

## Chapter V

### Africa

The apartheid policies of South Africa and ways to bring them to an end remained under active consideration during 1981 in several United Nations bodies (see below). The General Assembly continued to urge the imposition of mandatory sanctions and the Security Council denounced South Africa's bantustanization policy. An International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris in May, adopted a Declaration on Sanctions.

No progress was reported in efforts to bring about independence for Namibia through implementation of a plan approved by the Security Council in 1978 (p. 1126).

The Assembly condemned South Africa's aggression against neighbouring States, in particular against Angola and Seychelles (p. 214). While Angola's complaint to the Security Council against South Africa did not result in the adoption of a resolution (p. 217), the Council condemned the armed attack against Seychelles carried out in November by mercenaries and established a commission of inquiry to investigate the incident (p. 226).

Charges of South African attacks against Lesotho and Mozambique (p. 221), the situation in Chad (p. 222) and relations between Egypt, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Sudan (p. 225) were the subject of letters from those States to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council.

The Assembly reaffirmed the sovereignty of the Comoros over the island of Mayotte and invited the Comoros and France to continue talks for a just solution (p. 223). Assembly consideration of a dispute between France and Madagascar over the status of several Malagasy islands in the Indian Ocean was postponed until 1982 (p. 225).

The United Nations and the Organization of African Unity continued their co-operation on a number of matters aimed at the elimination of colonialism and apartheid in Africa and the accelerated development of African countries (p. 228).

### South Africa and apartheid

The General Assembly continued in 1981 to call insistently for an end to the racial separation policies enforced by the Government of South Africa under the name of apartheid

Throughout the year, the Assembly's Special Committee against Apartheid mobilized international campaigns to apply pressure on South Africa and to block various forms of collaboration with that country's régime.

Following a debate in plenary meetings, the Assembly adopted 16 resolutions on apartheid on 17 December. By the first of these,<sup>(4)</sup> it urged the Security Council to determine that the situation in South Africa constituted a grave threat to international peace and security, and to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria régime.

This call for sanctions was repeated in another text by which the Assembly also called on Governments to sever all relations with South Africa.<sup>(7)</sup> By a resolution condemning South Africa's acts of aggression against Angola, Seychelles and other African States, the Assembly urged the Council to adopt effective measures under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations (on action with respect to threats to the peace breaches of the peace and acts of aggression).<sup>(6)</sup> It repeated an earlier request that the Council consider imposing a mandatory oil embargo,<sup>(10)</sup> and urged it to consider effective measures to strengthen the existing arms embargo<sup>(9)</sup> and secure the immediate cessation of military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa.<sup>(8)</sup> It also demanded that Israel terminate all such collaboration.<sup>(16)</sup> In the economic sphere, it again urged the Council to consider steps to achieve the cessation of foreign investments and loans.<sup>(18)</sup> The termination of all collaboration by transnational corporations with South Africa was called for by the Economic and Social Council on 2 November.<sup>(2)</sup>

To mobilize support for such efforts, the Assembly proclaimed 1982 the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa<sup>(5)</sup> and authorized the Committee against Apartheid to organize in 1982 an International Conference of Trade Unions on Sanctions against South Africa.<sup>(11)</sup>

The Assembly took a series of steps to mobilize public action against apartheid. It endorsed a proposal for national and international conferences and exhibits to promote such action by academic, cultural and sports personalities, as part of a boycott of South Africa in these fields.<sup>(12)</sup> It moved to encourage action by non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the mass media in

the international campaign against apartheid including mobilization of support for sanctions.<sup>(15)</sup> In approving the work programme of the Committee against Apartheid, the Assembly made a special allocation for projects to promote the international campaign.<sup>(17)</sup>

The Security Council and the Assembly denounced South Africa's 4 December proclamation of the Ciskei, a bantustan, as a so-called independent State (p. 193).

The members of the Council, in a statement by its President on 5 February 1981, expressed grave concern over death sentences handed down by a South African court in November 1980 against three men charged with attacks on a bank and a police station (p. 195).

In the latest of a series of resolutions on political prisoners in South Africa, the Assembly demanded again that the Pretoria régime refrain from executing persons sentenced for acts arising from opposition to apartheid and release all political prisoners.<sup>(13)</sup> It invited co-operation in promoting solidarity with and assistance to the women and children of South Africa.<sup>(14)</sup> The Assembly appealed for contributions to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, which aided refugees from that country as well as persons persecuted under repressive and discriminatory legislation there.<sup>(19)</sup>

The Economic and Social Council, the Commission on Human Rights and its Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities dealt with human rights violations in South Africa, including death sentences, political prisoners, and women and children under apartheid (p. 943).

Concerned about the burden placed on host countries by student refugees from South Africa and Namibia, the Assembly, on 16 December, urged generous contributions to the assistance programmes for those refugees in southern Africa.<sup>(3)</sup> The United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa was giving scholarship aid to 533 persons from South Africa (p. 212).

Twice during the year, in March and September, the Assembly approved recommendations by its Credentials Committee to reject credentials submitted by South Africa (p. 163).

The Committee against Apartheid continued to review the apartheid policies of South Africa and their international repercussions. Meeting throughout the year, it carried out its mandate from the Assembly to promote the dissemination of information on the evils of apartheid and the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa, to encourage full implementation of United Nations resolutions on the subject by all Governments and organizations, to promote public

action and campaigns supporting the national liberation movement of South Africa, and to promote concerted action by Governments and organizations in the international mobilization against apartheid.

In its annual report,<sup>(1)</sup> transmitted to the Assembly on 9 October, the Committee summarized its activities and presented a series of conclusions and recommendations, many of which were incorporated into Assembly resolutions. It also submitted two special reports: on relations between Israel and South Africa (p. 192), and on the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa (p. 177).

A review of developments in South Africa since October 1980, annexed to the Committee's report, stated that mass resistance to apartheid had attained new heights and greater effectiveness. Organized and sustained struggles had taken place on several fronts, including a nationwide uprising against the Republic Day festivities in May, a widespread revolt by black students against racial discrimination in education, an unprecedented wave of strikes by black workers demanding a living wage and trade union rights, bus boycotts and rent strikes, and struggles against forced removals and relocation of communities in urban and rural areas. A significant feature of 1981 had been the growing unity in action among the various struggling sectors of the population.

The régime, however, was pursuing its policy of repression, terror and propaganda, the review continued. Political arrests, detentions, trials, torture, bannings, banishments, police attacks, intimidation and other forms of repression had intensified. Six freedom fighters had been sentenced to death. The Government had accelerated the implementation of its policy of bantustanization. Its aggression against neighbouring States had intensified. There were increased military contacts and co-operation between South Africa and some military establishments in Western Europe, North America, Latin America, Israel and Taiwan.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22 & Corr.1. Resolutions:

Economic and Social Council: <sup>(2)</sup>1981/86, 2 Nov. (p. 190).  
General Assembly: <sup>(3)</sup>36/170, 16 Dec. (p. 211); <sup>(4)</sup>36/172 A (p. 161), <sup>(5)</sup>36/172 B (p. 1781), <sup>(6)</sup>36/172 C (p. 216), <sup>(7)</sup>36/172 D (p. 171), <sup>(8)</sup>36/172 E (p. 185), <sup>(9)</sup>36/172 F (p. 174), <sup>(10)</sup>36/172 G (p. 177), <sup>(11)</sup>36/172 H (p. 180), <sup>(12)</sup>36/172 I (p. 203), <sup>(13)</sup>36/172 J (p. 198), <sup>(14)</sup>36/172 K (p. 199), <sup>(15)</sup>36/172 L (p. 206), <sup>(16)</sup>36/172 M (p. 193), <sup>(17)</sup>36/172 N (p. 213), <sup>(18)</sup>36/172 O (p. 187), <sup>(19)</sup>36/172 P (p. 212), 17 Dec.

Meeting records: GA, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 101-103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.).

### General aspects

COMMUNICATIONS. By a letter of 2 January 1981 to the Secretary-General,<sup>(4)</sup> South Africa

transmitted a letter of 1 January from its Minister for Foreign Affairs and Information dismissing as superficial and contemptible the resolutions on South Africa and apartheid adopted by the General Assembly in 1980. The Minister stated that the resolutions did not reflect the situation in South Africa, a dynamic society working at its major problem of accommodating the national aspirations of all its peoples in a way that would ensure advancement for all while avoiding conflict. Proposed sanctions would hurt South African blacks and Western investors.

Cuba, by a note verbale of 5 June to the Secretary-General,<sup>(3)</sup> transmitted a communiqué adopted by the extraordinary plenary meeting of the non-aligned countries, held in New York on 4 June, condemning the intensification of repression in South Africa, noting with grave concern the support of South African policies and practices by the United States, and reiterating its solidarity with the struggle of the oppressed South African people.

By a letter of 26 August to the Secretary-General,<sup>(1)</sup> the Acting Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid transmitted a Committee statement of the same day drawing urgent attention to the recent detention and trial of numerous persons and the death sentences passed against six freedom fighters (p. 196); it called for urgent and effective international action for the total isolation of the apartheid régime and for full support to the South African national liberation movement.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. The first of the resolutions on South Africa and apartheid which the General Assembly adopted on 17 December<sup>(7)</sup> dealt with the situation in South Africa and its international implications. Several of its provisions were elaborated upon in other resolutions of the same date.

The Assembly urged the Security Council to impose mandatory sanctions against South Africa and called for urgent measures to terminate all political, diplomatic, economic, trade, military, nuclear and other collaboration with that régime (p. 168). It condemned the actions of States which had increased their relations with South Africa, as well as transnational corporations and other organizations which collaborated with the régime and apartheid institutions. It appealed for assistance to the national liberation movement (p. 209) and reaffirmed the legitimacy of the anti-apartheid struggle by the South African people, including armed struggle. It vehemently condemned South Africa for repeated acts of aggression, subversion and terrorism against African States (p. 215) and denounced the "independence" proclamation of the Ciskei, a bantustan (p. 194).

On human rights aspects, it condemned South Africa for its brutal repression and the imposition of death sentences, demanded prisoner-of-war treatment for captured freedom fighters (p. 197), appealed to States to accede to the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid<sup>(6)</sup> (p. 946), and reaffirmed the United Nations commitment to the total eradication of apartheid and the establishment of a democratic society in South Africa.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 115 to 12, with 16 abstentions.

Introducing the 39-nation resolution, Nigeria recalled that the United Nations had repeatedly endorsed the aspirations of the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement, and remained committed to the establishment of a democratic society in which all the people would enjoy equal and full human rights and participate freely in determining their destiny. The South African régime, however, had increased its repression; six freedom fighters were under sentence of death; the Government had proceeded with its bantustanization policy in a vain attempt to deprive the African majority of its citizenship, and had engaged in numerous acts of aggression, terrorism and destabilization against several other countries. The United Nations Charter provided sufficient authority for decisive action.

While all States participating in the Assembly debate voiced strong opposition to South Africa's apartheid policies, a number of them, such as Australia (abstaining), the Bahamas, Brazil and Costa Rica (in favour) and the United States (against), objected to some of the language in this resolution and others on apartheid, on the ground that it prevented the Assembly from reaching the desired consensus. Australia, Austria, the Bahamas, Botswana, Greece, Indonesia, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway (for the Nordic States), Portugal, Samoa, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States found unsuitable the references to certain countries in this and other resolutions; the United States characterized as a despicable perversion of the truth the provision that its Government's pronouncements, policies and actions had encouraged South Africa to undertake its criminal acts. Solomon Islands abstained because of references to individual countries and Fiji voted in favour but with reservations on this point. Also voting positively, Thailand voiced reservations on the paragraph singling out the United States, and Ecuador said it would have abstained on that paragraph if there had been a separate vote.

Explaining their negative vote, several speakers, including Canada, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal and the United King-

dom, the last speaking for the member States of the European Community (EC), objected to the endorsement of armed struggle. Australia, Austria, Ireland, Norway (for the Nordic States) and Spain abstained because they could not support such an endorsement. Argentina and Papua New Guinea, though supporting the text, also reserved their position on this point. Fiji said it had no difficulty in supporting the provision to the extent that it advocated abandonment of apartheid through a process that would allow peaceful change.

Objections or reservations about the provision on sanctions were voiced by Botswana, Ireland, Lesotho, Spain and Swaziland (p. 168). Canada and the Netherlands objected to provisions on assistance to national liberation movements (p. 209). Argentina and the Netherlands had reservations on the provision concerning captured freedom fighters (p. 197).

During the debate, speakers generally condemned apartheid in South Africa as a criminal violation of human rights and demanded prompt international action for its eradication.

In Hungary's opinion, South Africa's apartheid policy had been the greatest political and moral challenge to the United Nations for many years. India said the question of apartheid was still the central issue facing the General Assembly, even after decades of discussions in various forums aimed at eliminating that pernicious evil. What distinguished apartheid from any other human rights violation and justified the world's insistent concern, said Ireland, was the fact that a racist theory had been adopted as a fundamental political principle for a whole society. Kenya observed that the United Nations had been founded to prevent such a situation from arising. Liberia charged that each time the issue of apartheid came up for debate by the international community, South Africa engaged in acts of defiance of United Nations policies. The more appeals the United Nations made, said Senegal, the more South Africa redoubled its efforts to consolidate the apartheid system.

As a result of apartheid, Bulgaria said, more than 3 million people had been uprooted from their homes and suffered untold misery, and the vast majority of the South African population was denied its right to equal education, health services and other benefits. In the view of Cyprus, apartheid was an affront to the United Nations and humanity as a whole. Finland regarded it as the most systematic and massive violation of human rights, while Saudi Arabia called it the basest form of degradation in society. Iran viewed it as a manifestation of materialism. Mexico remarked that no alleged legality, no so-called respect for freedom of expression or

for political organization could be invoked as being above the principles of equality, justice and human dignity which had to be restored in South Africa.

Sierra Leone expressed deep concern over the apparent disparity between the international community's overwhelming support for resolutions calling for action against apartheid and their implementation once adopted; the end result of that dichotomy was not only the perpetuation of apartheid but also the loss of the Assembly's credibility. Bahrain, Brazil, and Trinidad and Tobago expressed a similar view.

In Angola's view, the situation would not change unless the international community forced all States to observe and implement the countless resolutions on the subject. In view of South Africa's inflexible position, said Austria, the international community would doubtless consider further measures under the United Nations Charter to bring about the long-overdue change in that country's policy. Bhutan believed that only through joint and individual action by the international community, particularly by key Western countries, could South Africa be coerced into abandoning apartheid. Ghana felt the time had come for States to pronounce themselves against apartheid or risk most of their relations with the rest of Africa. Vanuatu thought United Nations decisions and international public opinion had been ignored far too long by those profiting from South Africa's system of exploitation. Viet Nam said a solution to the South Africa situation could not be postponed; the struggle of the people concerned and the international efforts to eliminate apartheid were entering a particularly urgent and complex phase, which could be decisive.

Many States were of the view that South Africa was enabled to persist in its apartheid policy because of the support it received from outside. Thus, the United Republic of Cameroon regretted that certain Powers, whose dedication to the ideals of freedom, human rights and justice was well known, had let themselves be caught in a web of economic and geostrategic interests, enabling South Africa to defy the entire international community.

Australia urged delegations to seek language in Assembly resolutions that would attract universal support as well as leave South Africa in no doubt that its policies were condemned by all United Nations Members; references commending armed struggle, or mentioning the purported errors of others in support of Pretoria, did nothing to enhance the deliberations.

Somalia felt there had been noticeable progress in recent years, and particularly over the previous 12 months, in establishing and shaping

international mechanisms to combat South Africa's racial policies, especially at the grass-roots level of NGOs and concerned individuals; however, in the face of increasing repression, the need for concerted action to eradicate apartheid had never been more apparent.

According to Cuba, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and others, repression in South Africa had intensified, in disregard of repeated United Nations resolutions. Madagascar thought that, despite protestations to the contrary, no progress had been made that reflected the desire of the international community for the establishment of racial equality, justice, freedom and peace in South Africa.

Bangladesh believed that the problem created by apartheid had two components, humanitarian and political, which could not be treated in isolation from each other. Other States mentioned the economic aspect, exemplified by the dependence of the apartheid system on cheap labour.

In Finland's opinion, South Africa's isolation would only deepen as long as apartheid persisted, with internal and external violence as an inevitable consequence. Djibouti, Sweden and others held a similar position. New Zealand thought South Africa could not keep the majority of its people under subjugation for long; if there was to be an evolutionary and relatively peaceful solution, the Government had to begin to bring about genuine change.

Many States expressed concern at South Africa's rapidly expanding military budget. Noting that the country's current defence spending had risen by 30 per cent over the previous year, Nepal said the aim was to keep the rulers safe from their own people and to carry out aggression against neighbouring States.

Apartheid was regarded by many, including Algeria, Bulgaria, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mongolia, Morocco, the Niger, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Tunisia, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zambia, as a threat to international peace and security. Haiti feared that, unless all States redoubled their efforts to deal the final blows to apartheid, the parties might resort to extreme measures and the conflict might spill over South Africa's borders and extend throughout Africa and even beyond.

Czechoslovakia said recent reforms which had softened some external aspects of apartheid could only be called cosmetic, since they had not touched such areas as education, the economy, health and sports; the racist leaders were merely changing tactics to gain time, compensate for political losses, halt the spread of the national

liberation struggle and resolve the problem of southern Africa on a neo-colonialist basis. Albania, Australia, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Egypt, Finland, the Gambia, Ghana, Ireland, the Netherlands, Singapore, the Sudan, Uganda, the Ukrainian SSR and Zimbabwe also expressed the view that the changes were not substantive; Zimbabwe saw them as aimed at maintaining white control by the limited appeasement of blacks.

Botswana said that constitutional reform, in the context of Afrikaaner political thought, meant the consolidation of apartheid and the desegregation of a few restaurants and other places, designed to hoodwink black South Africans and the world into believing that meaningful change had begun. Morocco asked how promises of reform could be believed when Pretoria sought ways to refine and perpetuate apartheid. Mauritania said there could be no compromise with apartheid, no liberalization by little steps. Mozambique and the Sudan stated that apartheid could not be dealt with by petty reforms; it must be destroyed. The United Kingdom, speaking for the EC members, said the reforms introduced by South Africa in 1980 had failed to create the hoped-for momentum for the liberalization and dismantling of apartheid; the system of apartheid must be eliminated, not simply modified, and must give way to a Government based on truly representative democracy.

Zambia cited the boycott of elections to the South African Indian Council as testimony of the oppressed people's mood in the face of divide-and-rule tactics intended to weaken the ranks of apartheid's victims.

The need for a peaceful solution was stressed by many speakers, including Austria, Brazil, the Netherlands, New Zealand and Norway; the United Nations, Brazil thought, had an important role to play in that connection. Botswana believed that dialogue between the leaders of white South Africa and the African leaders currently in prison or exile could initiate meaningful change towards a common society. Sweden also called for dialogue, warning that important sections of the majority increasingly saw little alternative to armed action to achieve fundamental change.

The view that mass resistance by the South African people was growing was shared by many countries, including Albania, Brazil, Czechoslovakia, the Gambia, the German Democratic Republic, Haiti, Jamaica, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mongolia, the Niger, Romania, Uganda, the USSR, Viet Nam and Zambia.

China stated that the historical trend of national liberation was irresistible, while the

Comoros expressed the conviction that South Africa was moving irresistibly towards majority rule, even if it might still demand a long struggle. Pakistan was confident that the South African people would succeed in their just struggle. Cuba thought the oppressed people of South Africa, despite massive and brutal repression, had won major victories in their struggle to eradicate apartheid and to create a new society based on freedom, equality and respect for human dignity.

Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Mozambique, Nicaragua, the Syrian Arab Republic, the USSR, the United Republic of Cameroon, Viet Nam, Zaire and many others declared their support for the liberation struggle of the South African people. Nicaragua said the determination of the South African people to struggle for its freedom must be given the broadest international support.

The Netherlands considered that the collective weight of the EC members provided an important means to influence events in South Africa and also that increased international pressure was necessary, supported by autonomous initiatives. Sri Lanka said those having diplomatic and other means of pressure on South Africa must convey to that régime the international community's rejection of apartheid so that bloodshed could be avoided and a free society established. Sweden also called for pressure by Western countries.

The United States said the United Nations should consider concrete ways to expand democracy, education and economic opportunity in South Africa, to help advance peaceful, non-destructive change; it also urged that South Africa be allowed to take its rightful place in the Assembly, arguing that its continued illegal expulsion violated the United Nations Charter and diminished the Organization's capacity to influence the country constructively.

Algeria, on the other hand, considered armed struggle the only means to free South Africa from racist oppression, while Gabon stated that the racist régime would not abandon apartheid until it was forced into its last trenches.

By a letter of 17 December to the President of the General Assembly,<sup>(2)</sup> the Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid transmitted a statement he had intended to make at the end of the Assembly debate. He appealed to the countries collaborating with South Africa to reassess their position and made a special appeal to the United States, whose attitudes and actions, he said, would greatly influence the pace of South Africa's inevitable transition to freedom and the scale of sacrifices in human lives needed to reach that goal.

