradication of *apartheid* and the establishment of a non-racial society in South Africa.

266. My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution entitled "International Declaration against *Apartheid* in Sports" contained in document A/32/L.32. However, I should like to state at this point that the implementation of some of the provisions of the Declaration may prove difficult.

267. With regard to the draft resolution entitled "Bantustans" [A/32/L.33], on which my delegation voted in favour, we support the main thrust of its operative paragraph 6, although there may be circumstances which cause some difficulties for us in implementing it in full. However, I wish to make it clear that it is the Japanese Government's policy not to recognize the so-called independence of Bophuthatswana or that of the Transkei.

268. Mr. CALDERON (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Mexican delegation voted in favour of all the draft resolutions submitted to the General Assembly for consideration, with the exception of draft resolution A/32/L.23, on which we abstained. In my delegation's opinion the condemnation of one single country in that draft resolution is not justified. In addition, this aspect of the problem has already been covered by draft resolutions A/32/L.25 and A/32/L.26 and by operative paragraph 5 of A/32/L.30.

269. The Mexican delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/32/L.29, although it has reservations with regard to certain aspects of the document. We believe that the measures referred to in it do not fall within the competence of the General Assembly.

270. Mr. ARNELLO (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Chile rejects and condemns racism and all forms of

racial discrimination. In Chile racism has never existed nor has there been any form of racial discrimination. It goes against the very nature of our people and it offends our consciences as free men. We condemn it because of our beliefs regarding the human person which spring from our humanitarian principles and which are essential to the international legal order, which Chile supports. We therefore reject and condemn *apartheid*, for it is based on racism and racial discrimination.

271. Chile also reiterates its rejection of the policy of bantustanization, and we have not recognized and will not recognize the so-called independence of any bantustan, which would be merely an additional means of implementing *apartheid* and of perpetuating it.

272. The votes of the delegation of Chile this afternoon have been in keeping with our humanitarian principles and the legal norms set forth in the United Nations Charter. It is our duty to condemn racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*, but we feel that that duty must be performed within the confines of the Charter. We supported all the draft resolutions, with only two exceptions, in spite of our reservations, based on the above-mentioned principles, to certain points in those two draft resolutions. That is how we wished to express our condemnation of *apartheid*. Despite our sincere desires, we had to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/32/L.23. Chile cannot agree that a single country should be singled out and discriminated against in circumstances in which there are other countries in a similar situation.

273. We did not participate in the vote on draft resolution A/32/L.29 solely because we feel that operative paragraph 3 is inconsistent with the purposes and principles of the Charter. We regret that a separate vote on that paragraph was not taken. That would have made it possible for us to support the draft resolution.

274. In spite of our reservations, we supported draft resolutions on which other delegations abstained. We wish that certain of the draft resolutions had been prepared more carefully and brought more closely into line with certain principles of the Charter. In that way, we could have avoided introducing certain terms which are in contradiction with the Charter; that might also have led to a complete consensus on all the draft resolutions on this item.

275. We believe that the moral basis of the condemnation of *apartheid* does not require statements which exceed the limits of the legal framework of the United Nations. Consequently, the delegation of Chile, in supporting draft resolutions A/32/L.20, A/32/L.21/Rev.1, A/32/L.24 to 28, and A/32/L.30 to A/32/L.33, must say that it has reservations to certain parts of some of those draft resolutions.

276. We have consistently recognized what are known as the national liberation movements when they are movements working for the independence of a country subject to a colonial régime and movements which, in addition, have been recognized by the regional organization. That was true of those in Africa recognized by the OAU. Our understanding is that the references to the national libera-

tion movement which appear in various resolutions are references to certain South African social sectors that are trying to achieve full recognition of the rights of the entire South African population, in particular, those rights denied by *apartheid*.

277. We consider that the expansion and implementation of resolutions adopted by the Security Council must be done by the Security Council under the express provisions of the Charter. For that reason, we have reservations regarding certain points contained in the resolutions just adopted. Those points go beyond what the Security Council has determined or that fall exclusively within the competence of that body.