The Special Political Committee, on 24 and 25 November, heard statements on the item by representatives of nine NGOs, in accordance with an Assembly decision that organizations having a special interest in the question should be heard. The speakers were: Beatrice von Roemer, International Confederation of Free Trade Unions; Wilfred Grenville-Grey, International Defence and Aid Fund for Southern Africa; Annie Street, Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility; Luis Guastavino, Chile Democrático; William Booth, American Committee on Africa; Jim Morrell, Center for International Policy; Vicki Erenstein, International Committee of the National Lawyers Guild; Colin Moore, National Bar Association; and the Reverend Herbert Daughtry, National Black United Front. The Assembly, by a decision of 27 November,<sup>(8)</sup> adopted without vote on an oral proposal of its President, took note of the Committee's report on these hearings.<sup>(5)</sup>

Letters and note verbale (nv): Committee against Apartheid Chairman and Acting Chairman (AC): <sup>(1)</sup>26 Aug., A/36/459-S/14656 (AC); <sup>(2)</sup>17 Dec., A/36/849. <sup>(3)</sup>Cuba, for non-aligned countries: 5 June, A/36/311-S/14508 (nv). <sup>(4)</sup>South Africa: 2 Jan., A/36/64. Report: <sup>(5)</sup>SPC, A/36/719.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(6)</sup>3068(XXVIII), annex, 30 Nov. 1973 (YUN 1973, p. 103); <sup>(7)</sup>36/172 A, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Decision: <sup>(8)</sup>GA: 36/419, 27 Nov., text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.

Meeting records: GA: SPC, A/SPC/36/PV.41, 42 (24, 25 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 101-103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/172 A

115-12-16 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981 39-nation draft (A/36/L.34 and Add.1); agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nigeria, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Situation in South Africa

The General Assembly,

Having considered the reports of the Special Committee against Apartheid,

Reaffirming that apartheid is a crime against humanity and a threat to international peace and security,

Recognizing the contribution of the struggle for freedom and equality in South Africa to the purposes of the United Nations,

Conscious of the responsibility of the United Nations and the international community towards the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement, as proclaimed, in particular, in General Assembly resolution 3411 C (XXX) of 28 November 1975,

Convinced that it is incumbent on the international community to provide all necessary assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement

in their legitimate struggle for the establishment of a democratic society in accordance with their inalienable rights, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,

Welcoming with great satisfaction the growing mobilization of world public opinion and of all segments of the oppressed people of South Africa against apartheid,

Commending, in particular, the courageous struggle of the black workers of South Africa for their legitimate rights,

Commending the liberation movements, particularly the African National Congress, and the oppressed people of South Africa for intensifying the armed struggle against the racist régime.

Paying tribute to all those who have sacrificed their lives in the struggle for freedom and human dignity in South Africa,

Reaffirming that the apartheid régime is totally responsible for precipitating violent conflict through its policy of apartheid and inhuman repression,

Gravely concerned at the intensification of repression in South Africa and the imposition of death sentences on six freedom fighters of the African National Congress, namely, Mr. Johannes Shabangu, Mr. Anthony Tsotsobe, Mr. David Moise, Mr. Ncimbithi Johnson Lubisi, Mr. Naphtali Manana and Mr. Petrus Tsepo Mashigo,

Reaffirming that freedom fighters of South Africa are entitled to prisoner-of-war status under Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949,

Denouncing as an international crime the policy of "bantustanization" designed to deprive the African majority of citizenship and to further dispossess it of its inalienable rights, as well as the continuing forced removals of millions of black people,

Recognizing that apartheid cannot be reformed but must be totally eliminated,

Noting with indignation the recent vetoing by the Western permanent members of the Security Council of proposals to impose mandatory sanctions against the apartheid régime of South Africa,

Concerned that some Western countries and Israel continue to provide military supplies to South Africa, directly and indirectly, in gross violation of the provisions of Security Council resolution 41 418(1977) of 4 November 1977 forbidding the supply of arms and all related matériel to the apartheid régime.

Reaffirming that the policies and actions of the apartheid régime, the strengthening of its military forces and its escalating acts of aggression, subversion and terrorism against independent African States have resulted in frequent breaches of the peace and constitute a grave threat to international peace and security,

Recognizing the urgent need for increased humanitarian and educational assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa, as well as for direct assistance to the national liberation movement in its legitimate struggle,

Taking note of Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/54 of 22 July 1981 on implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations,

Recalling and reaffirming the Declaration on South Africa contained in its resolution 34/93 O of 12 December 1979,

Endorsing the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa, adopted by the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981, as well as the declarations of international seminars organized by the Special Committee against Apartheid in 1981,

Emphasizing the conclusion of the Paris Declaration that the continuing political, economic and military collaboration of certain Western States and their transnational corporations with the racist régime of South Africa encourages its persistent intransigence and defiance of the international communi-

ty and constitutes a major obstacle to the elimination of the inhuman and criminal system of apartheid in South Africa and the attainment of self-determination, freedom and national independence by the people of Namibia,

Considering that the acquisition of nuclear capability by the apartheid régime constitutes a grave menace to Africa and the world,

Condemning all military, nuclear and other collaboration of certain Western States and Israel with South Africa,

Condemning also the collaboration of transnational corporations and financial institutions with South Africa,

1. Strongly condemns the apartheid régime of South Africa for its brutal repression and indiscriminate torture and killings of workers, schoolchildren and other opponents of apartheid, and the imposition of death sentences on freedom fighters;

2. Vehemently condemns the apartheid régime for its repeated acts of aggression, subversion and terrorism against independent African States, designed to destabilize the whole of southern Africa;

3. Reiterates its firm conviction that the apartheid régime has been encouraged to undertake these criminal acts by the protection afforded by major Western Powers against international sanctions, especially by the pronouncements, policies and actions of the Government of the United States of America;

4. Condemns, in particular, the actions of those States, especially the major trading partners of South Africa, that have increased their political, economic and military relations with the racist régime of South Africa despite repeated appeals by the General Assembly;

5. Further condemns those transnational corporations, financial institutions and other organizations that collaborate with the racist régime and apartheid institutions in South Africa;

6. Reaffirms its conviction that comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, universally applied, are the most appropriate and effective means by which the international community can assist the legitimate struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa and discharge its responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security;

7. Urges the Security Council to determine that the situation in South Africa and in southern Africa as a whole, resulting from the policies and actions of the apartheid régime of South Africa, constitutes a grave and growing threat to international peace and security, and to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against that régime under Chapter VII of the Charter;

8. Deplores the action of the Western permanent members of the Security Council in vetoing proposals for mandatory and comprehensive sanctions against South Africa and calls upon them to co-operate in effective action for the elimination of apartheid;

9. Denounces the proclamation of the so-called "independence" of the Ciskei on 4 December 1981;

10. Again calls upon all States and organizations to refrain from any recognition of or co-operation with the so-called "independent" bantustans;

11. Calls upon all States, in particular the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, the Federal Republic of Germany, France and Israel to take urgent, effective measures to terminate all collaboration with South Africa in the political, diplomatic, economic, trade, military, nuclear and other fields in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations;

12. Appeals to all States that have not yet done so to accede to the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid;

13. Reaffirms the legitimacy of the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement by all available means, including armed struggle, for the seizure of power by the people, the elimination of the apartheid régime and the exercise of the right of self-determination by the people of South Africa as a whole;

14. Demands that the apartheid régime treat captured freedom fighters as prisoners of war under the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 and Additional Protocol I thereto;

15. Again proclaims its full support of the national liberation movement of South Africa as the authentic representative of the people of South Africa in their just struggle for liberation;

16. Appeals to all States to provide all necessary humanitarian, educational, financial and other necessary assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement in their legitimate struggle;

17. Urges the United Nations Development Programme and other agencies of the United Nations system to expand their assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and to the South African liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity, namely, the African National Congress and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania, in consultation with the Special Committee against Apartheid;

18. Decides to continue the authorization of adequate financial provision in the budget of the United Nations to enable those liberation movements to maintain offices in New York in order to participate effectively in the deliberations of the Special Committee and other appropriate bodies;

19. Extends its greetings to the African National Congress on its seventieth anniversary;

20. Requests Governments and organizations to cooperate with the Special Committee in publicizing the national liberation struggle in South Africa, its legitimate objectives and its wider significance;

21. Reaffirms the commitment of the United Nations to the total eradication of apartheid and the establishment of a democratic society in which all the people of South Africa as a whole, irrespective of race, colour, sex or creed, will enjoy equal and full human rights and fundamental freedoms and participate freely in the determination of their destiny.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

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

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Liberia, Norway, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Upper Volta.

General Assembly decision 38/419

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President; agenda item 32.

Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa

At its 75th plenary meeting, on 27 November 1981, the General Assembly took note of the report of the Special Political Committee.

Credentials of South

Africa in the General Assembly

In 1981, the General Assembly twice approved recommendations of the Credentials Committee

to reject the credentials of South Africa, for the resumed thirty-fifth session and for the eighth emergency special session on the Namibia question. South Africa did not submit credentials for the regular Assembly session later in 1981.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION (MARCH). On 2 March,<sup>(9)</sup> the Assembly, by 112 votes to 22, with 6 abstentions, approved a report by its Credentials Committee<sup>(7)</sup> rejecting the credentials submitted by South Africa for the resumed thirty-fifth session. The credentials were rejected earlier that day by a Committee vote of 6 to 1 (United States), with 2 abstentions (Costa Rica, Spain).

The Committee acted after South Africa's credentials were challenged by the United Republic of Cameroon, on behalf of the African Group, at the start of the Assembly's deliberations on Namibia on 2 March (p. 1129). At the request of the United Republic of Cameroon, the Assembly President referred the matter immediately to the Credentials Committee.

The Committee's Acting Chairman announced that a letter had been received from South Africa requesting that it be permitted to present its position on its credentials to the Chairman or the Committee.<sup>(1)</sup> He stated that it was not the practice of the Committee to give the floor to non-members of the Committee and that therefore the request could not be acted upon.

In the Committee's discussion, as summarized in its report, the majority—Angola, China, Haiti, Kenya, Singapore and the USSR—of the nine members declared that they would vote to reject South Africa's credentials. They mentioned their stand on South Africa's apartheid policies, and China added that it could not accept the right of a minority racist régime, imposed on the South African people, to represent that people. In the view of the United States, however, the credentials conformed to the Assembly's rules of procedure and were therefore in order. Spain said it would abstain as it could not ignore the position adopted by the Assembly, although it appeared that the credentials were technically in order.

South Africa, by a letter of 2 March to the Assembly President,<sup>(2)</sup> expressed the wish to address the Assembly before it acted on the Committee's report; it invoked rule 29 of the rules of procedure, under which a representative to whose admission a Member had objected must be seated provisionally with the same rights as other representatives until the Credentials Committee had reported and the Assembly had decided. However, the Assembly adopted, by 113 votes to 23, with 1 abstention, a motion by the United Republic of Cameroon not to hear South



Africa before the report had been disposed of. Austria and the United Kingdom opposed the motion, arguing that South Africa should have had the opportunity to speak in accordance with rule 29.

Speaking in explanation of vote on the credentials resolution, several States objected to the denial of South Africa's right to participate in the Assembly deliberations, saying the Committee had rejected the credentials for reasons not provided for in the rules of procedure or in the Charter of the United Nations. Some, such as Australia, Austria, Chile, France, Iceland (speaking for the Nordic States) and Samoa, stated that they had voted against the decision on legal grounds, although they continued to oppose apartheid. Australia, Austria, Canada, Chile, Iceland (for the Nordic States), New Zealand and the United Kingdom also thought it was at variance with the principle of universality of the United Nations. Canada, Iceland (for the Nordic States) and the United States regarded the rejection of South Africa's credentials as contrary to Articles 5 and 6 of the Charter, according to which a Member State might be suspended or expelled only on the recommendation of the Security Council as confirmed by the Assembly.

The Netherlands, speaking for the EC members, said they had voted against because the Committee had rejected the credentials for reasons not provided for in the Assembly rules. The Federal Republic of Germany added that the Committee's competence did not go beyond the right to examine the due form of credentials and that it was inconsistent with the Charter to evaluate the legitimacy and policies of the Governments issuing credentials. A similar view was held by France and New Zealand. Portugal said it had voted against the Committee's decision because the credentials met the procedural requirements and also because it believed that South Africa should be considered as one of the parties in the Namibia question, as had been stressed in many Assembly resolutions. The United Kingdom did not think South Africa's exclusion helped solve the problems before the Assembly.

Costa Rica abstained, citing what it saw as the contradiction between legal arguments and the fact that the official policy of the Pretoria Government was based on minority control. Turkey said its positive vote should be interpreted strictly in the light of its protest against South Africa's racist policies.

By two further letters dated 2 March, South Africa protested the Assembly President's refusal to grant it the opportunity to speak on the original point of order raised by the United Republic of Cameroon,<sup>(3)</sup> and strongly objected to the decision to deny it the right to speak as violating

the Charter and the rules of procedure.<sup>(4)</sup> On 6 March, South Africa transmitted to the Secretary-General a letter of the same date from its Minister for Foreign Affairs and Information<sup>(5)</sup> rejecting as null and void the resolution to deny South Africa the right to participate in Assembly deliberations.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION (SEPTEMBER). On 4 September, the Assembly acted on South Africa's credentials for the eighth emergency special session, on the Namibia question, by adopting a resolution<sup>(10)</sup> approving a report of the Credentials Committee rejecting the credentials.<sup>(6)</sup> The Assembly acted by a recorded vote of 117 to 22, with 6 abstentions, after the Committee vote on the previous day of 6 to 1 (United States), with 2 abstentions (Costa Rica, Spain).

Explaining its negative vote on the Assembly decision, the United States repeated the arguments it had used in March, adding that it was vitally important that the United Nations be fair and even-handed if it was to be an effective participant in the process leading to Namibia's independence. Australia, Austria, Canada, Chile, New Zealand, Norway (for the Nordic States) and the United Kingdom (for the EC members) said that, although they opposed South Africa's apartheid policy and its illegal occupation of Namibia, they supported the acceptance of South Africa's credentials as they firmly believed in the basic principle of United Nations universality. Canada added that the Assembly decision contradicted the distribution of powers between the Security Council and the Assembly.

Costa Rica, explaining its abstention, stated that rejecting the credentials of a delegation because the Government that issued them was illegitimate would be equivalent to affirming the legitimacy of all those whose credentials had been accepted. Repeating the stand it had taken in March, Turkey said its positive vote should be interpreted strictly in the light of its protest against South Africa's racist policy.

Before considering the resolution, the Assembly, by a recorded vote of 113 to 24, with 6 abstentions, endorsed Algeria's appeal on behalf of the African Group against a ruling by the Assembly President to give South Africa the opportunity to speak. Canada, the United Kingdom (for the EC members) and the United States opposed that appeal as not being in accordance with the Assembly's rules of procedure. Jordan, on the other hand, believed that the rule stating that representatives whose credentials were in dispute should be provisionally seated did not mean that they should be entitled to participate in the debate.

On 11 September,<sup>(6)</sup> South Africa transmitted

to the Secretary-General a letter of the same date from its Foreign Minister rejecting the Assembly decision not to accept South Africa's credentials. He stated that the Assembly had revealed itself as the intransigent party, had reinforced the belief that it was incapable of being objective and was afraid of hearing an opposing view.

Letters: South Africa: <sup>(1)</sup>2 Mar., A/35/795; <sup>(2)</sup>2 Mar., A/35/796; <sup>(3)</sup>2 Mar., A/35/797; <sup>(4)</sup>2 Mar., A/35/798; <sup>(5)</sup>6 Mar., A/35/802-S/14395; <sup>(6)</sup>11 Sep., A/ES-8/12.  
 Reports: Credentials Committee, <sup>(7)</sup>A/35/484/Add.2 & Add.2/Corr.1, <sup>(8)</sup>A/ES-8/6.  
 Resolutions: GA: <sup>(9)</sup>35/4 C, 2 Mar. (p. 352); <sup>(10)</sup>ES-8/1 A, 4 Sep. (p. 352).

### Sanctions against South Africa

In 1981, the General Assembly and its Special Committee against Apartheid again called insistently for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa, and condemned States which maintained political and economic relations with that country. However, because of negative votes by three permanent members, the Security Council did not adopt proposals by African States to impose such sanctions in connection with South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia (p. 1133).

To help mobilize world opinion in favour of sanctions, the Committee, in co-operation with the Organization of African Unity (OAU), organized in Paris in May an International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa. The Assembly proclaimed 1982 the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa (p. 177). Recognizing the important role of trade unions in the international campaign for sanctions, the Assembly authorized the Committee to organize in 1982 an International Conference of Trade Unions on Sanctions against South Africa (p. 179). The Security Council was urged to strengthen the arms embargo (p. 172) and to consider a mandatory oil embargo against South Africa (p. 175).

**ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS.** On 23 February, in a resolution on violations of human rights in South Africa and Namibia (p. 944), the Commission on Human Rights requested the Security Council to consider imposing mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa.<sup>(11)</sup> On 6 March, in a resolution on the self-determination of peoples (p. 8911, the Commission condemned the policy of States which continued to maintain political, economic, military and other relations with the racist régime in southern Africa, thus supporting, protecting and encouraging it to persist in suppressing the aspirations of peoples for self-determination and independence.<sup>(12)</sup>

**CONFERENCE ON SANCTIONS AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA.** The International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, organized by the United Nations in co-operation with OAU, was held in Paris from 20 to 27 May. The Conference, authorized by the General Assembly in 1980,<sup>(13)</sup> was attended by representatives of 121 Governments as well as of United Nations bodies and specialized agencies, OAU, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, national liberation movements, intergovernmental, international and national organizations, and invited individuals. The liberation movements of South Africa and Namibia—the African National Congress of South Africa, the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania and the South West Africa People's Organization—were represented by high-level delegations led by their respective presidents. (For list of participating States and officers, see APPENDIX III.)

The Conference reviewed the situation in South Africa and in southern Africa as a whole. On 27 May, it adopted by acclamation the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa, by which it called on Governments and organizations to counteract all moves to assist and encourage the apartheid régime, and appealed to them to concert their efforts in an international campaign for comprehensive sanctions against South Africa. It urged the United Nations, in co-operation with OAU and the national liberation movements, to promote, secure and monitor the sanctions programme.

The purpose of the sanctions, according to the Declaration, was to force abandonment of apartheid and the illegal occupation of Namibia; to demonstrate abhorrence of apartheid and solidarity with the struggle against it; to deny benefits of international co-operation to South Africa; to undermine South Africa's ability to repress its people, commit aggression and threaten peace and security; and to remove economic support from apartheid so as to promote as peaceful a transition as possible.

The Conference drew the attention of States which opposed sanctions to the fact that their policies were aiding the escalation of violence. It considered that the oppressed people of South Africa and Namibia and their national liberation movements deserved international support in their legitimate struggle.

The Conference also adopted a Special Declaration on Namibia by which it called on all Member States to impose sanctions on South Africa to ensure its immediate compliance with United Nations decisions (p. 1137).

The Political and Technical Commissions of the Conference proposed a number of detailed political and economic measures to implement

sanctions and isolate South Africa, including an international campaign to stop the use of the veto against sanctions by one or more of the permanent members of the Security Council, unilateral sanctions pending the international imposition of a comprehensive programme and support to the national liberation movements. They also recommended strengthening of the existing arms embargo (p. 173) and oil embargo (p. 176), as well as other action to terminate military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa (p. 181), cut off foreign investments (p. 186) and monitor the activities of transnational corporations (TNCs) (p. 188).

The Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid, by a letter of 27 May,<sup>(1)</sup> drew the Conference report<sup>(10)</sup> to the attention of the Assembly and the Security Council. On 11 June, he transmitted the two declarations to the Secretary-General for the attention of the Assembly and the Council.<sup>(2)</sup>

Plans for publicizing the results of the Conference were made part of the programme for the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa (1982) (p. 177).

COMMUNICATIONS. In a message to the President of the Conference on sanctions, circulated by a note of 25 May,<sup>(7)</sup> the President of the Security Council stated that the Council recognized the legitimacy of the struggle of the South African people to eliminate apartheid and maintained the hope that the inevitable changes in South Africa's racial policy could be attained peacefully. Without prejudice to the individual position of its members, the Council was unanimous in its condemnation of apartheid and had called on South Africa to act immediately to eliminate apartheid and grant all citizens equal rights.

Brazil, by a letter of 27 May to the Secretary-General,<sup>(3)</sup> transmitted a message from its President to the Conference expressing solidarity with the peoples of Africa. Nicaragua, on 2 June,<sup>(4)</sup> transmitted a government message of 21 May saying the Conference must do everything possible to give practical expression to the international repudiation of apartheid.

South Africa, on 27 May,<sup>(5)</sup> transmitted a letter of the same date in which its Minister for Foreign Affairs and Information asserted that sanctions would hurt the countries of southern Africa whose economies were tied to that of South Africa, and said the Secretary-General's statement at the Conference simply echoed the same emotional statements expressed in General Assembly resolutions and ignored the fact that blacks in South Africa enjoyed better living conditions than black Africans in the rest of Africa. Replying on 29 May,<sup>(6)</sup> the Secretary-General

observed that the position of the main United Nations organs on apartheid did not coincide with that of South Africa, and that in his own statement he had observed strict moderation in order to facilitate peaceful change.

ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON COLONIAL COUNTRIES. A resolution on United Nations organizations and decolonization, containing provisions deploring relations between South Africa and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), was adopted on 17 August by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. These provisions were later incorporated into General Assembly resolution of 24 November (p. 167).

The Committee's Sub-Committee on Petitions, Information and Assistance presented a report in August in which it deplored the continued collaboration between IMF and South Africa. It stated that that country's continued membership, and its consequent ability to borrow money from the Fund when necessary, enabled it to borrow more and on better terms in private international financial markets, thereby buttressing the régime. The Sub-Committee recommended that the presiding officers of the Committee on colonial countries, the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Committee against Apartheid constitute a mission to the Fund in 1982, and that the United Nations Secretariat's Unit on Studies and Information on Decolonization prepare a study on the relationship between IMF and South Africa. The Committee on colonial countries decided that further consultations should be held on implementing these recommendations, and it annexed them to its report to the Assembly.<sup>(9)</sup>

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID. In its report to the General Assembly,<sup>(8)</sup> the Committee against Apartheid recommended that the Assembly endorse the declarations of the Conference on Sanctions against South Africa as well as the measures proposed by its commissions, and take urgent steps towards implementing them. The Committee regretted the non-participation in the Conference of a number of States, particularly the major trading partners of South Africa, namely, the United Kingdom, the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Italy, Belgium, Greece and Portugal, and of a number of inter-governmental organizations, particularly the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, IMF and the World Bank.

The Committee emphasized again the desirability of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions

against South Africa. It recalled that many States had instituted unilateral sanctions in response to appeals by the national liberation movements, OAU and the United Nations. It noted with utmost regret that the Western permanent members of the Security Council had continued, in the face of repeated breaches of peace and acts of aggression by South Africa, to prevent a determination by the Council that the situation constituted a threat to international peace and security requiring action under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter (on action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace and acts of aggression). It considered that the attitudes and actions of those permanent members were a violation of their responsibilities under the Charter and an abuse of the veto, encouraging South Africa to persist in its escalating crimes.

The Committee said that a number of States, including several Western States, had become convinced of the need for sanctions, and it noted with satisfaction the statements by the new Government of France. It expressed appreciation at action by African, non-aligned, socialist and other States to break off, or refrain from, any relations with the apartheid régime

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(23)</sup> the General Assembly endorsed the declarations of the Conference on sanctions and the reports of its Political and Technical Commissions, and requested the Security Council to consider them urgently with a view to imposing comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa. It called on all Governments to sever relations, implement the arms embargo (p. 173), prohibit nuclear collaboration (p. 180), cease trade and commercial transactions as well as loans and investments (p. 185), prohibit collaboration by corporations and individuals, prevent services by national airlines and shipping companies, and prevent cultural and sports contacts. It condemned the continuing collaboration of certain States with South Africa, in particular the United States, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany and Israel. It expressed serious concern that IMF and the World Bank had not acted to terminate loans and credits to South Africa and suspend its membership, and requested the Secretary-General to try to persuade them to respect United Nations resolutions. The Committee against Apartheid was requested to intensify its sanctions campaign, and Governments, parliaments and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) were invited to co-operate.

The Assembly also endorsed the recommendations of the Seminar on Effective Measures to

Prevent Transnational Corporations and Other Established Interests from Collaborating with the Racist Régime of South Africa (Geneva, 29 June-3 July) (p. 188).

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 109 to 18, with 13 abstentions.

In a resolution of 17 December proclaiming 1982 as the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa, the Assembly endorsed the Paris Declaration of the Conference on sanctions and commended it to the attention of all Governments and organizations.<sup>(21)</sup> In another resolution of the same date, on the work programme of the Committee against Apartheid, the Assembly requested the Committee to give the highest priority in 1982 to mobilizing support for sanctions, reviewing implementation of United Nations resolutions on apartheid, especially those on embargoes, and publicizing developments concerning collaboration with South Africa.<sup>(25)</sup>

In a resolution on foreign interests impeding decolonization,<sup>(15)</sup> adopted on 24 November, the Assembly strongly condemned Western and other States and TNCs which continued to invest in and supply armaments, oil and nuclear technology to South Africa. It called on all States, particularly the United Kingdom, the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Japan, Belgium, Israel and Italy, to terminate all political, diplomatic, economic, trade, military and nuclear collaboration with that régime.

Paragraph 10 of this resolution, citing States by name, was adopted by a recorded vote of 63 to 30, with 49 abstentions, after a motion to have a separate vote on this paragraph, to which Angola objected, was adopted by a recorded vote of 57 to 48, with 28 abstentions.

In a resolution of the same date on United Nations organizations and decolonization<sup>(16)</sup>—similar to the one adopted in August by the Committee on colonial countries—the Assembly expressed regret that the World Bank and IMF continued to maintain links with South Africa, as exemplified by that country's membership in both agencies; deeply deplored and called for an end to the persistent collaboration between IMF and South Africa; and proposed that the IMF Board of Governors include in its agenda an item on the Fund's relationship with South Africa.

The Assembly voted separately on two paragraphs of this resolution concerning IMF and World Bank relations with South Africa. Paragraph 6, expressing regret that the two agencies continued to maintain links with South Africa and that neither had fully implemented Assembly resolutions, was adopted by a recorded vote of 82 to 25, with 30 abstentions. Paragraph 7,

deploring and calling for an end to the persistent collaboration between IMF and South Africa, was adopted by a recorded vote of 84 to 22, with 29 abstentions.

The Assembly called for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa in resolutions adopted on 28 October, on the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination,<sup>(14)</sup> 10 December, on the Namibia situation,<sup>(17)</sup> and 17 December, on the South Africa situation.<sup>(20)</sup> By the last resolution, it reaffirmed its conviction that such sanctions, universally applied, were the most appropriate and effective means by which the international community could assist the legitimate struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa and discharge its responsibilities for the maintenance of peace and security; urged the Security Council to determine that the situation in South Africa and southern Africa as a whole, resulting from South Africa's policies and actions, constituted a grave and growing threat to international peace and security, and to impose comprehensive sanctions; and deplored the action of the Western permanent members of the Council in vetoing proposals for sanctions and called on them to cooperate in effective action for the elimination of apartheid.

By a resolution of 10 December calling for action by Member States in support of Namibia,<sup>(18)</sup> the Assembly requested States to take measures to isolate South Africa and sever all relations with it, and requested the Council for Namibia to continue to monitor the boycott of South Africa and to submit to the Assembly in 1982 a comprehensive report on all contacts between Member States and South Africa, with an analysis of information from States and other sources on the continuing political, economic and other relations of States and their economic and other interests with South Africa, and of measures taken by them to terminate all dealings with South Africa.

The 17 December resolution on sanctions was introduced by Ghana on behalf of 33 nations. Ghana said that violence and repression in South Africa were increasing and, save for a few cosmetic amendments to the laws, the apartheid system remained structurally unaltered. Therefore, despite the failure of the Security Council to impose sanctions, the case for them remained valid. The resolution represented another attempt to focus international attention on the serious situation in South Africa, to demonstrate the universal abhorrence of apartheid, and to deny the benefits of international co-operation to South Africa so as to oblige it and its supporters to heed world opinion.

Explaining the opposition of the Nordic

States to the resolution, Norway said they could not endorse the recommendations of the Conference commissions; they deplored the inappropriate and arbitrary singling out of individual countries and reserved their position on provisions which failed to take into account that only the Security Council could adopt decisions binding on Member States. Canada and New Zealand also voted against, Canada stating that the question of sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter was strictly a Council prerogative and New Zealand declaring that it could not support proposals seeking to pre-empt the Council's functions or singling out countries for criticism.

Ireland, though supporting the application by the Council of certain selective measures, voted against the resolution because it doubted the wisdom of calling for comprehensive sanctions and because it disapproved of the arbitrary condemnation of a number of countries. Spain also objected to the call for sanctions and the naming of countries, both in this resolution and in the one on the South Africa situation. The naming of States was cited by Greece and Portugal in explaining their negative votes on the sanctions resolution.

Explaining the negative votes of the EC members, the United Kingdom said they did not support demands to break off all relations with South Africa and believed that existing lines of communication must be used to allow for the free expression of views on all political, social and economic questions of concern to the South African people. The Netherlands favoured limited sanctions but believed that the imposition of global sanctions against South Africa and its total isolation would only lead to increased oppression and hardship for the population and cause damage to neighbouring States; it also had reservations on entrusting the Committee against Apartheid with tasks belonging to the Security Council's arms embargo Committee. The United States, also voting against, said sanctions and boycotts were ineffective ways by which to attempt the eradication of apartheid.

Lesotho abstained as it feared that, because of its geopolitical situation, economic sanctions would present it with considerable problems; it had the same reservations on the sanctions provisions of the resolution on the South Africa situation and in the call for Security Council action in the Assembly's 17 December resolution on South African aggression against neighbouring States.<sup>(22)</sup> Swaziland abstained on similar grounds in the vote on the sanctions resolution. Botswana reserved its position on the provisions concerning comprehensive sanctions in the resolutions on the work programme of the Committee against Apartheid and the South Africa situa-

tion, as well as on clauses in the latter resolution mentioning specific States and the reference to the Conference on sanctions in the resolution on an arms embargo.<sup>(24)</sup>

Austria, which abstained, said it could not support prejudgement of the prerogatives and decisions of the Council, and felt that the arbitrary singling out of States for condemnation or criticism was unjustified and did not advance the cause of the oppressed people in South Africa.

The Bahamas, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Senegal, Suriname and Togo supported the text but voiced reservations on the specific mention of certain States—as did Samoa, which abstained. Bangladesh and Suriname said they would have abstained had there been a separate vote on the paragraph concerned.

Argentina, which cast a positive vote, said Member States could not be asked to comply with some of the measures until the Security Council had acted.

Brazil voted in favour but voiced doubts about the excessive language and scope of the text, which seemed to go beyond what would be expected of an Assembly resolution. Costa Rica, though supporting the text, said it could not go along with some of its paragraphs and concepts; it also expressed reservations on the mention of the Paris Conference and Declaration in the preambles of the resolutions on the South Africa situation and the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa, noting that the Declaration had been adopted without Costa Rica's agreement.

Explaining its abstention on the resolution on an International Year for sanctions against South Africa, Australia noted that it had not participated in the Conference on sanctions and did not subscribe to the Declaration. New Zealand, which also abstained, said it could not support the endorsement of the Paris Declaration.

Ireland said its support for this resolution should be understood in the light of the statement it had made at the Conference (describing its understanding that the reports of the Political and Technical Commissions did not form part of the consensus). The Netherlands, though casting a positive vote, also voiced reservations on the Declaration. Speaking for the Nordic States, which also voted in favour, Norway recalled that they had participated in the Conference's consensus with reservations.

Voting against paragraph 10 of the resolution on foreign interests impeding decolonization, Belgium said the selection of States mentioned therein was inspired by political considerations. The Central African Republic, Ireland, New Zealand and Uruguay deplored the selective

condemnation of particular countries—especially, Ireland added, when some of them had denied the allegations. Chile thought the provision did nothing to encourage the understanding and co-operation needed to solve the problems of southern Africa. Denmark and Norway believed the accusations to be unjustified, and Finland said they were based on insufficient evidence. France asked how it and other members of the Western contact group on Namibia could be asked to break diplomatic relations with South Africa even as they were being urged to induce that régime to implement the Security Council's settlement plan for the Territory; as to economic and nuclear matters, France was bound to honour contracts and commitments already assumed. Israel believed that the condemnation of its Government had been generated by extraneous considerations. Japan said it had no diplomatic, military or nuclear relations with South Africa, had prohibited Japanese investments there, had called on its banks to refrain from extending loans and had limited trade relations with South Africa. Liberia remarked that the strategy of putting States in the full blaze of publicity had not proved successful.

Somalia thought the provision went against the aims of the resolution and contained a list that was far from exhaustive. Sweden said some countries were arbitrarily named, while Turkey would have preferred a text that avoided discriminatory condemnation. The United Kingdom, on behalf of the EC members, found the unjustified and arbitrary attacks against certain States particularly offensive. The United States said many Governments traded directly or indirectly with South Africa, often through their own state trading organizations.

Among those which abstained on this paragraph, Argentina and Fiji thought the provision impaired the effectiveness of the resolution. The Bahamas said no effort had been made to verify the allegations or distinguish between the positive and negative activities of certain States. Gabon, Indonesia, Morocco, Senegal, Sri Lanka and Togo expressed regret or reservations about the selective condemnation of several countries, as did the United Republic of Cameroon, which observed that the text was silent about other States that had collaborated with South Africa. Saint Lucia considered it impossible to encourage members of the Western contact group to apply pressure on South Africa while expecting them to sever all political relations with that régime. Reservations were also voiced by Bangladesh, Botswana, Burundi, Mali, Peru, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand; Botswana also reserved its position on the mention of oil supplies to South Africa.

In explanation of vote on the resolution concerning United Nations organizations and decolonization, the United Kingdom, speaking for the EC members, cited the references to IMF and the World Bank among the reasons why they could not support the resolution. They voted against two paragraphs referring to the two agencies, as did Canada and Uruguay, which regarded the provisions as unacceptable politicization of technical agencies, and New Zealand, which considered the criticisms to be inappropriate.

Among States which abstained on these paragraphs, Lesotho said its stand should not be interpreted as endorsing negative references to IMF and the World Bank; Sri Lanka would have preferred it if the text had not referred to technical institutions whose statutes prevented them from implementing some Assembly resolutions; and Swaziland objected to politicizing the two agencies. Bolivia, Fiji, Mexico, Portugal and Spain also said they had difficulties with these paragraphs, and Saint Lucia and Trinidad and Tobago thought they were not in accord with facts.

Voting for the resolution, the USSR said the \$2.2 billion in assistance received from IMF would help South Africa solve its balance-of-payments problems and increase its military power.

The IMF representative told the Fourth Committee, where the resolution originated, that the Fund's decisions on financial transactions had been taken in conformity with its Articles of Agreement and implied no approval or disapproval of policies or actions by a member State that were not within the Fund's authority. For IMF to base decisions on considerations unrelated to its Articles of Agreement would mean cutting itself adrift from agreed principles, to the detriment of all members.

The representative of the World Bank said South Africa had not been represented among the Bank's Executive Directors since 1972 and received no assistance from the Bank; the sole link was South Africa's membership in the agency.

Referring to a paragraph in an Assembly resolution of 10 December on dissemination of information on Namibia, calling for an international campaign to denounce the collusion of certain Western countries with the South African racists,<sup>(19)</sup> Costa Rica stated that it was against singling out any States for condemnation, because many others also traded with South Africa, including some in Africa, Asia and Eastern Europe. In response, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, the Central African Republic, the Congo, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, the Lao Peo-

ple's Democratic Republic, Poland, Romania, the USSR, Viet Nam and Zaire denied that they traded with South Africa.

During the debate on apartheid and South Africa, many speakers supported the call for sanctions or measures under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. Those taking this position included Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, China, the Comoros, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, the Gambia, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Haiti, Indonesia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, the Sudan, Sweden, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR, the United Republic of Tanzania and Yugoslavia. Several countries, such as Bangladesh, Cyprus, Jamaica, and Trinidad and Tobago, called for a total isolation of South Africa.

The Netherlands thought selective economic measures against South Africa should preferably be decided upon by the Security Council or be implemented by enough countries in a position to exert meaningful pressure. New Zealand was willing to go along with economic sanctions imposed by the United Nations. Senegal called for a ban on commercial transactions and on the provision of essential supplies, particularly electronic and telecommunications hardware.

Many countries declared that they had restricted their relations with South Africa. China, Cyprus, Turkey, the United Republic of Cameroon and Venezuela said they had no political or economic relations with that country; Venezuela added that it discouraged its citizens from establishing contact with South African corporations. Czechoslovakia said it had stopped all contacts with South Africa in 1963 and was systematically boycotting that country. Ecuador had no official relations and refrained from promoting trade with South Africa. Malaysia had totally banned all trade and economic relations with South Africa and prohibited travel between the two countries. Nigeria had maintained a total trade embargo since its independence in 1960. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had closed its air and sea space to the aircraft and ships of countries that collaborated with South Africa.

Norway said that, together with other Nordic countries, it had taken steps to prevent Norwegian investments in and exports to South Africa, adopted a policy of not selling Norwegian oil to South Africa and instituted visa requirements for South African citizens; it was willing to

co-operate with other countries to see how existing voluntary measures could be better coordinated and made more effective. Sweden said it had taken a series of measures unilaterally and on the basis of the Joint Nordic Programme of Action against South Africa adopted in 1978.

Japan and New Zealand declared that they had no diplomatic relations with South Africa; Japan added that it confined its economic relations with that country within the framework of normal trade and was making every effort to reduce its dependence on imports, particularly of natural resources, from there.

The United States, on the other hand, thought the United Nations could contribute to the ultimate erosion of apartheid if it became more realistic and less repetitive in calling for more embargoes, sanctions and other punitive steps which had never brought about constructive political reforms at any time in modern history.

According to many participants in the debate, collaboration by certain Western States and others was responsible for the continued existence of the apartheid régime. The Gambia said continued trade and investment were the life-blood of apartheid, enabling the régime to survive the economic disruption resulting from mass industrial action within the country. Saudi Arabia remarked that the profits derived from such a policy of opportunism were short term and would prove useless in the long run. The USSR said the Assembly should condemn States which had not ceased co-operating with South Africa, gave it political and diplomatic protection, and even proclaimed it their strategic ally. In the view of Viet Nam, the major Western countries must either continue their collusion with South Africa and share with it the ignominy of condemnation for complicity in the crime of apartheid, or join with the international community in imposing comprehensive sanctions.

Others protesting Western support for South Africa included Albania, Angola, Bahrain, the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ghana, Guinea, Nepal, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania. Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Mongolia and the Ukrainian SSR held the United States especially responsible in this regard. China said South Africa had stepped up its collaboration with the Taiwan authorities, in violation of Chinese sovereignty.

Letters: Committee against Apartheid Chairman: <sup>(1)</sup>27 May, A/36/501-S/14688; <sup>(2)</sup>11 June, transmitting Conference declarations, A/36/319-S/14531. <sup>(3)</sup>Brazil: 27 May, A/36/289. <sup>(4)</sup>Nicaragua: 2 June, A/36/304. <sup>(5)</sup>South Africa: 27 May, A/36/290. <sup>(6)</sup>S-G: 29 May, A/36/291.

Note: <sup>(7)</sup>SC President, S/14486.

Reports: <sup>(8)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22; <sup>(9)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev.1; <sup>(10)</sup>Conference A/CONF.107/8.

Resolutions: Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): <sup>(11)</sup>4(XXXVII), para. 12, 23 Feb.; <sup>(12)</sup>14(XXXVII), para. 9, 6 Mar. GA: <sup>(13)</sup>35/206 I, 16 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980 p. 215); <sup>(14)</sup>36/8, para. 8, 28 Oct. 1981 (p. 868); <sup>(15)</sup>36/51, paras. 8 & 10, 24 Nov. (p. 1109); <sup>(16)</sup>36/52, 24 Nov. (p. 1102); <sup>(17)</sup>36/121 A, para. 34, 10 Dec. (p. 1157); <sup>(18)</sup>36/121 B, 10 Dec. (p. 1157); <sup>(19)</sup>36/121 E, para. 4, 10 Dec. (p. 1168); <sup>(20)</sup>36/172 A, paras. 6-8, 17 Dec. (p. 162); <sup>(21)</sup>36/172 B, para. 1, 17 Dec. (p. 178); <sup>(22)</sup>36/172 C, para. 1, 17 Dec. (p. 216); <sup>(23)</sup>36/172 D, 17 Dec., text following; <sup>(24)</sup>36/172 F, para. 1, 17 Dec. (p. 175); <sup>(25)</sup>36/172 N, para. 2 (a)-(c), 17 Dec. (P. 213).

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 101-103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

Publication: Objective: Justice, vol. XIII, No. 1 (DPI/687), No. 2 (DPI/696).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/172 D

109-18-13 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981  
33-nation draft (A/36/L.37 and Add.1); agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nigeria, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

#### Comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa

The General Assembly,  
Recalling and reaffirming its resolution 35/206 C of 16 December 1980.

Having considered the reports of the Special Committee against Apartheid,

Recognizing that comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations are essential to avert the grave threat to international peace and security resulting from the policies and actions of the apartheid régime of South Africa,

Considering that political, economic, military and any other collaboration with the apartheid régime of South Africa encourages its persistent intransigence and defiance of the international community and its escalating acts of repression and aggression,

Deploring the attitude of those Western permanent members of the Security Council that have so far prevented the Council from adopting comprehensive sanctions against that régime under Chapter VII of the Charter,

Deploring also the attitude of those States, in particular the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Federal Republic of Germany and Israel, which have continued and increased their political, military, economic and other collaboration with South Africa,

Strongly condemning the activities of those transnational corporations that continue to collaborate with the apartheid régime, especially in the military, nuclear, petroleum and other fields, and of those financial institutions which have continued to provide loans and credits to South Africa,

Deploring the policies of those States that refuse to take firm action against transnational corporations and financial institutions within their jurisdiction to prevent them from collaborating with the apartheid régime,

Commending the efforts of trade unions, religious institutions, student organizations and anti-apartheid movements in their campaigns against transnational corporations and



financial institutions collaborating with the racist régime of South Africa,

Taking into account the relevant decisions adopted by the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 9 to 13 February 1981, and by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its eighteenth ordinary session, held at Nairobi from 24 to 27 June 1981.