278. Chile accepts no form of discrimination in sports. For that reason, we reject racial discrimination in sports, and *apartheid* entails a form of racial discrimination in such activities. But we must say that we have reservations on certain points in the Declaration adopted under operative paragraph 1 of A/32/L.32 which may go beyond the necessary and exclusive rejection of *apartheid* in sports.

279. Similarly we have reservations regarding certain agreements contained or mentioned in some resolutions which are neither directly nor indirectly connected with *apartheid* and refer to measures which, in any case, fall within the sole jurisdiction of the Security Council.

280. In explaining our votes the delegation of Chile wished to convey the fact that it fully supports the condemnation of *apartheid*. We have tried to explain the moral and legal foundation of our condemnation of *apartheid*. We also wanted to say that it is devotion to the principles of the Charter that has prompted us to support all the draft resolutions with two exceptions and to make the reservations that I have already explained.

281. It is our hope that the world-wide repudiation of the system of *apartheid* will lead to the triumph of justice in South Africa in the very near future.

282. Mr. RUDOLFSKY (Austria): Austria has on many occasions made clear her categorical rejection of the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa. The Austrian representative, during the debate on this item [72nd meeting], clearly restated the Austrian position.

283. Austria is of the opinion that the Government of South Africa and the people who support that Government and its policies must be brought to understand that this system of *apartheid* is not, and can never form, the basis for a viable society; that the system in itself in the end is self-destructive and that the entire community of States is opposed to this system.

284. We believe that the unanimous, or quasi-unanimous, adoption of the various resolutions passed by this Assembly on this subject would enhance the chances for an early termination of the *apartheid* policies. With this in mind, my delegation has voted in favour of the majority of the draft resolutions presented to this Assembly, although my Government sustains reservations to certain formulations.

285. My Government regrets that the content and wording of other resolutions, partly for constitutional and legal

considerations, or because of an incompatibility with fundamental principles guiding Austrian foreign policy, have not allowed us to support them.

286. Mr. ESFANDIARY (Iran): The Iranian delegation, in line with its long-established policy against racism, has already expressed, during the general debate, its abhorrence of the policy of *apartheid* which the Government of South Africa continues to pursue. We have already voiced our deep concern that unless speedy and effective action is taken for the total and full eradication of *apartheid*, the whole of South Africa might be engulfed in bloodshed. To this end, the United Nations should take all practical measures in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter to assist in the elimination of *apartheid* in South Africa. Until this is achieved, the United Nations should also do its utmost to alleviate the suffering under which the victims of *apartheid* continue to languish.

287. In the light of the foregoing, the Iranian delegation has voted in favour of draft resolutions A/32/L.20, L.21/Rev.1, L.22/Rev.2, L.24, L.25, L.27, L.28 and L.31 to L.33.

288. At the same time, some of the paragraphs in documents A/32/L.23, L.26, L.29 and L.30, as formulated, are not acceptable to my delegation. In our view, measures relating to Chapter VII of the Charter must originate from the Security Council. In the absence of such action by the Security Council, it would be illusory to expect the desired results on which we are all united. Therefore, we abstained in the vote on those draft resolutions.

289. The Iranian delegation fully supports the objectives of draft resolution A/32/L.30, but the language used in some paragraphs made us abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole. As for draft resolution A/32/L.29 entitled "Assistance to the national liberation movement of South Africa", the Iranian delegation fully supports the idea in principle that the international community should aid and assist the national liberation movement in its struggle for eradication of *apartheid*. But such help and assistance should be made within established norms and under the Charter of the United Nations and general principles of international law.

290. Having said this, I wish once again to reaffirm our steadfast stand against *apartheid* and the evil it has cast on Africa.

291. Mr. QUARTIN-SANTOS (Portugal): Allow me to explain very briefly the vote cast by the Portuguese delegation on the draft resolution entitled "International Declaration against *Apartheid* in Sports" [A/32/L.32] just adopted by the General Assembly.

292. Portugal has made very clear its unequivocal opposition to any form of racial discrimination and *apartheid* as being in total contradiction with the feelings and character of the Portuguese people and with the democratic nature of its Constitution and political institutions. This also applies, of course, to the different forms of enforcement of the *apartheid* policy in the field of sports.