Having considered the declarations and reports of commissions of the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, as well as the declarations of the international seminars organized in 1981 by the Special Committee against Apartheid.

1. Endorses the declarations of the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa as well as the reports of Its Political and Technical Commissions, and the declarations of the International seminars organized by the Special Committee against Apartheid;

2. Also endorses the recommendations of the Seminar on Effective Measures to Prevent Transnational Corporations and Other Established Interests from Collaborating with the Racist Régime of South Africa, held at Geneva from 29 June to 3 July 1981;

3. Requests the Security Council urgently to consider the above declarations and reports with a view to the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the apartheid régime of South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations;

4. Condemns the continuing economic and other collaboration of certain Western and other States, in particular the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Federal Republic of Germany and Israel, with the racist régime of South Africa;

5. Commends all Governments that have taken action to break off, or to refrain from, any relations with the apartheid régime of South Africa;

6. Urges all States that have not yet done so to adopt separate and collective measures for comprehensive sanctions against South Africa, pending action by the Security Council;

7. Calls upon all Governments that have not yet done so:

(a) To sever diplomatic, military, nuclear, economic, cultural, academic, sports and other relations with the apartheid régime of South Africa;

(b) To implement scrupulously the arms embargo against South Africa and prohibit all forms of nuclear collaboration with South Africa;

(c) To cease all direct and indirect trade and commercial transactions with, as well as loans to and investments in, South Africa;

(d) To terminate all government promotion of, or assistance or facilities to, trade with and investment in South Africa;

(e) To prohibit the sale of krugerrands;

(f) To prohibit, within their jurisdiction, collaboration of corporations and individuals with the racist régime of South Africa;

(g) To cease any facilities to airlines and shipping lines of South Africa and to prevent their national airlines and shipping companies from providing services to and from South Africa;

(h) To deny visas and other facilities to South African athletes, artists, entertainers and academic personalities and effectively to prevent their nationals from having cultural, academic and sporting contacts with South Africa;

8. Again requests States members of the European Economic Community, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, as well as States parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, to take the necessary steps to deny all assistance and commercial or other facilities to the racist régime of South Africa;

9. Expresses serious concern that the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank have not taken steps to terminate loans and credits to South Africa and to suspend South Africa from membership;

10. Requests the Secretary-General to undertake urgent consultations with the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank in order to persuade them to respect the repeated resolutions of the United Nations on collaboration with the apartheid régime of South Africa, and to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

11. Requests the Secretary-General, as well as all agencies and organizations of the United Nations system:

(a) To withhold any facilities from, or investment of any funds in, banks, financial institutions and corporations that continue to give loans to or invest in South Africa;

(b) To refrain from any purchase of South African products, directly or indirectly;

(c) To deny any contracts or facilities to transnational corporations and financial institutions collaborating with South Africa;

(d) To prohibit any official travel by South African Airways or South African shipping lines;

12. Requests and authorizes the Special Committee:

(a) To continue and intensify its campaign to achieve world-wide support for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa;

(b) To strengthen its co-operation with trade unions and other organizations in order to promote effective sanctions against South Africa;

(c) To publicize the activities of transnational corporations, financial institutions and other interests collaborating with the apartheid régime of South Africa;

(d) To organize conferences and seminars, and to arrange for studies and publications on all aspects of sanctions against South Africa and on the continuing collaboration with South Africa of Governments, corporations and other interests;

13. Invites all Governments, parliaments, non-governmental organizations, anti-apartheid and solidarity movements, trade unions, religious bodies and other groups to promote comprehensive sanctions against South Africa in co-operation with the Special Committee.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad,

China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia,

Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia,

Fill, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea,

Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia,

Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's

Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar,

Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico,

Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria,

Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines,

Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Gren-

dines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles,

Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab

Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey,

Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Repub-

lic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam,

Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal

Republic of Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg,

Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom,

United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Botswana, Central Afri-

can Republic, Finland, Guatemala, Lesotho, Liberia, Samoa,

Swaziland, Sweden, Upper Volta.

#### Arms embargo

There were calls in United Nations bodies during 1981 for a strengthening of the arms embargo against South Africa mandated by the Security Council in 1977.<sup>(10)</sup>

**ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS.** On 23 February 1981, in a resolution on violations of human rights in South Africa and Namibia (p. 944), the Commission on

Human Rights requested the Security Council to reinforce the arms embargo against South Africa by adopting comprehensive mandatory measures to end all military and nuclear collaboration with the apartheid régime.<sup>(4)</sup>

ACTIVITIES OF THE SEMINAR ON THE ARMS EMBARGO. An International Seminar on the Implementation and Reinforcement of the Arms Embargo against South Africa was held in London from 1 to 3 April 1981, organized by the Committee against Apartheid in co-operation with the World Campaign against Military and Nuclear Collaboration with South Africa and with the assistance of the British Anti-Apartheid Movement. The Seminar was attended by representatives of United Nations bodies, Governments, national liberation movements of South Africa and Namibia, anti-apartheid movements and other NGOs, members of parliament and experts.

In a Declaration, transmitted to the Secretary-General by a letter of 10 April from the Committee Chairman,<sup>(1)</sup> the Seminar expressed serious concern that the Security Council's arms embargo had not been effectively implemented because of the resistance of certain Western and other States. It pointed to the failure of many States to enact adequate legislation, to their narrow interpretations which made the embargo largely ineffective and to the weakness of monitoring and enforcement measures.

The Seminar considered it essential and urgent to promote a world-wide campaign aimed at pressing the major Western Powers to implement and reinforce the arms embargo against South Africa. It suggested in particular: that all States enact legislation or policy directives covering all military collaboration, including transfers through third parties and involvement in production in South Africa; that petroleum, computers, other electronic equipment, military technology, "dual purpose" equipment for civilian and military use, components, auxiliary equipment and spare parts for arms be included in the embargo; that the Security Council adopt the 1980 recommendations<sup>(12)</sup> of its Committee on the question of South Africa established in 1977<sup>(11)</sup>

(on measures to make the arms embargo more effective); and that all States furnish the Council with information about violations.

In its report to the General Assembly,<sup>(2)</sup> the Committee against Apartheid recommended urgent action on the Seminar's recommendations for the enforcement and better monitoring of the arms embargo. To promote effective monitoring, the Committee suggested joint meetings of itself and the Council Committee to consider means to investigate and publicize information on implementation of the embargo and the strength-

ening of monitoring services in the United Nations Secretariat.

ACTION BY THE CONFERENCE ON SANCTIONS. In its Paris Declaration of 27 May (p. 165), the Conference on Sanctions against South Africa<sup>(3)</sup> also endorsed the recommendations of the Security Council Committee. Like the London Seminar, the Conference called on States to adopt legislation or issue policy directives covering all forms of military collaboration, direct or indirect, including end-user clauses designed to monitor and enforce the arms embargo scrupulously. Such legislation should also cover existing loopholes with regard to "dual purpose" items, computers, electronic equipment and related technology.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. The Declaration of the Seminar on the arms embargo against South Africa was approved by the General Assembly in a resolution of 28 October on racial discrimination.<sup>(5)</sup>

By a resolution of 17 December on the arms embargo against South Africa,<sup>(9)</sup> the Assembly urged the Security Council to consider effective measures to reinforce and strengthen the embargo, taking into account the 1980 recommendations of the Council Committee and the declarations of the Conference on sanctions and the Seminar. It called, on all States to take effective measures to ensure that governmental and non-governmental organizations within their jurisdiction ceased relations with the military and police forces, military industry and nuclear institutions of South Africa; requested States to take firm steps to prevent co-operation or contacts with South Africa by military alliances to which they were parties, and asked them to co-operate with the Committee against Apartheid and the Council Committee; and requested more effective Secretariat services for monitoring the arms embargo. The Assembly also requested the Committee against Apartheid to strengthen its co-operation with the Council Committee and to continue efforts for a comprehensive and effective embargo on all military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa.

The resolution, introduced by Nigeria on behalf of 52 sponsors, was adopted by a recorded vote of 138 to none, with 7 abstentions.

By a resolution of the same date concerning military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa,<sup>(8)</sup> the Assembly urged the Security Council to take immediate steps to ensure the scrupulous and full implementation of the arms embargo and its effective monitoring in the light of the Council Committee's report on ways of making the embargo more effective.

In a resolution of 28 October on the right of peoples to self-determination,<sup>(6)</sup> the Assembly

again demanded the immediate application of the arms embargo by all countries, particularly those that maintained military and nuclear co-operation with the Pretoria régime and continued to supply it with related matériel

By a resolution of 10 December on action by Member States in support of Namibia,<sup>(7)</sup> the Assembly requested all States: to cease providing to South Africa arms and related matériel, as well as equipment, supplies and licences for their manufacture or maintenance; to ensure that arms export agreements provided for guarantees preventing embargoed items or any components thereof from reaching South Africa through third countries; to prohibit the export of spare parts for embargoed aircraft and other military equipment belonging to South Africa, and the maintenance and servicing of such equipment; to prohibit government agencies and corporations under their jurisdiction from transferring technology for the manufacture of arms and related matériel to South Africa and from investing in such manufacture in South Africa; and to prohibit all imports of arms and related matériel from there.

France said its abstention in the vote on the arms embargo resolution was justified by the fact that certain provisions were perceptibly removed from the 1977 Security Council resolution imposing an arms embargo, which it was strictly applying. Also abstaining, the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the declarations of the Conference on sanctions and the Seminar on the arms embargo contained dubious propositions to which it could not subscribe; it had applied a voluntary arms embargo against South Africa since 1963 and had given full support to the 1977 Council resolution.

Among those voting for the resolution, Australia and Spain mentioned that the imposition of sanctions was the responsibility of the Security Council. Belgium, Botswana, Japan and the Netherlands, though supporting the text, expressed reservations on the Conference and Seminar declarations; Belgium added that it could not accept the indirect references to supposed co-operation between certain Western States and South Africa, and Japan said it had strictly implemented the arms embargo. Ireland said its support for the resolution should not be seen as endorsement of the Seminar Declaration; it also expressed reservations concerning the paragraph calling on States to take specific measures unilaterally. The Netherlands attached importance to strengthening the arms embargo as a means to compel South Africa to desist from its repressive internal policy and military actions against neighbouring States; however, it believed that peaceful nuclear collaboration could not be categorized as a form of military collaboration.

During the debate, many States-among them Gabon, Indonesia, Ireland and Singapore-deemed it essential to strengthen the arms embargo and improve its monitoring. Malaysia and others were disturbed at reports of breaches of the embargo by certain countries. Ghana and Tunisia expressed concern that there were still loopholes which permitted violations, while Venezuela was concerned at the failure to enforce the embargo. The German Democratic Republic charged imperialist monopolies with violating the embargo, and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya said that 'Western States, and the United States in particular, had paid no attention to its implementation.

The Netherlands said it had long prohibited the sale of arms on a voluntary basis. The United Kingdom, speaking for the EC members, stated that they strictly observed the embargo. The United States said it had been the first country to impose a complete arms embargo against South Africa, in 1963, 15 years before the United Nations embargo.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid Chairman, transmitting Declaration of Seminar on arms embargo, 10 Apr., A/36/190-S/14442.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22; <sup>(3)</sup>Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, A/CONF.107/8.

Resolutions: <sup>(4)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): 4(XXXVII), para. 12 (b), 23 Feb. GA: (5)36/8, para. 9, 28 Oct. (p. 868); <sup>(6)</sup>36/9, para. 12, 28 Oct. (p. 895); <sup>(7)</sup>36/121 B, paras. 15-20, 10 Dec. (p. 1158); <sup>(8)</sup>36/172 E, para. 5, 17 Dec. (p. 185); <sup>(9)</sup>36/172 F, 17 Dec., text following. SC: <sup>(10)</sup>418(1977), 4 Nov. 1977 (YUN 1977, p. 161); (11)421(1977), 9 Dec. 1977 (ibid., p. 162).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(12)</sup>1980, p. 201.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 101-103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/172 F

138-0-7 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981  
52-nation draft (A/36/L.39 and Add.1); agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Arms embargo against South Africa

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/206 B of 16 December 1980,

Further recalling Security Council resolutions 418(1977) of 4 November 1977, 421(1977) of 9 December 1977 and 473(1980) of 13 June 1980.

Recognizing the importance of the effective and universal implementation of the arms embargo against South Africa, the cessation of all military co-operation with South Africa and the denial of any assistance or co-operation, either direct or indirect, to South Africa in its military build-up or nuclear plans,

Considering that military or nuclear co-operation with South Africa increases the threat to international peace and security.

Having considered the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid,

Taking note of the report of the International Seminar on the Implementation and Reinforcement of the Arms Embargo against South Africa, held in London from 1 to 3 April 1981, and the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa, adopted by the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981,

Expressing its grave concern about the large increase in the military budget of South Africa since the imposition of the arms embargo by the Security Council, the development by South Africa of its nuclear-weapon capability and the increasing acts of aggression by South Africa against independent African States,

Noting with regret that the Security Council has so far failed to take action on the report of 19 September 1980 of the Council Committee established by resolution 421 (1977) concerning the question of South Africa on ways and means of making the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa more effective,

Commending the World Campaign against Military and Nuclear Collaboration with South Africa and other groups for their co-operation in providing information to organs of the United Nations on infringements of the arms embargo,

1. Urges the Security Council to consider effective measures to reinforce and strengthen the arms embargo against South Africa, taking into account the recommendations of the Council Committee established by resolution 421(1977) concerning the question of South Africa, the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa and the Declaration of the International Seminar on the Implementation and Reinforcement of the Arms Embargo against South Africa;

2. Calls upon all States to take effective measures to ensure that governmental and non-governmental organizations within their jurisdiction cease any relations with the military and police forces, military industry and nuclear institutions of South Africa;

3. Requests all States concerned to take firm steps to prevent any co-operation or contacts with the régime of South Africa by military alliances to which they are parties;

4. Requests all States to extend their co-operation to the Special Committee against Apartheid and the Security Council Committee established by resolution 421 (1977) concerning the question of South Africa in the discharge of their respective mandates;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to ensure more effective Secretariat services for the monitoring of the arms embargo against South Africa and maximum co-ordination towards that end;

8. Requests and authorizes the Special Committee:

(a) To strengthen its co-operation with the Security Council Committee established by resolution 421(1977) concerning the question of South Africa;

(b) To continue in its efforts to promote a comprehensive and effective embargo on all forms of military and nuclear collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

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

Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Italy, Portugal, United Kingdom, United States.

#### Oil embargo

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID. During 1981, the Committee against Apartheid continued to promote an embargo on international trade in petroleum and petroleum products with South Africa. In co-operation with a committee of nine Western European parliamentarians, it organized a Conference of West European Parliamentarians on an Oil Embargo against South Africa, at Brussels, Belgium, on 30 and 31 January. The Conference, attended by 35 members of parliament from eight Western European countries and the European Parliament, representatives of United Nations bodies, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the national liberation movements of South Africa and Namibia, adopted a declaration favouring a mandatory Security Council oil embargo and urging legislative action by European Governments to enforce and strengthen such an embargo.

The Committee Chairman, by a letter of 21 January, expressed appreciation to Norway for its action in preventing a Norwegian tanker from delivering oil from the Norwegian continental shelf to South Africa. By a letter dated 22 January to the Chairman 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, he requested that Committee to consider the continued supply to South Africa of oil from Brunei under a contract between Shell and SASOL, the South African parastatal oil corporation. By a letter of 20 March, he commended the work of the Holland Committee and its Shipping Research Bureau, established to study how South Africa had been able to evade the oil embargo imposed by oil-exporting countries.

The Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid and the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, in a joint statement commending five churchmen in France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States for a letter they had addressed on 23 March to five oil companies, called on all oil companies to cease forthwith the supply of oil and oil products to South Africa, especially in violation of embargoes enacted by oil-exporting countries.

In its 1981 report to the General Assembly,<sup>(3)</sup> which gave an account of these activities, the Committee recommended that the Security Council institute a mandatory oil embargo against South Africa and call on States to impose exemplary punishment on any transnational corporation or tanker company involved in the supply of oil to South Africa. It also called for the termination of all participation by corporations and financial institutions in South Africa's oil-from-coal industry.

The Committee commended for the urgent attention of the Council and the Assembly the proposals of the Conference of West European Parliamentarians on an oil embargo and of the Technical Commission of the Conference on Sanctions against South Africa (see below), as well as a resolution on South Africa adopted in June at Nairobi, Kenya, by the OAU Council of Ministers, which reaffirmed the organization's commitment to an oil embargo and reiterated its appeal to prohibit oil exports to South Africa or Namibia.<sup>(1)</sup>

**ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS.** In a resolution of 23 February on violations of human rights in South Africa and Namibia (p. 944), the Commission on Human Rights requested the Security Council to consider imposing mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa, including in particular an embargo on the supply of petroleum and petroleum products.<sup>(5)</sup>

**ACTION BY THE CONFERENCE ON SANCTIONS.** In its Paris Declaration of 27 May, the Conference on Sanctions against South Africa<sup>(4)</sup> (p. 165) noted with satisfaction that the major oil-exporting States had imposed an embargo on the supply of their oil to South Africa. It called on other suppliers of oil or oil products to join in implementing the embargo through legislation or policy directives. It urged the Security Council to institute a mandatory embargo on the supply of oil and oil products to South Africa and on the provision of any assistance to the South African oil industry.

The Conference's Technical Commission, recognizing that oil was South Africa's most vulnerable point of dependence on the outside world, agreed that an oil embargo was a key element in any sanctions programme against South Africa. It recommended a set of legislative, monitoring and enforcement measures, including the establishment of an intergovernmental monitoring agency and action by Governments to penalize companies that violated the embargo.

**COMMUNICATION.** Kuwait, by a letter of 9 November,<sup>(2)</sup> transmitted to the Secretary-General a resolution adopted at Kuwait on 6

May by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries (OAPEC), containing recommendations for the strengthening and better control of the embargo on the delivery of Arab oil to South Africa, to be adopted by its member countries. The resolution was signed by Algeria, Bahrain, Iraq, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic and the United Arab Emirates.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(8)</sup> the General Assembly again requested the Security Council to consider urgently a mandatory embargo on the supply of petroleum and petroleum products to South Africa. It urged States to take effective legislative and other measures to ensure the implementation of an oil embargo, and asked them to act against corporations and tanker companies involved in the illicit supply of oil to South Africa. It requested the Committee against Apartheid to continue its efforts to promote an effective oil embargo and authorized it to organize if necessary, under United Nations auspices, a conference of oil-exporting countries that had imposed an oil embargo, to consider national and international arrangements to ensure implementation. It invited Governments and organizations to lend their full support to the embargo.

This resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 126 to 7, with 12 abstentions.

By a resolution of 24 November on foreign interests in colonial countries,<sup>(7)</sup> the Assembly called on oil-producing and oil-exporting countries to take effective measures against the oil companies that supplied crude oil and petroleum products to South Africa.

Introducing the 52-nation resolution on an oil embargo against South Africa, Algeria said the text essentially reproduced the provisions of the 1980 Assembly resolution on the subject.<sup>(6)</sup> The sponsors were convinced that its strict application would do a great deal to strengthen common action to eradicate apartheid.

New Zealand, which abstained in the vote, as well as Ireland, the Netherlands and Spain, which supported the Assembly's request to the Council to impose an oil embargo, reserved their position on provisions which they regarded as appearing to pre-empt Council consideration. Australia abstained on similar grounds. Norway, which voted in favour, said the Nordic States were prepared to join in a mandatory oil embargo imposed by the Council; it was Norway's policy not to sell oil to South Africa.

During the debate, Ghana urged the Council to adopt an oil embargo as a matter of urgency. The call for an embargo was supported by a number of other countries, among them Algeria,

Ireland, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Poland and Senegal; the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya said that, as a member of OAPEC, it worked closely with other oil-exporting countries in implementing the embargo. Saudi Arabia declared its readiness to carry out boycotts by every available means, particularly an oil embargo. The Netherlands said it was considering participation in the existing voluntary embargo.

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, annexing OAU resolutions, 18 Sep., A/36/534; <sup>(2)</sup>Kuwait, 9 Nov., A/36/665-S/14750.

Reports: <sup>(3)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22; <sup>(4)</sup>Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, A/CONF.107/8.

Resolutions: <sup>(5)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): 4(XXXVII), para. 12 (a), 23 Feb. GA: <sup>(6)</sup>35/206 D, 16 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 214); <sup>(7)</sup>36/51, para. 13, 24 Nov. 1981 (p. 1109); <sup>(8)</sup>36/172 G, 17 Dec., text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 101-103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/172 G

126-7-12 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981  
52-nation draft (A/36/L.40 and Add.1): agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Oil embargo against South Africa

The General Assembly,

Recalling and reaffirming its resolution 36/206 D of 16 December 1980.

Having considered the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid,

Taking note of the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa, adopted by the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981, and the Declaration of the Conference of West European Parliamentarians on an Oil Embargo against South Africa, held at Brussels on 30 and 31 January 1981.

Convinced that an embargo on the supply of petroleum, petroleum products and other strategic materials is an essential complement to the arms embargo against South Africa.

Commending all Governments that have imposed an oil embargo against South Africa,

Taking note of the resolution adopted on 6 May 1981 by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries to tighten crude oil sales contracts in order to prevent oil from reaching South Africa,

Reiterating the urgent need for the imposition of a mandatory oil embargo against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations and for more effective monitoring of the embargoes imposed by most oil-exporting States,

Condemning the activities of corporations and other interests engaged in the clandestine supply to South Africa of oil from countries which imposed an oil embargo,

1. Again requests the Security Council to consider urgently a mandatory embargo on the supply of petroleum and petroleum products to South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations;

2. Urges all States that have not yet done so to take effective legislative and other measures to ensure the implementation of an oil embargo against South Africa;

3. Requests all States concerned to take effective action against corporations and tanker companies involved in the illicit supply of oil to South Africa;

4. Requests and authorizes the Special Committee against Apartheid to continue its efforts, including the undertaking of missions, the holding of seminars and the publication of studies, to promote an effective oil embargo against South Africa;

5. Further authorizes the Special Committee, in consultation with the Secretary-General and oil-exporting countries, to organize if necessary, under the auspices of the United Nations, a conference of oil-exporting countries that have imposed an oil embargo against South Africa to consider national and international arrangements to ensure the effective implementation of their oil embargo;

6. Invites Governments, International and non-governmental organizations, trade unions and other appropriate bodies to lend their full support to the oil embargo against South Africa.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

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

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Luxembourg, United Kingdom, United States.

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

#### International Year for sanctions against South Africa (1982)

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID. In its annual report for 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Committee against Apartheid recommended that 1982 be proclaimed the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa.

In a special report to the General Assembly on this observance, transmitted on 29 October 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> the Committee suggested that the purpose of the Year should be to make world public opinion aware of the grave situation in southern Africa and mobilize maximum support for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa. While awaiting the imposition of sanctions by the Security Council, the Year's activities would seek to promote selective and partial sanctions and unilateral measures by States, organizations, groups and individuals in order to isolate the apartheid régime.

The programme for the Year would entail the

promotion of concrete action by the United Nations, Governments, and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to end collaboration and encourage wider public action such as consumer, sports, cultural and academic boycotts, divestment from corporations doing business in South Africa, and the establishment of anti-apartheid and solidarity movements.

The Committee's recommendations for the Year included: the holding of a special General Assembly meeting to present awards to persons recommended by the Committee for their outstanding contribution to the international movement for sanctions; United Nations publicity for the Paris Declaration and other documents of the Conference on sanctions (p. 165), and for other measures for the isolation of South Africa; and government action to establish national committees, hold special parliamentary sessions and review actions concerning the cessation of collaboration with South Africa. Specialized agencies and other intergovernmental organizations should be requested to review their relations with South Africa with a view to terminating any collaboration.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** By a resolution of 17 December 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly proclaimed 1982 the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa. It endorsed the programme for the Year recommended by the Committee against Apartheid, as well as the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa, and requested the Committee to promote observance of the Year. It invited Governments, intergovernmental organizations, NGOs and institutions to participate, and requested the Secretary-General to encourage the widest possible observance.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 130 to 8, with 8 abstentions.

By another resolution of the same date,<sup>(5)</sup> dealing with the Committee's work programme, the Assembly requested the Committee to give the highest priority in 1982 to mobilizing support for sanctions against South Africa.

India introduced the resolution on the International Year on behalf of its 52 sponsors, stating that the time had come for greater concerted efforts to mobilize the world community for comprehensive sanctions.

Explaining its negative vote on the resolution, Portugal said the initiatives of those in South Africa struggling for fundamental changes should not be hampered and contact should be kept with the people of South Africa.

New Zealand, which abstained, said it thought that designating an international year was the wrong way to go about imposing selective sanctions. Speaking for the Nordic States,

which voted in favour, Norway observed that the resolution did not take into account the guidelines for international years established in 1980 by the Economic and Social Council.<sup>(3)</sup>

Reservations regarding the Paris Declaration were voiced by Australia and New Zealand, which abstained, and by Ireland, the Netherlands and Norway, the last speaking for the Nordic States, which voted in favour (p. 169).

During the Assembly's debate, Jamaica suggested that the programme of the Year concentrate on promoting concrete actions by Governments to end collaboration with South Africa and encourage wider public action, such as consumer, sports and cultural boycotts.

Reports: Committee Apartheid, <sup>(1)</sup>A/36/22, <sup>(2)</sup>A/36/22/Add.2-S/14689/Add.2.  
Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC: 1980/67, annex, 25 July 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1030). GA: <sup>(4)</sup>36/172 B, 17 Dec. 1981, text following; <sup>(5)</sup>36/172 N, para. 2 (a), 17 Dec. (p. 213).  
Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.  
Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 101-103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/172 B

130-8-8 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981  
52-nation draft (A/36/L.35 and Add.1): agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian, SSR., United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Zimbabwe.

#### International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa

The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981.

Recognizing that the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa, adopted by the Conference, provides the framework for effective international action for the elimination of apartheid and for averting the growing threat to international peace and security,

Recognizing the need to promote maximum support for the implementation of the Paris Declaration,

Having considered the special report of the Special Committee against Apartheid on the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa,

Having also considered resolution CM/Res.865(XXXVII) adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity at its thirty-seventh ordinary session, held at Nairobi from 15 to 26 June 1981.

1. Endorses the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa and commends it to the attention of all Governments and organizations;

2. Proclaims the year 1982 International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa;

3. Endorses the programme for the Year recommended by the Special Committee against Apartheid in its special report;

4. Requests the Special Committee to take all appropriate action to promote the widest and most effective observance of the Year:

5. Invites all Governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and institutions to participate effectively in the observance of the Year in co-operation with the United Nations;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to encourage the widest possible observance of the Year and to provide all necessary assistance to the Special Committee in the discharge of its responsibilities.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

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

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Luxembourg, Portugal, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Botswana, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, New Zealand, Swaziland.

#### Trade unions and sanctions

**ACTION BY THE CONFERENCE ON SANCTIONS.** The Political Commission of the Conference on Sanctions against South Africa (p. 165), in its report to the Conference adopted on 26 May,<sup>(3)</sup> called on all trade unions to help boycott transport and communication with South Africa and to support the struggle of black workers there and in Namibia, both through direct solidarity and by giving material assistance to the South African Congress of Trade Unions and the National Union of Namibian Workers.

**ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID.** In its 1981 report,<sup>(2)</sup> the Committee against Apartheid commended the actions of trade unions in denouncing repression against workers and journalists, supporting sanctions and exposing violations of the arms and oil embargoes, discouraging loans and emigration of workers to South Africa, opposing the activities of transnational corporations (TNCS) in aid of the apartheid régime, and assisting persecuted workers and their trade unions. It also commended the Declaration and resolutions on apartheid adopted at Geneva in June by the General Conference of the International Labour Organisation (ILO) as an important guide to further action.

In its Declaration, which updated a 1964 ILO Declaration on the subject,<sup>(7)</sup> the General Conference reaffirmed the organization's determination to promote and take part in securing the

freedom and dignity of the people of South Africa, and to fight the policy of apartheid; confirmed the ILO Director-General's mandate to monitor and follow the situation in South Africa in respect of labour and social matters and to submit a special report every year; decided to establish a permanent Conference Committee on Apartheid to examine information on South Africa and on action taken against apartheid; and asked ILO to increase its technical assistance to the liberation movements, black workers and their independent trade unions and to create a training institute for South Africa to promote manpower training and development.

The Committee against Apartheid welcomed a resolution adopted at Nairobi, Kenya, in June by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), requesting the OAU Sanctions Committee, in collaboration with the Organization of African Trade Union Unity, the Committee against Apartheid and the United Nations Council for Namibia, to convene an international trade union conference to work out an action programme towards the enforcement of sanctions.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Committee recommended that the General Assembly should: denounce the trade union rights violations in South Africa and the repression against black workers; commend the courageous struggle of black workers of South Africa for their rights; commend actions by the world trade union movement in support of the struggle for trade union rights and liberation in South Africa, and encourage further measures in the light of the conclusions of the Conference on sanctions and the decisions of the ILO General Conference; and provide funds to enable the Committee to contribute to the organization of an international sanctions conference of trade unions and to undertake other activities to promote trade union action against apartheid.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** On 17 December,<sup>(5)</sup> the General Assembly requested and authorized the Committee against Apartheid to take steps, in co-operation with the Council for Namibia, ILO, OAU and the Organization of African Trade Union Unity, to organize in 1982 an International Conference of Trade Unions on Sanctions against South Africa. The purpose of the Conference would be to work out an action programme towards the enforcement of sanctions against apartheid. The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 129 to 2, with 12 abstentions.

By its resolution of the same date on sanctions against South Africa,<sup>(4)</sup> the Assembly requested the Committee to strengthen its co-operation with trade unions and other organizations in order to promote effective sanctions against South Africa. In another resolution of 17 Decem-



ber, on public information, the mass media and apartheid the Assembly authorized the Committee to promote the organization of the Conference.

Guinea, introducing the 47-nation resolution on the Conference, said the denial of trade union rights formed part of a series of measures to restrict, limit, persecute and do police violence to the victims of which made of South Africa a vast camp of displaced persons, subjected to strict conditions of forced labour. The Assembly, in endorsing the holding of a conference of trade unions, would contribute to the success of the International Year for sanctions (p. 177) and express its devotion to humanitarian ideals.

Abstaining in the vote on this resolution, New Zealand voiced reservations about the call for such a conference. Costa Rica, though voting in favour, expressed reservations on the mention of the report of the Conference on sanctions in a preambular paragraph of the resolution. Botswana had reservations on the reference to the Conference of trade unions in the public information resolution.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, 18 Sep., annexing OAU resolutions, A/36/534.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22; <sup>(3)</sup>Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, A/CONF.107/8.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>36/172 D, para. 12 (b), 17 Dec. (p. 172); <sup>(5)</sup>36/172 H, 17 Dec., text following; <sup>(6)</sup>36/172 L, para. 6, 17 Dec. (p. 207).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(7)</sup>1964, p. 492.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 101-103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/172 H

129-2-12 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981  
47-nation draft (A/36/L.41 and Add. 1): agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Burundi, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

International Conference of Trade Unions on  
Sanctions against South Africa

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/206 C of 16 December 1980.

Deploping that some Member States have maintained and even increased their political, military, economic and other relations with South Africa despite the resolutions of the United Nations on apartheid:

Having considered the report of the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981, as well as the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid.

Recognizing the important role of trade union organizations in the international campaign for sanctions against South Africa,

1. Requests and authorises the Special Committee against Apartheid to take all necessary steps, in co-operation

with the United Nations Council for Namibia, the International Labour Organisation, the Organization of African Unity and the Organization of African Trade Union Unity, to organize in 1982 an International Conference of Trade Unions on Sanctions against South Africa for the purpose of working out a programme of action towards the enforcement of sanctions against apartheid;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to provide all necessary assistance to the Special Committee in the organization of the Conference.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

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

Against: United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Botswana, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Portugal, Swaziland.

### Relations with South Africa

Political, economic and military collaboration with South Africa by States, business enterprises and financial institutions was condemned in 1981 by the General Assembly, the Conference on Sanctions against South Africa and the Committee against Apartheid as an encouragement of South Africa's apartheid policies. To isolate South Africa, they urged the Security Council to take measures to end such collaboration, especially in the military and nuclear fields (see below). The Assembly condemned in particular Israel's increasing collaboration with South Africa in these areas (p. 192). Termination of collaboration by TNCS was called for by the Economic and Social Council (p. 188), while the Assembly requested effective steps by the Security Council to achieve the cessation of foreign investments in South Africa (p. 185).

### Military and nuclear relations

ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS. By a resolution of 23 February, on foreign support of South Africa (p. 945), the Commission on Human Rights requested States to end all forms of collaboration and assistance, including military and nuclear supplies and equipment, to the racist régime which used such assistance to repress the people of South Africa

and Namibia and their national liberation movements<sup>(7)</sup>

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION (MARCH).** In a resolution on the Namibia question adopted on 6 March,<sup>(11)</sup> the General Assembly condemned Western and other States which had assisted South Africa in developing a nuclear capacity and urged all Member States to frustrate South Africa's attempts to develop nuclear weapons.

In a resolution of the same date on Namibian uranium,<sup>(12)</sup> the Assembly requested the Security Council to ensure that South Africa did not continue to acquire foreign nuclear technology. It condemned the collusion of France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Israel and the United States with South Africa in the nuclear field; and called on all States to refrain from supplying the régime with installations that might enable it to produce nuclear materials, reactors or military equipment.

**ACTION BY THE CONFERENCE ON SANCTIONS.** In its Paris Declaration, adopted on 27 May (p. 165), the Conference on Sanctions against South Africa<sup>(6)</sup> expressed concern at reports of efforts by South Africa to form military alliances and arrangements involving some Western Powers and régimes in other regions. It considered that any military alliances or arrangements with South Africa would be an act of hostility against the struggle of its people that would greatly aggravate the situation in southern Africa, and called for vigilance by the international community to prevent such arrangements.

The Political Commission of the Conference stated in its report that the apartheid economy and its war machine had been created primarily through the active participation of a number of Western Powers and TNCS, which had developed into an alliance between those enterprises and the régime. South Africa continued to manufacture under licence military aircraft and equipment originating in France, Italy, the United Kingdom and other countries; it had obtained military communications equipment from France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom; Danish ships had been involved in arms transport to South Africa, Spain had acted as a conduit of arms, a United States-Canadian company had provided an artillery system and Israel had supplied arms and munitions. Several Western States had permitted the training and recruitment of nuclear scientists and the supply of nuclear technology.

In addition to calling for a strengthened arms embargo, the Commission said there was an urgent need to apply Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations (on action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace and

acts of aggression) to prevent all forms of nuclear collaboration with South Africa. It also called for action to stop all imports of uranium from South Africa and Namibia.

The Conference's Technical Commission expressed grave concern over the serious and immediate threat which South Africa's nuclear capability presented to world peace and particularly to African States. It was of the view that South Africa had developed and tested a design weapon and that producing a small arsenal from its available weapons-grade material was only a matter of weeks. That capability had been acquired with the assistance of France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States, as well as Belgium, Israel, Japan, the Netherlands and Switzerland, through uranium extraction and processing, supply of nuclear equipment, technology transfer, and training and exchange of scientists.

The Commission recommended a halt to the uranium trade with South Africa and Namibia and a strengthened Security Council ban on nuclear collaboration with South Africa. It also proposed the termination of nuclear contracts, training of personnel, technology transfer, supply of nuclear materials, and all economic and other support for South Africa's nuclear industry or any related industry.

**ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON COLONIAL COUNTRIES.** In a consensus on military bases in colonial countries (p. 1110), adopted on 14 August,<sup>(5)</sup> the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples condemned any co-operation with South Africa by certain Western countries and other States in supplying arms, military equipment and technology, including nuclear technology and equipment that could be used for military purposes. It called on States to cease such collaboration and support, particularly the sale of weapons and other matériel which increased South Africa's capacity to wage war against neighbouring States, as well as the supply of equipment, technology, materials and training which increased its nuclear capacity.

In a consensus on the Namibia question (p. 1138), also adopted on 14 August, the Committee condemned the continued military collaboration between South Africa and certain Western and other States, and called for the termination of their collaboration in the nuclear field, which it regarded as a serious violation of the military embargo imposed by the Security Council in 1977.<sup>(20)</sup>

**ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID.** During 1981 the Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid addressed com-

munications — summarized in its annual report<sup>(4)</sup> — to the Secretary-General, the President of the Security Council and others calling attention to instances in which equipment with military uses had reportedly been supplied to South Africa.

By a letter of 12 March to the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations, he conveyed the Committee's concern at press reports that the United States intended to grant Israel the right to sell to South Africa its KFIR jets and other military equipment with American components, and called for action to prevent such sale. In a reply of 6 April, the United States assured the Committee that it had received no such request from Israel and that it would not grant permission to sell any military equipment containing American components, including KFIR jets, to South Africa.

After receiving a report that the United Kingdom was exporting electronic equipment from the Plessey Company to South African military forces, the Chairman sent a letter on 29 April to the Chairman of the Security Council Committee on the question of South Africa, expressing hope that the Committee would take urgent action to prevent the export of the equipment to South Africa. On 8 May, following a further report that the equipment included United States computers manufactured under licence in Ireland, the Chairman wrote to the United States requesting that it look into the matter urgently and act in the light of the Council and Assembly arms embargo resolutions.

By a letter of 11 May, the Chairman transmitted to the Secretary-General, for the attention of the Assembly and the Council, a statement of the same date denouncing reported plans for a non-governmental conference at Buenos Aires, Argentina, on 26 May, to be attended by representatives from South Africa, the United States, Argentina, Brazil and other Latin American countries, for the purpose of discussing a South Atlantic alliance, including South Africa.<sup>(1)</sup>

In a reply of 22 May,<sup>(3)</sup> transmitted on the same day to the Secretary-General, Brazil stated that it had never been associated with the event, would not send any representative and had not altered its opposition to undertaking military alliances with the South African Government. Argentina, by a letter of 22 June,<sup>(2)</sup> transmitted to the Secretary-General a letter of 15 May to the Chairman together with a press release of 14 May, stating that it had no connection with the meeting and it resolutely opposed the conclusion of any military pact with South Africa relating to the South Atlantic.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION (DECEMBER). By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(19)</sup> the General As-

sembly strongly condemned the collusion with South Africa in the nuclear field by certain Western countries and other States, particularly the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany and Israel, and called on France and all other Governments not to supply installations that might enable South Africa to produce nuclear materials, reactors or military equipment. It condemned all States that continued military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, in particular certain Western States and Israel. The Assembly again requested the Security Council to strengthen the arms embargo (p. 173) and secure the immediate cessation of military and nuclear collaboration. It authorized the Committee against Apartheid to continue to promote an embargo on such collaboration and to expose developments. It invited Governments and organizations to assist persons compelled to leave South Africa because of conscientious objection to military or police service. Condemning manoeuvres to create a South Atlantic Treaty Organization with South Africa, it appealed to the Council to ensure that such an organization was not established.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 119 to 19, with 4 abstentions. Paragraph 1, condemning nuclear collusion by certain named States and calling on France and others not to supply certain installations, was adopted by a recorded vote, requested by the United States, of 56 to 24, with 51 abstentions.

By a resolution of 9 December on implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa,<sup>(16)</sup> adopted in 1964 by the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the Assembly reaffirmed that South Africa's nuclear programme endangered peace and security and increased the danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons; condemned and called for an end to nuclear collaboration with South Africa by any State, corporation, institution or individual; and requested the Security Council to prohibit all such collaboration. In a resolution of the same date on South Africa's nuclear capability, the Assembly requested the Council to intensify its efforts to prohibit nuclear co-operation and collaboration with South Africa and to institute effective enforcement action to prevent that regime from endangering peace and security by acquiring nuclear weapons. It called on States, corporations, institutions and individuals to terminate all military and nuclear collaboration, including the provision of such related materials as computers, electronic equipment and corresponding technology.

In resolutions on foreign interests impeding decolonization, adopted on 24 November,<sup>(13)</sup> and on the Namibia situation, adopted on

10 December,<sup>(18)</sup> the Assembly strongly condemned the continuing collaboration of certain Western and other States with South Africa and called on all Governments to refrain from such collaboration. It particularly condemned such collusion by the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany and Israel, and called on France and all others to refrain from supplying South Africa with installations that might enable it to produce nuclear materials, reactors or military equipment.

The Assembly, in a resolution of 1 December<sup>(14)</sup> on implementation of its 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,<sup>(8)</sup> strongly condemned all collaboration with South Africa, particularly nuclear and military, and called on all States concerned to cease all such collaboration forthwith.

In a resolution of 9 December<sup>(17)</sup> on implementation of its 1970 Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security,<sup>(10)</sup> the Assembly called on the Security Council to take effective measures to promote the denuclearization of Africa in order to avert the serious danger which South Africa's nuclear capability constituted to the African States, in particular the front-line States, as well as to peace and security.

Introducing in the Assembly the 34-nation resolution on military and nuclear collaboration, Cuba said South Africa's actions were sufficient cause for denying that country collaboration of any kind, all the more so if such collaboration enabled it to strengthen its already considerable military potential and gave it access to nuclear military technology. It was highly surprising that well-known Western Powers should maintain links with South Africa and expressly violate the arms embargo. Particularly disturbing was the information concerning recent talks between the United States and South Africa on nuclear collaboration. It was necessary to put an end to that reprehensible collaboration, which directly resulted in aggression by South Africa against African States and the consolidation of apartheid.

Voting against paragraph 1 as well as the resolution as a whole, Australia, Greece, Ireland, New Zealand, Norway (for the Nordic States), Portugal and Spain declared that they could not support the singling out of certain States. Spain reserved its position also on the naming of countries and groups of countries in the preamble (which referred to certain members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and Israel) and in paragraph 4 (mentioning the United States). Norway, speaking on behalf of the three Nordic NATO members-Denmark, Iceland and Norway-rejected the reference to NATO as wholly unjustified, saying it introduced

an East-West element totally irrelevant to the struggle against apartheid.