293. We would be ready to contribute, within the limits of our constitutional and legal system, to the eradication of

apartheid in sports. However, we think that several provisions of the above-mentioned draft, because of what we consider a certain lack of realism, are not the most appropriate means for the attainment of that goal.

294. Therefore, my delegation, to its regret, was forced to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/32/L.32.

295. Mr. MANSUVAN (Thailand): My delegation has voted in favour of the draft resolution on the subject of military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, document A/32/L.25. However, we have some reservation on the language used in operative paragraph 2, especially the reference to the three Member States which were deliberately singled out. Therefore, had there been a separate vote on operative paragraph 2, we would have abstained.

296. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of Nigeria, who wishes to make a statement in his capacity as Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*.

297. Mr. HARRIMAN (Nigeria), Chairman, Special Committee against *Apartheid*: Mr. President, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to say a few words as Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, at what we might regard as the conclusion of the consideration of the question of *apartheid* in South Africa. I recall that one draft resolution on investments has been delayed for later consideration.

298. The resolutions on *apartheid* adopted at this session of the General Assembly, as well as the related resolutions adopted on other agenda items, constitute a new stage in international commitment against the inhuman and criminal system of *apartheid* and in support of the oppressed people and their national liberation movement.

299. The General Assembly has once more endorsed the Lagos Declaration of the World Conference for Action against *Apartheid*, a declaration of conscience by Governments and peoples of the world, and a call to eradicate *apartheid* by international action as the slave trade was abolished in the last century. For *apartheid* is nothing but a refined system of slavery.

300. The Assembly has proclaimed an International Anti-*Apartheid* Year, beginning on 21 March 1978 to concert all international efforts against *apartheid*.

301. The resolutions, indeed, call for action campaigns—by Governments, intergovernmental organizations, trade unions, churches and other public organizations—on all aspects of the struggle against *apartheid* and for the liberation of South Africa. The Assembly has called for the total isolation of the *apartheid* régime in the military, economic, political and other fields; for moral and material assistance to the national liberation movement of South Africa; for educational and humanitarian assistance to the victims of *apartheid*; for campaigns for the release of the fighters for freedom who are imprisoned, detained and restricted by the *apartheid* régime; for the boycott of *apartheid* sports teams; for the enforcement of the International Convention for the Suppression and Punishment of

the Crime of *Apartheid*; and for the total mobilization of public opinion in all countries in support of international action.

302. We are glad that the resolutions have obtained greater support this year than in the past, especially from the Western Powers. But the Western Powers have still a long way to go before they can align themselves fully with the vast majority of Member States and join in the concerted action against *apartheid*. We do hope that those concerned will reconsider their positions in the light of the grave developments in South Africa and in the light of the resolutions adopted today.

303. I would like to note with special satisfaction that the Government of the United States of America has moved forward quite substantially from its most disappointing performance at the previous session of the General Assembly.

304. We recognize—and the Vorster régime fully recognizes—that the policies and actions of the United States will have a great effect on the evolution of the situation in South Africa. This country has a special responsibility as a great Power and, may I add, as the homeland of the second largest community of people of African origin in the world. This is the nation that produced Mr. DuBois, the pioneer of Pan-Africanism, and the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., so well known for his human rights activities, for which he died. But its past record in South Africa has been a negation of its best traditions. We believe that the conscience of the people of this great country has been stirred at last by the recent events in southern Africa, and there is a greater disposition to look afresh at the long-range interests of the country.

305. We hope that the leaders of this country will exert their influence in favour of the forces of freedom and liberty in South Africa, and give a lead to the Western world. They have lagged behind; they have been led by the smaller nations, the Nordic countries. They have the power to shorten the struggle and minimize the bloodshed and suffering in the course of the inevitable transformation of South Africa. History will not forget great countries like the United States if they do not move forward in their commitment to free the suffering and enslaved people.

306. We hope for an international community in which all men and women can live together in harmony, in a society in which the pigment of the skin or so-called racial origins do not assign superiority or inferiority. This is what we are seeking to achieve.

307. History has destined them—the liberation fighters in South Africa—to wage the last and most difficult battle for the emancipation of the continent of Africa and, indeed, for the liberation of peoples from the inseparable evils of colonialism and racism. History has destined the black people of South Africa to carry on this long and painful struggle, holding up for all the world the banner of faith in the future. Their struggle is the struggle of Africa; the struggle of the two thirds of humanity which has suffered the ravages of colonialism, not to speak of slavery; and indeed, the struggle of all humanity. It is irresistible and irrepressible.

308. It is perhaps a coincidence—but one whose significance is clear to us all—that the General Assembly has taken action against *apartheid* today, on the seventeenth anniversary of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. For the struggle for the liberation of South Africa is inextricably linked with the struggles for the liberation of Namibia and Zimbabwe and of all the colonial territories and peoples.

309. Let me make it clear—in view of the massive propaganda launched by the *apartheid* régime—that liberation is a positive act, an affirmation of the right of self-determination of all the people of South Africa, irrespective of race, colour or creed. It is the attainment by the black people of South Africa—the great majority of which has been enslaved and dispossessed over the centuries, which was callously excluded from the constitutional dispensations in 1910 and 1961—of the right to participate as equals in the determination of the destiny of the nation. It is freedom and democracy not only for the black people of South Africa, but for all the people of that land.

310. We are not moved by the shrill cries of the racists that the choice is between majority rule and the survival of the “white nation”. They are nothing but the screams of a spoiled child of the West which seeks sympathy on the grounds that it has become an orphan after killing its parents.

311. We recognize no “white nation” in South Africa because we cannot condone the classification of human beings by the colour of their skin. Africa has many colours, even many shades of black. As a Head of State of Africa declared recently, Africa will not be all black, nor will Europe be all white.

312. The national liberation movement of South Africa has repeatedly declared—with the full endorsement of Africa and the world—that South Africa belongs to all its people and that all those who demonstrate their loyalty to Africa are Africans.

313. On this occasion, we send our greetings to the oppressed people of South Africa, to all those struggling against the crime of *apartheid* and especially to all those imprisoned or restricted for their participation in that struggle.

314. We greet Nelson Mandela, the great African patriot, whose sixtieth birthday will be observed all over the world next year.

315. We greet Robert Mangaliso Sobukwe, who has suffered imprisonment and restrictions for over 17 years, and who is still being harassed today on his sickbed.

316. We greet Dorothy Nyembe, the brave African woman in prison, who has been honoured this year by the Ceres medal of FAO.

317. We greet the hundreds of political prisoners and banned persons—people of all racial origins, professions and ideologies—and tell them that we shall not rest until they are free, until their beloved country is liberated.

318. In the resolutions adopted today, the General Assembly has assigned many responsibilities to the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, as the body which has been charged with co-ordinating the international campaign against *apartheid* under the auspices of the United Nations.

319. On behalf of the Special Committee, I wish to declare that we accept these responsibilities in all modesty and solemnity, with faith and determination. We express our gratitude to all Member States for their confidence, and for their commendation of the accomplishments of the Special Committee.

320. The Special Committee—a small and dedicated body of this Organization—needs even greater co-operation of all Governments, organizations and institutions in discharging its enhanced responsibilities. I take this opportunity to address an earnest appeal for such co-operation.

321. I would make special mention of the request addressed to the Special Committee to promote the full implementation of the arms embargo against South Africa. The decision of the Security Council on 4 November to institute a mandatory arms embargo has been hailed as a historic move. The embargo must be effectively implemented and must be seen as the first step in a comprehensive programme of action.

322. I am today addressing a public appeal to all concerned to acquaint the Special Committee with all breaches of the arms embargo. I recall with appreciation that several employees in arms factories in several Western countries have on grounds of conscience refused to work on military orders from the *apartheid* régime. I appeal to all workers in those factories, to seamen and to dockers, to journalists and others, especially in the Western countries, to be vigilant in support of the United Nations decision on an arms embargo. Let us not deceive ourselves. No one must connive or acquiesce in the supply of weapons to those guilty of the massacres of Sharpeville and Soweto.

323. The problem of *apartheid* is and must be a matter of utmost priority for this Organization, as it is for the OAU and the non-aligned movement. *Apartheid* in South Africa is not only the core of the problem in southern Africa but has much wider significance for humanity.