The United Kingdom, speaking for the European Community (EC) members, which also voted against in both votes, said they rejected all arbitrary and unjustified attacks on Member States, whether by name or implicitly. The Federal Republic of Germany strongly rejected the accusations of nuclear and military collusion as unjustified, unacceptable and harmful to friendly co-operation. The United States said it denounced, in the strongest possible terms, the malicious fabrications on military and nuclear collaboration; it did not export nuclear fuel or provide nuclear facilities to South Africa, and charges about its alleged intention to create a "South Atlantic Treaty Organization" were specious and demonstrably false.

Several other speakers objected or expressed reservations to the singling out of certain countries. These included Austria, which voted against paragraph 1 and abstained on the whole text, as well as Argentina, Bangladesh, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Indonesia, Jamaica, Morocco, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Togo, which voted in favour of the resolution but abstained on that paragraph; Togo wondered whether the States mentioned were the only ones deserving of condemnation.

Brazil, voting for the text but abstaining on paragraph 1, said some provisions should have been more balanced; it reiterated its opposition to any military alliance involving South Africa. Chile said the allusion to such an alliance was baseless and Costa Rica said it could not accept the paragraph. Turkey, which supported the resolution but voted against paragraph 1, voiced reservations also about the reference to NATO in the preambular paragraph by which the Assembly expressed serious concern at the failure of certain NATO members, Israel and other States to cease their military and nuclear co-operation with South Africa.

Sierra Leone, on the other hand, said there was substantial evidence, which had yet to be contradicted or disproved, to support paragraph 1, and there was also evidence of a fiendish attempt by South Africa to draw others into a so-called South Atlantic Treaty Organization; it could not see why those who would have nothing to do with such an organization should be exercised by the reference to it.

Paragraph 4 of the resolution on the denuclearization of Africa, containing the call for termination of military and nuclear collaboration, was approved in the Assembly's First Committee by a recorded vote, requested by the United States, of 101 to 6, with 16 abstentions. Several States objected to this provision and to a

preambular paragraph by which the Assembly expressed indignation that certain Western countries and Israel had continued to collaborate with South Africa despite the risk of proliferation of nuclear weapons. Voting against the paragraph, Israel and the United Kingdom denied any nuclear collaboration with South Africa, while the United States rejected efforts to include all high-technology items under the arms embargo. Among those abstaining, Australia objected to the tendentious naming of States, while Portugal considered that only military co-operation should be condemned. Austria, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Norway, Spain, Sweden and Turkey objected to the preambular provision referring to certain Western countries and Israel.

Paragraph 9 of the resolution on foreign interests impeding decolonization, citing States by name in reference to military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, was adopted by a recorded vote of 59 to 36, with 47 abstentions, after a motion to have a separate vote on this paragraph, to which Angola objected, was adopted by a recorded vote of 57 to 50, with 26 abstentions.

Voting against the paragraph, the Federal Republic of Germany rejected the accusation of military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, adding that it had applied since 1963 a voluntary embargo on arms to that country. The United States said it had permitted no export of nuclear fuel or facilities to South Africa in the previous five years. Belgium, the Central African Republic, Chile, Denmark, Finland, Gabon, Israel, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Senegal, Somalia, Sweden, Turkey and Uruguay, as well as the United Kingdom on behalf of the EC member States, objected to the mention of specific States.

Reservations, mainly concerning the selectivity of the list, were also voiced by the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Burma, Burundi, Fiji, Indonesia, Liberia, Mali, Peru, the Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Suriname, Thailand and Togo, which abstained on the paragraph. Liberia added that it would have been better if the States accused of nuclear collusion had been requested to advise the Secretary-General on the action they had taken or intended to take.

Canada, speaking for the five-nation contact group engaged in negotiations on the Namibia question, stated that the condemnation of two members of that group for collusion with South Africa in the nuclear field was included in the resolution on the Namibia question in apparent ignorance of the true state of affairs.

During the Assembly debate on apartheid, a number of speakers viewed as ominous the possible acquisition of nuclear weapons by South

Africa. Several countries proposed a total ban on nuclear collaboration with South Africa, and Ghana urged the Security Council urgently to prohibit all such collaboration. Singapore urged countries supplying South Africa with nuclear technology and equipment to reconsider their policy. Sri Lanka called for a halt to all military and other collaboration with South Africa which enabled it to maintain apartheid and commit aggression against neighbouring States. The Netherlands held it imperative that South Africa adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons<sup>(9)</sup> or, at least, that it accept full-scope safeguards which would permit inspection of its installations.

Austria endorsed a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa, while Turkey stated that every effort should be made to achieve the denuclearization of Africa and the ending of nuclear co-operation with South Africa.

According to the USSR, South Africa's military self-sufficiency had advanced from 70 to 90 per cent as a result of financial and technical assistance and licences granted by Western Powers. The Syrian Arab Republic said the open collaboration between South Africa and the United States had reached a higher stage, as evidenced by visits to that country by South African military officials. Those who supplied military hardware to South Africa, said the Gambia, must assume direct responsibility for the savage repression of the Africans there.

Japan said there was no military co-operation between Japan and South Africa, nor co-operation in nuclear development.

Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, the Ukrainian SSR and Viet Nam expressed concern at reports that the United States was trying to create a South Atlantic Treaty Organization including South Africa, Argentina and other countries. Argentina restated its opposition to such a pact.

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid Chairman, 11 May, A/36/253-S/14479; <sup>(2)</sup>Argentina, 22 June, A/36/340-S/14565; <sup>(3)</sup>Brazil, 22 May, A/36/285-S/14487.

Reports: <sup>(4)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22., <sup>(5)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev.1; <sup>(6)</sup>Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, A/CONF.107/8.

Resolutions: <sup>(7)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): 8(XXXVII), para. 4, 23 Feb. GA: <sup>(8)</sup>1514(XV), 14 Dec. 1960 (YUN 1960, p. 49); <sup>(9)</sup>2373(XXII) annex, 12 June 1968 (YUN 1968, D. 17); <sup>(10)</sup>2734(XXV), 16 Dec. 1970 (YUN 1970, p. 105); <sup>(11)</sup>35/227 A, para. 24, 6 Mar. 1981 (p. 1149); <sup>(12)</sup>35/227 I, paras. 7 & 12, 6 Mar. (p. 1169); <sup>(13)</sup>36/51, paras. 6 & 9, 24 Nov. (p. 1109); <sup>(14)</sup>36/68, para. 8, 1 Dec. (p. 1098); <sup>(15)</sup>36/86 A, paras. 3 & 4, 9 Dec. (p. 48); <sup>(16)</sup>36/86 B, paras. 2-5, 9 Dec. (D. 45); <sup>(17)</sup>36/102, para. 11, 9 Dec. (p. 145); <sup>(18)</sup>36/121 A, para. 17, 10 Dec. (p. 1156); <sup>(19)</sup>36/172 E, 17 Dec., text following. <sup>(20)</sup>SC: 418(1977), 4 Nov. 1977 (YUN 1977, p. 161).

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 101-103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/172 E

119-19-4 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981 34-nation draft (A/36/L.38 and Add.1); agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nigeria, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa

The General Assembly,

Reaffirming its resolutions on military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, in particular its resolution 35/206 B of 16 December 1980.

Recalling Security Council resolutions 418(1977) of 4 November 1977, 421(1977) of 9 December 1977 and 473 (1980) of 13 June 1980.

Recalling also its resolutions concerning the denuclearization of the continent of Africa,

Having considered the reports of the Special Committee against Apartheid and of the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981.

Gravely concerned that the racist régime of South Africa has continued to obtain military equipment and ammunition, as well as technology and know-how, to develop its armament industry and to acquire nuclear-weapon capability,

Recognizing that any nuclear-weapon capability of the racist régime of South Africa constitutes a threat to international peace and security,

Expressing its serious concern at the failure of certain members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Israel and other States to cease their co-operation with the racist régime of South Africa in the military and nuclear fields and to prevent corporations within their jurisdiction from carrying out such co-operation,

Condemning the attitude of those transnational corporations that continue, through their collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa, to enhance its military and nuclear capabilities,

Considering the urgent need for comprehensive mandatory sanctions by the Security Council, under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, to prohibit any military and nuclear collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa,

1. Strongly condemns the collusion by the Governments of certain Western countries and other States, particularly those of the United States of America, the Federal Republic of Germany and Israel, with the racist régime of South Africa in the nuclear field and calls upon France and all other Governments to refrain from supplying the racist minority régime of South Africa, directly or indirectly, with installations that might enable it to produce uranium, plutonium and other nuclear materials, reactors or military equipment;

2. Further condemns the manoeuvres to create a South Atlantic Treaty Organization with the racist régime of South Africa and appeals to the Security Council to undertake measures to ensure that this sinister organization is not established;

3. Condemns all States that violate the arms embargo and continue to collaborate with South Africa in the military and nuclear fields, in particular certain Western States and Israel;

4. Expresses its deep concern about reports on the recent talks between the United States of America and South Africa concerning closer collaboration in the nuclear field;

5. Urges the Security Council to take immediate steps to ensure the scrupulous and full implementation of the arms

embargo imposed by the Council in its resolution 418(1977) and the effective monitoring of the embargo in the light of the report of the Council Committee established by resolution 421(1977) concerning the question of South Africa on ways and means of making the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa more effective;

6. Again requests the Security Council to take mandatory measures to strengthen the arms embargo and secure the immediate cessation of any form of collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa in the military and nuclear fields;

7. Requests all States to co-operate with the Special Committee against Apartheid in its efforts to ensure the total cessation of military and nuclear collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa;

8. Invites all Governments and organizations to assist, in consultation with the national liberation movements of South Africa and Namibia, persons compelled to leave South Africa because of their objection, on the ground of conscience, to serving in the military or police force of the apartheid régime;

9. Authorizes the Special Committee:

(a) To follow closely the question of the nuclear plan and capability of South Africa;

(b) To continue its efforts to promote a comprehensive and effective embargo on all forms of military and nuclear collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa;

(c) To continue its efforts to expose all developments concerning military and nuclear collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa, particularly:

(i) Supply of arms, technology and other vital resources in contravention of resolutions of the United Nations;

(ii) Attempts to forge any military alliance with the racist régime of South Africa;

(iii) Development of further links with the apartheid régime as an ally, in the context of aggravating international tension and conflict.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

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

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Austria, Finland, Guatemala, Sweden.

#### Investments in South Africa

ACTION BY THE CONFERENCE ON SANCTIONS. In its Paris Declaration,<sup>(3)</sup> adopted on 27 May 1981, the Conference on Sanctions against South Africa (p. 165) called for a freeze on all new investments in, and financial loans to, South Africa. Foreign capital, loans and other financial facilities, it said, sustained the apartheid economy and provided it with resources to expand its aggressive apparatus and increase its

military and nuclear capability, to the detriment of peace and security in southern Africa.

More specific action was proposed in the report of the Conference's Technical Commission. This included intensified campaigns against financial institutions which provided loans to South Africa, aimed at severing all such links; investigation of banks involved in financing trade with South Africa; and campaigns against the sale of kruggerands (South African gold coins).

**ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID.** On 24 March, the Committee against Apartheid held a hearing on bank loans to South Africa, with the participation of several leaders of non-governmental organizations who informed the Committee of their campaigns against such loans.

The Committee, in co-operation with the World Council of Churches, the Non-Governmental Organizations Sub-Committee on Racism, Racial Discrimination, Apartheid and Decolonization, the Swiss Anti-Apartheid Movement and the Berne Declaration Group, held an International Seminar on Loans to South Africa at Zurich, Switzerland, from 5 to 7 April. Participants included representatives of Governments, United Nations bodies and agencies, other organizations and national liberation movements of South Africa and Namibia, as well as individual experts.

The Seminar adopted a Declaration containing a number of proposals for halting all loans, credits and other financial assistance to South Africa, including a special appeal to Switzerland and the Federal Republic of Germany. Any such assistance, it declared, represented collusion with apartheid and was a hostile act against the oppressed people of South Africa, OAU and the United Nations. It called on all financial institutions to cease all lending to the South African Government and its agencies and to South African corporations, and called on the United Nations and Governments to assist the front-line and other neighbouring States in their efforts to extricate themselves from economic relations with South Africa. The Declaration was transmitted to the Secretary-General by a letter dated 10 April from the Committee Chairman.<sup>(1)</sup>

On 5 January, the Committee Chairman issued a press statement expressing satisfaction at the decision of the Borough of Lambeth, London, to remove its account from Barclays Bank because of the Bank's involvement in South Africa, and commending the United Kingdom Labour Party for drawing the attention of all Labour-controlled municipal councils to the involvement of the Bank in financing the apartheid régime. On 9 January, in another press state-

ment, he commended six United States organizations for initiating a campaign to press for further action by state legislatures and city councils to divest from banks and corporations in South Africa.

By a letter dated 20 March to the President of the United Nations Correspondents Association, the Chairman expressed consternation that the membership directory of the Association carried an advertisement for South African Airways.

By letters of 13 May to the Director-General of the World Health Organization and the Secretary-General of the World Medical Association, the Chairman conveyed the Committee's appeal to reject attempts to readmit the Medical Association of South Africa to the World Medical Association. After the Association took this step at its annual Assembly (Lisbon, Portugal, 28 September-2 October), the Committee denounced the decision and called for appropriate action by Governments and organizations.

In a statement and cable of 13 September, the Chairman expressed satisfaction at an announcement by the World Council of Churches that it was breaking links with the Union Bank of Switzerland, the Swiss Bank Corporation and the Dresdner Bank of the Federal Republic of Germany because of their extensive involvement in financial support to South Africa.

In its 1981 report to the General Assembly,<sup>(2)</sup> the Committee noted with regret that the Security Council had failed to take steps to achieve cessation of further foreign investments in and loans to South Africa. It noted with serious concern that South Africa had been able to raise substantial loans in the past year, regarding them as an expression of confidence in the apartheid system, and noted with regret the continuing flow of large-scale investments to South Africa from a number of Western countries.

The Committee recommended that the Assembly endorse the recommendations contained in the Declaration of the Seminar on Loans to South Africa and the report of the Technical Commission of the Conference on sanctions. It also recommended that the Assembly appeal to States and organizations to support non-governmental campaigns against loans to and investments in South Africa.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(5)</sup> the General Assembly again urged the Security Council to consider at an early date the matter of foreign investments in and loans to South Africa, with a view to taking effective steps to achieve their cessation. In the preamble, the Assembly expressed its conviction that a cessation of all new foreign investments and loans would constitute an important step in international action for the elimination of apart-

heid, as such investments and loans abetted and encouraged South Africa's apartheid policies. It welcomed the action of those Governments that had taken legislative and other measures and noted with regret that the Council had not yet acted.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 138 to 1, with 7 abstentions.

By a resolution of 24 November on activities of foreign interests impeding decolonization,<sup>(4)</sup> the Assembly requested all States to refrain from making any investments to the benefit of, or extending loans to, South Africa and from agreements or measures to promote trade or other economic relations with it.

Introducing the 49-nation resolution on foreign investments, Sweden said a diminishing flow to South Africa of capital for investment and other purposes would be an effective means of pressing the régime to change its racial and aggressive policies, and would make it more difficult for that country to carry out the increasingly costly build-up of its military and nuclear capacity and energy reserves for the purpose of withstanding internal and international pressure. Though some States might find the scope of the resolution too limited, the sponsors had formulated the operative element in such a way as to enable the widest range of countries to vote for it. The broadest possible support for such action would be a clear signal to South Africa that the world as a whole was reacting strongly against its apartheid policies.

Speaking in explanation of vote, Canada said it had abstained because of the inclusion of emotive or substantial generalizations on such matters as the alleged effect and intent of international business dealings with South Africa and allegations of collaboration with South Africa by private and public institutions.

New Zealand explained that it was a sponsor of the text because it offered a practical way of bringing pressure to bear on South Africa peacefully and effectively. Greece voted for the resolution on similar grounds. The Netherlands also voted in favour but said selective enforcement measures should preferably be decided upon by the Security Council.

Speaking during the Assembly debate on apartheid, a number of States cited foreign investment as a vital source of support for the South African Government. Directly or indirectly, said the Byelorussian SSR, such loans enabled South Africa to finance its repressive apparatus, including its militarization and nuclear programmes, as well as its aggression against African States. Trinidad and Tobago remarked that capital flows to South Africa from major financial institutions in Western countries continued unabated, while develop-

ing countries had been experiencing enormous difficulties in obtaining financial aid for development. According to Hungary, the United States had \$2 billion of direct investment in South Africa. The USSR cited figures published in the South African press putting foreign investment in South Africa at 30 billion rands and stating that, at the end of 1980, there had been 1,200 British, 375 American and 350 West German companies operating in South Africa.

Japan declared that it did not permit direct economic investment in South Africa and had called on Japanese foreign exchange banks to refrain from extending loans to that country. The Netherlands said it withheld medium- and long-term credit guarantees to South Africa and was considering regulations concerning investments in that country. Norway stated that, together with other Nordic countries, it had adopted a number of measures aimed at voluntary and unilateral disengagement from previous contacts with South Africa, including steps to prevent Norwegian investments. Sweden said it was reviewing its 1979 law on prohibition of investments in South Africa and Namibia in the light of possible supplementary measures in such areas as technology transfer. The United States maintained that South Africa was only of modest economic interest to it, having received only some 1 per cent of United States overseas investment.

Algeria, Ireland and Senegal called for a ban on investments, while Ghana strongly urged the Security Council to prohibit all forms of loans and technology transfers to South Africa. In Finland's view, the Council should, as a first step, take decisions aimed at preventing new foreign investments in South Africa; this position was supported by Singapore.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid Chairman, transmitting Declaration of Seminar on Loans to South Africa, 10 Apr., A/36/201-S/14443.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22; <sup>(5)</sup>Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, A/CONF.107/8.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>36/51, para. 12, 24 Nov. (p. 1109); <sup>(5)</sup>36/172 O, 17 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 102, 103 (2 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/1720

138-1-7 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981  
49-nation draft (A/36/L.48and Add.1); agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Angola, Bangladesh, Congo, Cyprus, Denmark, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.



### Investments in South Africa

The General Assembly,  
Recalling its resolution 35/206 Q of 16 December 1980.

Taking note of the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid,

Convinced that a cessation of all new foreign investments in, and financial loans to, South Africa would constitute an important step in international action for the elimination of apartheid, as such investments and loans abet and encourage the apartheid policies of that country,

Welcoming the actions of those Governments that have taken legislative and other measures towards that end,

Noting with regret that the Security Council has not yet taken steps towards that end, as requested by the General Assembly in its resolutions 31/6 K of 9 November 1976, 32/105 O of 16 December 1977, 33/183 O of 24 January 1979, 34/93 Q of 12 December 1979 and 35/206 Q of 16 December 1980.

Again urges the Security Council to consider the matter at an early date with a view to taking effective steps to achieve the cessation of further foreign investments in, and financial loans to, South Africa.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

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

Against: United States.

Abstaining: Botswana, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Guatemala, Italy, United Kingdom.

### Activities of transnational corporations

**ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL.** In a resolution of 23 February 1981 on foreign support of South Africa (p. 945), the Commission on Human Rights called on Governments to put an end to the trading, manufacturing and investing activities in South Africa by banks, transnational corporations (TNCs) and other organizations identified in a report by a Special Rapporteur of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities as assisting the racist régime.<sup>(6)</sup>

On 8 May,<sup>(12)</sup> the Economic and Social Council approved a 1980 decision of the Sub-Commission<sup>(13)</sup> to authorize the Special Rapporteur to continue updating the list of organizations in his report.

**ACTION BY THE CONFERENCE ON SANCTIONS.** The Technical Commission of the Conference

on Sanctions against South Africa (p. 165), in its report of May 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> recommended that the Committee against Apartheid in consultation with the United Nations Council for Namibia and the national liberation movements of South Africa and Namibia, should ensure that effective monitoring procedures were established with a view to investigating financial and commercial dealings, including the transfer of technology, between TNCs and other companies and the South African economy. It proposed that regular reports of such dealings be provided to Governments and the Council, to be taken into account in the award of public contracts and in all other appropriate ways. The Commission further recommended the extension of campaigns against emigration to South Africa, to include especially the transfer of personnel by TNCs, as a contribution towards halting the exchange of technology, and the co-ordination of campaigns to expose the role of TNCs in South Africa, in order to secure their withdrawal and a halt to trade promotion.

**SEMINAR ON TNCs AND SOUTH AFRICA.** In connection with the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (1973-1983) (p. 864), the United Nations Division of Human Rights organized at Geneva from 29 June to 3 July a Seminar on Effective Measures to Prevent Transnational Corporations and Other Established Interests from Collaborating with the Racist Régime of South Africa. Arrangements for the Seminar were made following consultations between the Chairmen of the Commission on Human Rights and the Committee against Apartheid. Participants came from 16 countries, several United Nations organs and bodies, specialized agencies, the League of Arab States and OAU.