324. The General Assembly has pledged—in resolution 3411 B (XXX) of 28 November 1975—that it will devote increasing attention and all necessary resources to concert international efforts for the speedy eradication of *apartheid* and the liberation of the South African people.

325. Any racial conflagration in South Africa will not be limited to South Africa. If today blacks are subjected to a *pogrom* in South Africa, reverberations will be felt in this country and in the Diaspora. If tomorrow whites are slaughtered in South Africa because of their madness, reverberations will be felt throughout the world, wherever there is a black community. It is an international problem. It is a threat to international peace and security.

326. The International Anti-Apartheid Year must be observed all over the world so as to heighten the level of international action against *apartheid* and bring that obnoxious system to an end. It must be not a year of mere statements and resolutions, but a year of action. There

must be action by Governments and mobilization of the public. There must be a vigorous effort to end all external involvement in *apartheid* and to effect a substantial increase in assistance to the oppressed people and their national liberation movement.

327. The Special Committee pledges its utmost efforts to make the Year meaningful. I should like to address an earnest appeal to all Governments, organizations and information media for their co-operation with the Special Committee and their full participation in the International Year.

328. I address a special appeal to churches, religious organizations and all men and women of conscience. There is no nobler task for them today than to lead a crusade against the blasphemy of racism and oppression.

329. I appeal to trade unions all over the world, confident of their support in all our efforts against the oppression of black workers in South Africa.

330. I appeal to students and to young people to join us in this struggle to build a saner world for the future.

331. I make a special personal appeal to all people of African origin all over the world. This century began with the first Pan Africanist Congress of 1900, which pledged solidarity to end the centuries of murder and humiliation of the black people. We recall the prophetic words of Mr. DuBois that the problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the colour line. The founders of Pan-Africanism have beckoned to us to redeem not only Africa, but humanity as a whole.

332. We are today on the threshold of victory, and the crucial struggle is in South Africa. We now have many friends all over the world. And we shall overcome.

333. Before I conclude I wish to refer to a message from the President of the Republic of Gambia which the Secretary-General has communicated to the Chairman of the Special Committee. He has suggested that the anniversary of the murder of Steven Biko be observed with a pledge by Member States to institute effective measures against the system of *apartheid* and the *apartheid* régime. The martyrdom of Steven Biko is an event that has opened the eyes of millions of people to the inhumanity of the practitioners of *apartheid* and to the need for urgent action to destroy the system of *apartheid*. Many Steven Bikos die almost daily. There are many unknown Steven Bikos. I commend the suggestion of the President of Gambia, Al-Haji Sir Dawda Jawara, to all Member States and assure them that the Special Committee will take all appropriate action.

334. At this late hour I do not wish to continue to speak, but unfortunately I regret I must say a few words about the extraordinary statement made by the representative of Israel at this meeting. In my statement of 21 November [76th meeting] I explained quite clearly why the Special Committee had been obliged to make a special report on Israel and South Africa. On that occasion I said that as soon as Israel informed the Assembly that it had ceased to collaborate with the *apartheid* régime Nigeria would be only too happy to work towards withdrawing separate resolutions and co-operating with Israel in the discharge of

its responsibility towards the emancipation of the oppressed peoples of South Africa. I had intended at this meeting to renew that appeal to Israel because of our desire to secure united and concerted action by all the nations of the world for the eradication of *apartheid*. We had hoped that the decision of the former Government of Israel in 1976 to enter into a series of agreements with the *apartheid* régime and to supply it with military equipment was an aberration. We had hoped that good sense would prevail and the Government of Israel would look at its long-term interests, especially in Africa, at a time when important moves towards peace were taking place in the Middle East. But today the representative of Israel has treated us to a statement that has surpassed all precedents in the reckless use of epithets directed against the Special Committee, against this Organization and against States Members which have voted for the draft resolutions put before them.

335. What he has avoided are the very specific matters I raised in my statement of 21 November. I shall not stoop to the level of the representative of Israel. I shall not even take the time of this Assembly to comment on the figures he used concerning trade and investment. If trade between Israel and South Africa is so infinitesimal, as he claims, why does he continue to disregard the wishes of Africa?

336. But we were not talking about trade. The resolution is quite clear. We were talking about collaboration.

337. He has also chosen to quote a report from the *Wall Street Journal* and has even distorted it. Let me not comment on the background of the reporting journalist. How can the Ambassador of Israel sincerely say that Nigeria is dealing and trading with South Africa when he bases his remarks on a report which in part reads as follows:

"South Africa also trades clandestinely with such powerful African nations as Nigeria, it is asserted here. 'We send quite a lot of foodstuffs by ship,' says a trading company executive. 'They stop at Cotonou or Lomé (ports in small neighbouring countries) and the stuff is discharged and then brought in on fishing boats or by road into Nigeria.'"

338. If South Africa claims it has engaged in smuggling into Nigeria, we shall deal with that. But if the Ambassador of Israel considers that to be trading, I am very saddened by his capacity to distort the facts.

339. He quoted this professor as saying further that a major industrial company in South Africa had just signed a \$2 million or \$3 million—he is not very certain—contract with Nigerian interests to help set up an engineering shop there, supplying it with machinery made in South Africa. I can assure the Assembly that my Government is seized with this matter, and if there is any such company in existence, it is breaking the laws of Nigeria. Just as many Europeans who have smuggled currency out of Nigeria have been dealt with, they also will be dealt with under the laws of Nigeria.

340. Let me declare on behalf of Nigeria that we welcome any inquiry into allegations concerning trade between South Africa and Nigeria. But we know the writers of these documents. We know how much has been paid in this country by South Africa to distort the true image of that country, to place South Africa in the good books of the

capitalists of this country and of Western Europe. I am sure that no sensible Member of this Organization will be taken in by such paid propaganda of lies—to use the words of the Ambassador of Israel.

341. In the case of Israel we are not dealing with infractions of a boycott or even a failure to cut off trade with South Africa; the Government of Israel had deliberately encouraged increasing collaboration in all fields—military, political, economic, sports and cultural. The Ambassador took refuge in trade statistics and I feel certain that he knows that, owing to the orientation of the colonial infrastructure of many southern African States, such States cannot reorient their trade pattern overnight. They are hostages of colonialism. But he quotes statistics instead of trying to prove his own case.

342. I refer in particular to military collaboration. The Security Council called for an arms embargo against South Africa as early as 1963. As early as 1966 the OAU Assembly declared that any supply of arms to South Africa was a hostile act against the whole of Africa. The reference at that time was to France and African States have repeatedly pressed France to cease its export of arms. But, aware of the resolutions of the United Nations and the OAU, Israel decided deliberately in 1976, the year of the Soweto massacre, and shortly after, flagrantly to violate the arms embargo and to supply sophisticated military equipment to South Africa. That was proudly announced. It was Israel which flung the challenge to the United Nations and the OAU. It has not been singled out; it has singled itself out.

343. Nigeria, for its part, will never remain silent and idle when any country engages in arms trade with South Africa. We have waited for a categorical statement from Israel—even after Security Council resolution 418 (1977) of 4 November—that it would totally stop military collaboration with South Africa; but the declarations from Israel have been equivocal.

344. The Special Committee in the discharge of its mandate has been in contact with many Member States in an effort to persuade them to cease collaboration with the *apartheid* régime. Even in the past few weeks I had occasion to contact a number of States from all continents, including African States. The Committee has also communicated with Israel, but that country had utterly no regard for our communications. I may recall that in 1973 when Israel operated its diplomatic mission to South Africa in South Africa the Special Committee wrote to Israel but received no reply.

345. I regret having had to take the time of the General Assembly on this matter but I should like again to appeal to Israel to abandon diversions and reassess its policy. I hope that it does not see its future as an enemy of African liberation and an ally of the *apartheid* régime. I spoke at the last meeting of our hopes of friendship and co-operation between the black people and the Jewish people which have both suffered grievously from racism. Nigeria has repeatedly expressed its hope for a just and lasting settlement in the Middle East. It is up to the Government of Israel to make up its mind.

The meeting rose at 8.15 p.m.