The Seminar, in its report,<sup>(5)</sup> recommended the following measures, among others: concerted campaigns against TNCs whose collaboration was crucial to South Africa's economy, with direct action against specific corporations; a stepped-up boycott of South African products; elaboration of a global convention or regional conventions binding States to enforce sanctions against South Africa and to prevent their nationals from collaborating with it; consideration of the international responsibility, including criminal responsibility, of TNCs, their officers and their countries of nationality; and measures to awaken world public opinion to the adverse consequences for human rights in South Africa of the collaboration with that country by certain Governments-in particular those of Belgium, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Israel, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United

States-and of TNCs and other interests, and to expose the false picture of that collaboration being presented by the collaborators and their defenders.

Among the Seminar's other recommendations were: that oil-exporting countries review their relations with TNCs supplying petroleum and petroleum products to South Africa, in particular Shell, British Petroleum, Total, Caltex and Mobil; that States committed to action against apartheid review their relations with TNCs operating in Namibia and South Africa; that trade unionists employed by TNCs be urged to act to secure the withdrawal of those corporations from South Africa and to take action in solidarity with the struggle of South African workers; and that measures be adopted to stop TNC activities which assisted the apartheid régime by undermining United Nations initiatives, promoting trade and immigration, carrying out propaganda for the apartheid régime and otherwise assisting South Africa.

Recommendations for action by the United Nations and its specialized agencies included: preparation of a report on TNC involvement in the infringement of human rights in South Africa; publication by the Commission on Human Rights of a list of all TNCs directly contributing to South Africa's military and nuclear capability; convening of an international conference of scientists to consider the implications of South Africa's nuclear capability for the peace and security of Africa; and discontinuation of business dealings between United Nations organizations and banks or other commercial enterprises collaborating with South Africa.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID. In its annual report,<sup>(2)</sup> the Committee against Apartheid again emphasized the importance of action against TNCs collaborating with South Africa and called for action by the United Nations and Member States to prevent such collaboration.

The Committee recommended that the General Assembly endorse and act on the recommendations made by the Technical Commission of the Conference on Sanctions against South Africa and by the Seminar on TNCs and South Africa. It also asked that it be authorized to organize seminars and symposia to promote the campaign against TNC operations in South Africa.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMISSION ON TNCs. In a report of 9 July,<sup>(4)</sup> the United Nations Secretariat supplied to the Commission on Transnational Corporations information on recent financial activities and employment practices of TNCs in South Africa and Namibia. According to this report, following three years of relatively low levels of foreign borrowing, South Africa had

resumed in 1980 its borrowing activities abroad. The value of identified foreign loans had increased from \$296 million in 1979 to nearly \$800 million in 1980, arranged mainly by individual transnational banks or by consortia.

Most of the new investment projects had fallen into three groups: energy, mining and import substitution, especially for strategic products such as chemicals and transport equipment. The role of TNCs in the energy sector had been particularly important in view of South Africa's dependence on external sources of petroleum and of the Government's goal of self-sufficiency. The activities of some TNCs in the coal and oil sectors, and in oil-from-coal projects, as well as the flow of foreign capital through international loans, undermined international efforts against apartheid. Yet, except for efforts by some countries to discourage the flow of capital and technology to South Africa, most home Governments of TNCs operating there had not responded to the concerns of the international community.

Regarding employment practices, the report said that some TNCs had recognized black trade unions in 1980, but on the whole it did not seem that the TNC practices had made significant contributions in the area of wages or industrial relations; with few exceptions, they did not differ substantially from those of South African enterprises.

In September,<sup>(1)</sup> the Commission recommended to the Economic and Social Council a draft resolution on TNC activities in southern Africa (see below).

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION (NOVEMBER). Adopting on 2 November the resolution proposed by the Commission on Transnational Corporations,<sup>(7)</sup> the Economic and Social Council condemned those TNCs which collaborated with South Africa and urged all TNCs to comply fully with United Nations resolutions by terminating all further investments in South Africa and Namibia and by ending their collaboration. It called on all home countries of TNCs to take steps to terminate such collaboration by their corporations, to prevent new investments and reinvestments, and to bring about an immediate withdrawal of all existing investments in Namibia; and it called on institutions which owned shares of TNCs operating in South Africa and Namibia to withdraw their holdings. The Council reaffirmed that the code of conduct on TNCs (p. 600) should include measures against their collaboration with South Africa, and requested the Secretary-General to intensify the collection and dissemination of information on TNC activities in southern Africa, to arrange for public hearings by the Commis-

sion and to present further reports to the Commission.

The resolution was adopted by a roll-call vote of 35 to 5, with 8 abstentions.

Speaking for the European Community members represented on the Council, the United Kingdom said they could not support the resolution because it contained some unacceptable elements, though they abhorred and rejected apartheid and were committed to peaceful change in southern Africa. The United States said it was unable to support the text, as the competence to adopt measures constituting sanctions lay exclusively with the Security Council.

During the Council debate, Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 developing countries, said the resumed financial and banking support to South Africa's public sector had a clear political significance; also, although some developed countries had induced TNCs to apply codes of conduct in employment matters, the corporations had not always observed the codes and had followed South African labour legislation, which sanctioned apartheid. Nigeria said many corporations had not observed the United Nations stipulations that the purpose of their activities in southern Africa should be to improve living and working conditions; some corporations seemed to have increased their investments in South Africa, thus strengthening the position of the racist minority regime and contributing to a deterioration in the situation instead of helping to improve political conditions.

The German Democratic Republic and the USSR spoke in support of the resolution; in the USSR's opinion, the Secretariat's Centre on Transnational Corporations should establish closer co-operation with the Centre against Apartheid in its research on TNC activities in South Africa.

**ACTION BY THE SUB-COMMISSION ON DISCRIMINATION AND MINORITIES.** In a resolution on adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights of assistance given to racist regimes in southern Africa, adopted on 9 September,<sup>(11)</sup> the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities recommended to its parent body, the Commission on Human Rights, that the Group of Three set up under the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid<sup>(8)</sup> should be asked whether the actions of TNCs operating in South Africa came under the definition of the crime of apartheid, and whether or not legal action could be taken under the Convention (p. 946).

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** The activities of TNCs in South Africa were dealt with in two of the resolutions on apartheid which the General

Assembly adopted on 17 December. In its main resolution on the South Africa situation,<sup>(9)</sup> the Assembly condemned TNCs that collaborated with the racist regime and with apartheid institutions in South Africa. In its resolution on sanctions,<sup>(10)</sup> the Assembly endorsed the recommendations of the Seminar on TNCs and South Africa, requested the Secretary-General and United Nations organizations to deny contracts or facilities to TNCs that collaborated with South Africa, and requested the Committee against Apartheid to publicize the activities of such corporations.

During the Assembly debate on apartheid, many speakers, among them the Byelorussian SSR, Nicaragua and the Ukrainian SSR, stated that the co-operation of certain Western Powers and their TNCs with South Africa supported the apartheid policy. Bulgaria remarked that more than 2,000 Western companies, over 540 of them American, had economic interests in South Africa. Bahrain urged that the countries concerned forbid TNCs from trading or otherwise co-operating with South Africa.

The TNCs operating in South Africa were also criticized for bolstering apartheid through their labour policy. Angola stated that they had created the migrant labour system and the poverty and deprivation resulting from it. Egypt thought it illogical to expect that TNCs in South Africa would work to eliminate racial discrimination, since apartheid enabled them to reap tremendous profits through cheap labour.

The Nordic States described steps they had taken to curb investments in South Africa (p. 187).

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on TNCs, E/1981/49; <sup>(2)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22; <sup>(3)</sup>Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, A/CONF.107/8; <sup>(4)</sup>Secretariat, E/C.10/83 & Corr.1,2; <sup>(5)</sup>Seminar on TNCs and South Africa, ST/HR/SER.A/9.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: <sup>(6)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): 8(XXXVII), 23 Feb. <sup>(7)</sup>ESC: 1981/86, 2 Nov., text following. GA: <sup>(8)</sup>3068(XXVIII), annex, 30 Nov. 1973 (YUN 1973, p. 103); <sup>(9)</sup>36/172 A, para. 5, 17 Dec. 1981 (p. 162); <sup>(10)</sup>36/172 D, 17 Dec. (p. 171). <sup>(11)</sup>SCPDPM (report, E/CN.4/1512): 6(XXXIV), para. 4, 9 Sep.

Decision: <sup>(12)</sup>ESC: 1981/141, 8 May (p. 946).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(13)</sup>1980, p. 809.

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.42, 43 (21 Oct., 2 Nov.).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/86  
35-5-8 (roll-call vote) Meeting 43 2 November 1981  
Draft by Commission on TNCs (E/1981/49); agenda item 12.

Activities of transnational corporations in southern  
Africa and their collaboration with the  
racist minority régime in that area

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling General Assembly resolutions 3201(S-VI) and 3202(S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New Inter-

national Economic Order, 3281(XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and 3362(S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation.

Recalling also General Assembly resolutions 35/206 F of 16 December 1980, entitled "Role of transnational corporations in South Africa", 35/227 A of 6 March 1981, entitled "Situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa", and 35/227 B of 6 March 1981, entitled "Intensification and co-ordination of United Nations action in support of Namibia", and the Special Declaration on Namibia adopted at the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981,

Reaffirming the resolutions adopted by the Commission on Transnational Corporations at its previous sessions on the activities of transnational corporations in southern Africa and their collaboration with the racist minority regime in that area,

Having considered the report of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations entitled "Transnational corporations in southern Africa: update on financial activities and employment practices",

Considering the internationally documented fact that the employment practices of transnational corporations in southern Africa have brought no positive contribution to the improvement of the situation of the majority populations in that area,

Considering also that the operations of transnational corporations in the industrial and technological development of South Africa contribute to the survival of the racist minority regime and the continued illegal occupation of Namibia,

Considering further that the role of transnational corporations in critical sectors of South Africa's economy undermines the sustained efforts of the international community directed against the policy of apartheid and the continued illegal occupation of Namibia,

Concerned that some Governments of home countries of transnational corporations operating in southern Africa have not taken effective measures at the national level which respond directly to the concerns of the international community to prevent collaboration by transnational corporations with the racist minority régime in southern Africa,

Affirming the need for action at the international level by inter-governmental as well as non-governmental organizations in order to complement national measures,

1. Notes with satisfaction the report of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations entitled "Transnational corporations in southern Africa: update on financial activities and employment practices";

2. Expresses its appreciation to the Secretariat for the efforts made by it to publicize in home countries of transnational corporations information on the activities of transnational corporations in southern Africa;

3. Reaffirms the legitimate struggle of the people of South Africa and Namibia towards self-determination and independence, including their right to armed struggle;

4. Commends those non-governmental organizations which have made efforts to combat apartheid and, in particular, to stop bank loans and capital transfers to South Africa and calls upon such organizations to intensify their useful efforts in these areas:

5. Welcomes as a positive step the policies of some Governments to bring about an end to the activities of their transnational corporations in southern Africa;

6. Condemns the racist minority regime in South Africa for its perpetuation of the inhuman system of apartheid and the illegal occupation of Namibia;

7. Condemns those transnational corporations which collaborate with the racist minority régime in southern Africa, and calls upon all transnational corporations to respect the various United Nations resolutions concerning southern Africa;

8. Condemns the actions of those home countries of transnational corporations designed to promote and perpetuate investments by their transnational corporations in South

Africa and Namibia in contravention of United Nations resolutions;

9. Calls upon all home countries of transnational corporations to take effective measures to terminate the collaboration of their transnational corporations with the racist minority régime in southern Africa, to prevent further new investments and reinvestments and to bring about an immediate withdrawal of all existing investments in Namibia;

10. Calls upon all those countries concerned to re-examine their relations with the transnational corporations operating in their territories which collaborate with the racist minority régime in southern Africa;

11. Calls upon all anti-apartheid movements, religious institutions and bodies, trade unions, universities and other institutions which are shareholders of transnational corporations operating in South Africa and Namibia to contribute to the efforts of the international community to eradicate apartheid by withdrawing their shareholdings in such transnational corporations;

12. Urges all transnational corporations to comply fully with the relevant United Nations resolutions by terminating all further investments in South Africa and Namibia and by ending their collaboration with the racist minority régime;

13. Reaffirms Security Council resolution 301(1971) of 20 October 1971 calling upon all States to abstain from entering into economic relations with South Africa in respect of Namibia and declaring that rights, titles or contracts granted to individuals or corporations by South Africa after the termination of the mandate are not subject to protection or espousal by their home States against the claims of a future lawful government of Namibia;

14. Reaffirms that the code of conduct on transnational corporations should include effective measures against the collaboration of transnational corporations with the racist minority régime in southern Africa;

15. Requests the Secretary-General:

(a) To intensify the useful work of the Secretariat in the collection and dissemination of information on the activities of transnational corporations in southern Africa;

(b) To make arrangements for the organization of public hearings, at an appropriate time, to be conducted by the Commission on Transnational Corporations or an ad hoc body, with the assistance of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations, on the activities of transnational corporations in South Africa and Namibia;

(c) To disseminate the text of the present resolution as widely as possible, particularly to anti-apartheid movements, religious institutions and bodies, trade unions, universities and other institutions and transnational corporations operating in South Africa and Namibia, and to seek their reaction and follow-up action thereon;

(d) To report to the Commission on Transnational Corporations at its eighth session on the measures taken in pursuance of the present resolution;

(e) To prepare a report on the policies and practices of transnational corporations regarding their activities in South Africa and Namibia for the Commission on Transnational Corporations at its ninth session, and to include as an annex to that report a list of transnational corporations which continue to operate in strategic sectors, including military and nuclear sectors, of the southern African economy in violation of United Nations resolutions, as well as those transnational corporations which have taken measures to terminate their activities in such sectors.

Roll-call vote in Council as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, China, Cyprus, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, India, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Peru, Poland, Thailand, Turkey, USSR, United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Canada, Denmark, Ireland, Italy, Malawi, Norway, Spain.

## Israel and South Africa

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID. The Acting Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid transmitted to the Secretary-General on 9 September 1981 a special report by the Committee on recent developments concerning relations between Israel and South Africa,<sup>(1)</sup> prepared in pursuance of a 1980 General Assembly request.<sup>(3)</sup> The report stated that, during the 12 months under review, the collaboration had become systematic and covered a wide range of political, military, nuclear, economic and cultural relations.

The report said that Lucas Mangope and Chief Patrick Mphahlele, the Presidents of the bantustans Bophuthatswana and Venda, respectively, had visited Israel in 1980. Israeli officials had also visited South Africa.

There had been persistent reports of increasing nuclear collaboration between Israel, Taiwan and South Africa. According to those reports, South Africa was the main supplier of uranium to Israel and Taiwan, and shared its uranium extraction process with them. The United States Department of State and intelligence sources had reported that the three were collaborating on a nuclear-weapons programme and developing a strategic cruise missile with a nuclear warhead delivery capacity of 1,500 miles. At Salisbury Island, South Africa, Resheff class single-missile gunboats were being constructed under contract with Israel.

Trade between Israel and South Africa had been increasing rapidly; during the first nine months of 1980, Israeli exports to South Africa reportedly totalled \$33 million while its imports totalled \$63 million. Bank Leumi and its subsidiary, the Union Bank, had begun selling krugers in Israel. In December 1980, South Africa and Israel had concluded a trade agreement, providing Israel with 125 million rands of easy South African credit over the following three years, allowing South Africa to invest approximately R 45 million in Israel and permitting the Israel bonds campaign to operate in South Africa. Agreements in principle had also been reached to increase Israel's fishing rights off the South African coast and to increase South Africa's coal quota to Israel from the current 1 million tons per annum to 3 million tons.

Relations existed also in the areas of culture, sports and science. An Israeli soccer team had toured Bophuthatswana in June 1981, while South Africa had participated in Israel's Maccabi Games in July. Joint medical and scientific research programmes had been carried out, and a conference on operation research had been held in February as a joint venture between the Operation Research Societies of Israel and South Africa.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly strongly condemned Israel's continuing and increasing collaboration with South Africa, especially in the military and nuclear fields, and demanded that Israel desist from and terminate all such collaboration. It requested the Committee against Apartheid to keep the matter under constant review and report to the Assembly and the Security Council as appropriate.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 104 to 19, with 17 abstentions.

The Sudan, which introduced the 48-nation resolution, pointed to what it saw as the danger arising from relations between the two countries and cited, as a recent example of military collaboration, the visit of the Israeli Defence Minister to South Africa in December.

Israel did not participate in the vote, saying that it wished to express its abhorrence at the cynical debasement of the discussion. It was the only country singled out for specific condemnation in a special resolution based on patent falsehoods. The sponsors of the resolution had ignored official Israeli communications refuting the false allegations and had instead relied on the unsupported distortions, innuendoes and speculative press reports cited in the Committee's report. During the Assembly debate on apartheid, Israel reaffirmed its strong and absolute opposition to apartheid, stating that there was no evidence of anything special or different in its relations with South Africa; the unending diatribes against Israel only served to subvert and discredit the United Nations role in the genuine battle against racism.

Voting against the resolution, Ireland believed the text inappropriately singled out one State for selective condemnation. Australia, Austria, New Zealand and Norway, the last speaking for the Nordic States, cited similar reasons for their negative votes, as did Argentina, the Bahamas, Chile, Costa Rica and Greece for their abstentions. Reservations about the condemnation of Israel for its collaboration with South Africa were also voiced by Jamaica and Thailand, which voted in favour.

During the Assembly debate, most Arab States condemned co-operation between Israel and South Africa, and many added that the two régimes applied similar racist policies in areas subject to their domination.

ACTION BY THE CONFERENCE ON NEW AND RENEWABLE SOURCES OF ENERGY. In a resolution of 21 August on the right of nations to develop and control non-fossil energy resources,<sup>(2)</sup> the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (p. 689) warned against the danger of joint military nuclear

activities between Israel and South Africa. This provision was in a resolution by which the Conference condemned Israeli aggression against Iraq's nuclear research centre (p. 279).

Explaining its negative vote, Israel denied allegations of nuclear co-operation, stating that no evidence had been adduced. It added that it accounted for a mere two fifths of 1 per cent of South Africa's international trade and that virtually every nation was represented in the other 99.6 per cent.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22/Add.1-S/14689/Add.1.

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (report, A/CONF.100/11, Sales No. E.81.L24):2, para. 2, 21 Aug. GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/206 H, para. 3, 16 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 223); <sup>(4)</sup>36/172 M, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 102, 103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (1.5 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/172 M

104-19-17 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981  
48-nation draft (A/36/L.46 and Add.1); agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Relations between Israel and South Africa

The General Assembly,

Recalling and reaffirming its resolution 35/206 H of 16 December 1980,

Having considered the special report of the Special Committee against Apartheid on recent developments concerning relations between Israel and South Africa,

Gravely concerned about the reports of continued collaboration between Israel and South Africa, in particular in the military and nuclear fields,

Considering that such collaboration is a serious hindrance to international action for the eradication of apartheid, an encouragement to the racist régime of South Africa to persist in its criminal policy of apartheid and a hostile act against the oppressed people of South Africa and the entire African continent, and constitutes a threat to international peace and security,

1. Strongly condemns the continuing and increasing collaboration of Israel with the racist régime of South Africa, especially in the military and nuclear fields;

2. Demands that Israel desist from and terminate all forms of collaboration with South Africa forthwith, particularly in the military and nuclear fields, and abide scrupulously by the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council;

3. Requests the Special Committee against Apartheid to keep the matter under constant review and to report to the General Assembly and the Security Council as appropriate.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon,

Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahamas, Burma, Chile, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Greece, Ivory Coast, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Singapore.

<sup>a</sup> Later advised the Secretariat it had intended to abstain.

### Non-recognition of the independence of the Ciskei

Both the Security Council and the General Assembly denounced the proclamation by South Africa of the Ciskei, a bantustan, as a so-called independent State on 4 December 1981.

LETTER FROM THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID. The Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid by a letter of 19 November,<sup>(1)</sup> transmitted to the Secretary-General a statement approved by the Committee on 17 November, calling on the international community to denounce the so-called "independence" of the Ciskei, to refrain from direct or indirect recognition of its authorities or any dealings with them and to proclaim that the 2.1 million people of Ciskeian origin retained their inalienable rights as citizens of South Africa as a whole.

The proclamation of so-called independence, the statement said, was part of the plan to ensure total white domination of South Africa and to dispossess the African people of their inalienable rights in their own country. The Ciskei had a population of 636,000, while the South African régime regarded 2.1 million people of Ciskeian origin all over South Africa as "citizens" of the Ciskei. An area of 8,300 square kilometres, or 2.4 per cent of South Africa, with low farm income and hardly any industry, it suffered from high population density and extreme poverty and unemployment. Chief Lennon Sebe, the Chief Minister of the Ciskei, and his brother Brigadier Charles Sebe, Ciskei's intelligence chief, had established a régime of terror with brutal repression against trade union leaders, students and others, in order to suppress the widespread resistance to their collusion with the Pretoria régime.

SECURITY COUNCIL ACTION. At a meeting on 15 December, the Security Council condemned and declared invalid the proclamation of the Ciskei's "independence". The Council's position was set out in a statement made on its behalf by

its President, after consultation with the members. The statement,<sup>(4)</sup> read out at the meeting, was as follows:

"The Security Council notes that on 4 December 1981, the South African régime proclaimed the Ciskei, an integral part of South African territory, a so-called 'independent' State, in pursuance of its apartheid and bantustanization policy.

The Security Council recalls its resolution 417(1977), in which it demanded that the racist régime of South Africa should abolish the policy of bantustanization. It also recalls its resolutions 402(1976) and 407(1977), in which it endorsed General Assembly resolution 31/6 A of 26 October 1976 on the matter. The Council further takes note of General Assembly resolution 32/105 N of 14 December 1977 on the question of bantustans.

The Council does not recognize the so-called 'independent homelands' in South Africa: it condemns the purported proclamation of the 'independence' of the Ciskei and declares it totally invalid. This action by the South African régime, following similar proclamations in the case of the Transkei, Bophuthatswana and Venda, denounced by the international community, is designed to divide and dispossess the African people and establish client States under its domination in order to perpetuate apartheid. It seeks to create a class of foreign people in their own country. It further aggravates the situation in the region and hinders international efforts for just and lasting solutions.

The Security Council calls upon all Governments to deny any form of recognition to the so-called 'independent' bantustans, to refrain from any dealings with them, to reject travel documents issued by them, and urges Governments of Member States to take effective measures within their constitutional framework to discourage all individuals, corporations and other institutions under their jurisdiction from having any dealings with the so-called 'independent' bantustans."

The meeting was convened following receipt of a letter of 7 December<sup>(2)</sup> from Botswana, on behalf of the African Group, inviting the Council President to consult with members on appropriate action. The Group said the action was designed to divide and dispossess the Africans and establish client States under South Africa's domination in order to perpetuate apartheid.

On 28 December, South Africa transmitted to the Council President a letter of the same date from its Minister for Foreign Affairs and Information<sup>(3)</sup> saying that the President's statement was reprehensible and that the Council had no authority or jurisdiction to involve itself in the matter. Accordingly, South Africa rejected the statement as an attempt to deny the people of the Ciskei their right to self-determination. The decision to grant independence to the Ciskei had been taken in exercise of South Africa's sovereign right in response to a request by the Ciskei, following a referendum in which a sub-

stantial majority of the people of the Ciskei opted for independence. The letter concluded that no decision by the Council or any other United Nations body could eliminate the fact that the Republic of the Ciskei was now an independent State.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. In its resolution of 17 December on the South Africa situation,<sup>(5)</sup> the General Assembly denounced the proclamation of the so-called "independence" of the Ciskei and again called on all States and organizations to refrain from any recognition of or co-operation with the so-called "independent" bantustans.

During the debate on apartheid, many speakers, including Bhutan, the Byelorussian SSR, Djibouti, the Gambia, Hungary, Japan, Madagascar, Mongolia, Morocco, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Trinidad and Tobago, the Ukrainian SSR, the United Kingdom (for the European Community members), the United States, Yugoslavia and Zambia, rejected South Africa's bantustan programme and pledged to withhold recognition of the so-called independent bantustans, including the Ciskei. More Africans were to be deprived of their citizenship, said Cyprus, and transferred forcibly to densely populated areas with the aim of dismembering the country. Greece, Ireland and Venezuela condemned bantustanization as a policy designed to deprive thousands of Africans of their human rights.

The Niger and others supported the view of the Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid that the policy of bantustanization was aimed at strengthening white South African domination while confining the black population in so-called States which were nothing but satellites, providing South Africa with its own reserves of cheap labour and a dumping-ground for the infirm and elderly. Albania saw the policy as turning South Africa into a veritable concentration camp for more than 20 million blacks. Gabon said the Government was increasingly thinking in terms of a white State from which blacks would be banned. Africans were being deprived of their citizenship and ethnic differences were being exacerbated, Hungary and the Lao People's Democratic Republic commented. The USSR remarked that the policy sought to relegate the indigenous population to 10 bantustans comprising only 13 per cent of South Africa's territory, on land least suitable for supporting human life. The United States described the policy as cruel in bestowing "homelands citizenship" on 6 million urban blacks who might never have seen those poor lands.

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid Chairman, 19 Nov., A/36/708; <sup>(2)</sup>Botswana, for African Group, 7 Dec., S/14787; <sup>(3)</sup>South Africa, 28 Dec., S/14817.

Note: <sup>(4)</sup>SC President, S/14794.  
 Resolution: <sup>(5)</sup>GA, 36/172 A, paras. 9 & 10, 17 Dec.  
 (p. 162).  
 Meeting record: SC, S/PV.2315 (15 Dec.).

### Situation in South Africa

Violations of human rights in South Africa continued to be considered by United Nations bodies in 1981. Members of the Security Council, in a statement by its President, expressed grave concern over death sentences imposed on three members of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) (see below), and the General Assembly again demanded the release of all political prisoners (p. 196). The Assembly also appealed for solidarity with and assistance to South African women and children in their liberation struggle (p. 198).

Economic and social conditions in South Africa were the subject of a report of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) (p. 200). The Trade and Development Board requested the UNCTAD Secretary-General to assist national liberation movements of southern Africa on trade and development issues (p. 209).

Reviewing the year's developments in South Africa, the Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid told the General Assembly in November that there had been a further mobilization of the oppressed people against racist tyranny. Blacks and many whites had joined in a massive boycott of celebrations organized by the régime in May to celebrate the twentieth anniversary of the Republic. The nearly total boycott of elections to the South African Indian Council (4 November) had shown the futility of manoeuvres to divide the blacks. Armed resistance had increased, with attacks by freedom fighters on police stations, apartheid institutions and military installations. Action by the international community would determine whether freedom would come through martyrdom or through the creation of a non-racial society by means of consultation.

### Sentencing of ANC members

Three members of ANC were sentenced to death in 1981 by the Pretoria Supreme Court, and three others were awaiting an appeal from death sentences imposed in 1980. Those sentenced in November 1980—Ncimbithi Johnson Lubisi, Naphtali Manana and Petrus Tsepo Mashigo—had been tried on charges of treason and attempted murder in connection with January 1980 attacks on a bank at Silverton (a suburb of Pretoria) and a police station in northern Transvaal. The three others—David Moise, Johannes Shabangu and Anthony Tsotsobe—were sentenced on 19 August 1981 for a June 1980 attack on instal-

lations of SASOL (the South African parastatal oil corporation) and assaults on a police station and a constable's house. The Security Council met twice during 1981 on these cases.

COMMUNICATION. Egypt, by a letter of 23 January 1981 to the Secretary-General,<sup>(1)</sup> denounced the 1980 death sentences as a crime against humanity, appealed to world public opinion to mobilize efforts to secure the immediate release of all African nationals in South African prisons and called on national and international organizations to ensure the implementation of sanctions against South Africa.

SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION (FEBRUARY). On 5 February 1981, the Council met following consultations on a November 1980 letter concerning the sentences, sent by Senegal as Chairman of the African Group.<sup>(7)</sup> The President read out the following statement on behalf of the Council members:<sup>(4)</sup>

"The members of the Security Council have entrusted me to express, on their behalf, their grave concern over the death sentences recently passed by the Transvaal Division of the Supreme Court at Pretoria on Ncimbithi Johnson Lubisi (28), Petrus Tsepo Mashigo (20) and Naphtali Manana (24), and which may be considered shortly by the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court at Bloemfontein.

Having this in mind, I strongly urge that the Government of South Africa, in order to avert further aggravating the situation in South Africa, should take into account the concerns expressed for the lives of these three young men."

SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION (AUGUST). On 27 August, the Niger, on behalf of the Group of Non-Aligned Countries members of the Council, transmitted a letter of 24 August<sup>(2)</sup> to the Council President from the ANC representative to the United Nations, Johnstone F. Makatini, conveying a request of the ANC National Executive Committee for action by the Council to save the lives of the three ANC members sentenced to death on 19 August. That verdict and sentence, the letter added, was designed to pave the way for indiscriminate prosecution and execution of all opponents of the apartheid régime. The Niger requested a Council meeting at the earliest possible opportunity to consider this matter.

The Council met on this request the same day and decided to invite Mr. Makatini under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure.<sup>3</sup> The proposal to invite the ANC representative was made by the Niger, Tunisia and Uganda in a letter of 27 August.

<sup>3</sup> Rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure reads: "The Security Council may invite members of the Secretariat or other persons, whom it considers competent for the purpose, to supply it with information or to give other assistance in examining matters within its competence."



During the Council debate, all speakers expressed concern at the death sentences. China condemned them as outrageous criminal acts, while Mexico saw them as proof that Pretoria despised international public opinion and systematically denied United Nations principles. Although the ANC members had been condemned for alleged acts of sabotage, said the Niger, the sentences were obviously linked to their everyday struggle against the apartheid régime. In Uganda's view, the Council must make clear that it was dealing not with a normal judicial process but with a political situation which had given rise to oppression leading to resistance and to the death sentences; it should do nothing which would comfort the forces of apartheid or which might be interpreted as equivocation.

The German Democratic Republic, Panama, the Philippines, Spain and Tunisia were among those calling for urgent Council action to save the lives of young patriots; the Philippines expressed disappointment and astonishment that there had been opposition to such an appeal. In France's opinion, the Council, through its President, should unanimously express concern and appeal to South Africa to take that concern into account in order not to aggravate the situation. Ireland supported an appeal by the President on behalf of Council members, and Japan wanted the members' concern conveyed immediately to South Africa. The USSR said it supported the convening of the Council in order to prevent a fresh crime against those combating apartheid; it also supported the proposal of the non-aligned countries that the President make a statement on behalf of the Council.

The United Kingdom said it understood that the judicial process in the case might not be complete; however, on humanitarian grounds alone, the death sentences, if confirmed, should call for clemency. The United States strongly urged the South African Government to take into serious account the concern expressed not only regarding the lives of the three men but also regarding the need not to enhance the tensions within the country.

Mr. Makatini appealed to the Council to make its voice heard in order to save the lives of the three patriots who, in the eyes of the entire black community in South Africa, were freedom fighters; the Council could not afford by omission to encourage further deterioration of the South Africa situation, whose explosion might poison race relations not only in Africa but throughout the world for decades to come.

The Council adjourned without setting a date for a further meeting on the subject.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID. In its 1981 report to the General Assembly,<sup>(5)</sup> the Committee against Apartheid strongly condemned the imposition of death sentences on six freedom fighters. It considered the sentences imposed on 19 August to be particularly alarming, as they set the precedent of death sentences in cases in which no loss of life had resulted from the alleged actions of the accused. The court's conclusion that membership in ANC showed a common purpose and conspiracy to commit "terrorism" opened the way to mass executions of members of the national liberation movement. The Committee warned that the execution of patriots was bound to lead to grave repercussions and might well lead to reprisals by the liberation movement against the régime and its supporters.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. In the preamble to its 17 December resolution on political prisoners in South Africa,<sup>(6)</sup> the General Assembly expressed alarm at the imposition of death sentences on six freedom fighters and the recent assassination of attorney Griffith Mxenge (p. 197).

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Egypt, 23 Jan., A/36/79; <sup>(2)</sup>Niger, for non-aligned countries, 27 Aug., S/14648; <sup>(3)</sup>Niger, Tunisia, Uganda, 27 Aug., S/14653.

Note: <sup>(4)</sup>SC President, S/14361.

Report: <sup>(5)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22.

Resolution: <sup>(6)</sup>GA, 36/172 J, 17 Dec. (p. 198).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(7)</sup>1980, p. 228.

Meeting records: SC, S/PV.2264, 2295 (5 Feb., 27 Aug.).

#### Political prisoners

ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID. The Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid, in a press statement of 10 March 1981, denounced the capture of ANC members reportedly abducted by South African forces—three from Mozambique on 30 January and one from Swaziland on 19 February—and urged Governments to exert their influence to persuade South Africa to release and return them.

In its 1981 report,<sup>(2)</sup> the Committee noted again with utmost concern that, despite repeated calls by the United Nations and the international community, the apartheid régime had failed to release political prisoners and detainees and grant prisoner-of-war status to captured freedom fighters, and instead had intensified repression and instituted numerous trials. There had been increasing evidence of torture of political detainees, and the régime had even resorted to kidnapping and assassination of members of national liberation movements from neighbouring countries.

The Committee noted with satisfaction that the national liberation movement of South Africa had adhered to the Geneva Conventions

of 12 August 1949 and Additional Protocol I of 1977 on respect for human rights in armed conflicts. It recommended that, in the light of the escalating repression by the apartheid régime and its grave repercussions, the General Assembly should warn the régime of the grave consequences of continued repression and execution of patriots, call on all parties to the Geneva Conventions to take effective measures to grant prisoner-of-war status to captured freedom fighters, and request all Governments to help promote the campaign for the release of all political prisoners in South Africa.

On 12 October, the Committee held two meetings in observance of the Day of Solidarity with South African Political Prisoners (11 October). After hearing statements by United Nations and national liberation movement officials, it adopted a Declaration by which it appealed to Governments, organizations and individuals: to denounce the brutal repression in South Africa; to demand the immediate and unconditional release of all those imprisoned, restricted, banished or exiled for their opposition to apartheid; to publicize and mobilize support for their noble ideals; to honour the martyrs and leaders in the South African liberation struggle; and to support that struggle by implementing United Nations resolutions for the isolation of the apartheid régime and for assistance to the liberation movements. This Declaration was transmitted to the Secretary-General for the attention of the General Assembly and the Security Council by a letter of 13 October from the Committee Chairman.<sup>(1)</sup>

On 27 November, the Chairman expressed indignation at the assassination in Durban, South Africa, of Griffith Mxenge, an attorney who had defended a number of political prisoners in South Africa. In a statement of the same date, he expressed shock at the death in police custody of Tshifhiwa Muofhe, a leader of the banned Black People's Convention.

On 1 December, the Chairman issued a statement denouncing the arrest of over 30 trade unionists, as well as student and other leaders. He expressed concern on 8 December at reports of a hunger strike among a number of political prisoners on Robben Island.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(4)</sup> adopted without vote, the General Assembly demanded again that South Africa end repression against the black people and other opponents of apartheid, cease all trials under arbitrary repressive laws, refrain from executing persons sentenced under those laws for acts arising from opposition to apartheid, release all political prisoners and abrogate bans on organizations and the media for their opposition to

apartheid. It urged Governments and organizations to act for an end to repression and for the release of all political prisoners in South Africa, and requested the Committee against Apartheid with the assistance of the United Nations Centre against Apartheid, to continue to promote the world campaign for the release of all political prisoners in South Africa. By a preambular paragraph, the Assembly expressed alarm at the death sentences imposed on six freedom fighters (p. 196) and at the assassination of Mr. Mxenge.

The Assembly, in its resolution on the South Africa situation, adopted on the same date,<sup>(3)</sup> demanded that the apartheid régime treat captured freedom fighters as prisoners of war under the 1949 Geneva Conventions and Additional Protocol I. Also on 17 December, in a resolution on the work programme of the Committee against Apartheid,<sup>(5)</sup> the Assembly requested the Committee to give the highest priority in 1982 to promoting the world campaign for the unconditional release of all persons imprisoned or restricted for their opposition to apartheid.

Introducing the 68-nation resolution on political prisoners, Finland said that, in view of the death sentences pending against six ANC members and the recent arrests of numerous black trade union leaders, students and others, the resolution had particular urgency. Wide support for the text should help persuade South Africa to change its policies and convey a message of solidarity to the victims and opponents of apartheid.

Argentina and the Netherlands expressed reservations about the provision in the resolution on the South Africa situation concerning prisoner-of-war status under the Geneva Conventions and Protocol; the Netherlands questioned the applicability of those instruments, while Argentina said it was still studying the Protocol.

During the Assembly debate on apartheid, many countries, including the United Kingdom, speaking for the European Community members, called for the immediate and unconditional release of all political prisoners. The Lao People's Democratic Republic called for a campaign to free those imprisoned for resistance to apartheid or at least give them the status of political prisoners. The Sudan also urged assistance to the prisoners and their families and a halt to arbitrary arrests. Sweden appealed for the release of Nelson Mandela and other imprisoned leaders of the majority, stating that they could make an important contribution to South Africa's transition to a democratic society.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid Chairman, 13 Oct., A/36/592-S/14724.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee against Apartheid. A/36/22.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>36/172 A, para. 14, 17 Dec. (p. 163); <sup>(4)</sup>36/172 J, 17 Dec., text following; <sup>(5)</sup>36/172 N, para. 2 (e), 17 Dec. (p. 214).  
 Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.  
 Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81. 101-103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/172 J

Adopted without vote Meeting 102 17 December 1981  
 68-nation draft (A/36/L.43 and Add.1); agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Belgium, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Political prisoners in South Africa

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions concerning political prisoners in South Africa, in particular resolution 35/206 K of 16 December 1980,

Noting with grave concern the continued escalation of repression against all opponents of apartheid in South Africa, including the persecution of black trade unionists, students and journalists, as well as the threats against churches,

Alarmed at the imposition of death sentences on six freedom fighters, namely, Mr. Johannes Shabangu, Mr. Anthony Tsotsobe, Mr. David Moise, Mr. Ncimbithi Johnson Lubisi, Mr. Naphtali Manana and Mr. Petrus Tsepo Mashigo,

Further alarmed at the recent assassination of attorney Griffith Mxenge and other opponents of the apartheid régime,

Considering that the continued repression against and executions of opponents of apartheid are bound to have grave repercussions,

Taking note of the Declaration adopted by the Special Committee against Apartheid on 12 October 1981 to commemorate the Day of Solidarity with South African Political Prisoners,

Reaffirming the legitimacy of the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa for the elimination of apartheid and the establishment of a democratic society,

1. Demands again that the racist régime of South Africa:

(a) End repression against the black people and other opponents of apartheid;

(b) Cease all trials under arbitrary repressive laws;

(c) Refrain from the execution of persons sentenced under such repressive laws for acts arising from opposition to apartheid;

(d) Release all political prisoners in South Africa;

(e) Abrogate bans imposed on organizations and the media for their opposition to apartheid;

2. Expresses its appreciation to those Governments, cities, organizations and institutions that have honoured the leaders of the struggle against apartheid imprisoned or restricted by the South African régime, as part of the campaign for the release of political prisoners in South Africa;

3. Urges all Governments and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to take all appropriate action for an end to repression and for the release of all political prisoners in South Africa, and to lend their co-operation to the Special Committee against Apartheid;

4. Requests the Special Committee, with the assistance of the Centre against Apartheid of the Secretariat, to continue to promote the world campaign for the release of all political prisoners in South Africa.

#### Women and children under apartheid

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID. During the year, the Committee against Apartheid and its Task Force on Women and Children under Apartheid continued to devote attention to the plight of women and children under apartheid their role in the national liberation struggle and ways of promoting assistance to them. The Task Force consulted with the liberation movements and the Non-Governmental Organizations Sub-Committee on Racism, Racial Discrimination, Apartheid and Decolonization.

In its 1981 report,<sup>(1)</sup> the Committee urged that international action in solidarity with the struggle of women in South Africa and Namibia should be intensified, particularly with respect to mobilization of world opinion and increased assistance. It declared its intention to expand its activities to that end and invited Governments and organizations to co-operate. It planned to send a mission to the relevant projects of national liberation movements and front-line States in order to consult on means to promote greater assistance to them; to expand contacts with women's organizations all over the world; and to organize in 1982 an international conference in co-operation with the newly established International Committee of Solidarity with the Struggle of Women in South Africa and Namibia (p. 199).

The Committee recommended that the General Assembly proclaim 9 August as International Day of Solidarity with the Struggle of Women in South Africa and Namibia (p. 199), appeal to Governments and organizations for assistance to projects of the national liberation movement and front-line States and invite United Nations Secretariat units to co-operate on publicity for the plight of women and children under apartheid and their struggle for national liberation.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly encouraged the Committee against Apartheid to intensify activities in support of women and children oppressed by apartheid, through conferences, seminars and missions. It appealed to Governments and organizations to contribute to the projects of national liberation movements and front-line States for assistance to refugee women and children from South Africa. It requested the Secretary-General to ensure the closest co-operation by the Secretariat's Centre against Apartheid Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs and Department of Public Information on maximum publicity for the plight of women and children under apartheid and their struggle for national liberation. It invited Governments and organizations to observe 9 August annually as the International Day of Soli-

parity with the Struggle of Women in South Africa and Namibia (see below).

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 145 to none, with 2 abstentions. The 63-nation text was introduced by Indonesia.

In a resolution of 28 October on the self-determination of peoples,<sup>(2)</sup> the Assembly demanded the immediate release of children detained in Namibian and South African prisons.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>36/9, para. 22, 28 Oct. (p. 896); <sup>(3)</sup>36/172 K, 17 Dec., text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 101-103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/172 K

145-0-2 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981

63-nation draft (A/36/L.44 and Add.1); agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Women and children under apartheid

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/206 N of 16 December 1980,

Gravely concerned about the inhuman oppression of millions of women and children under apartheid, resulting in the killing, detention and torture of schoolchildren protesting against discrimination, the enforced separation of women from their husbands and mass starvation in the reserves,

Commending the Special Committee against Apartheid and its Task Force on Women and Children for giving special attention to the plight of women and children under apartheid,

Noting the wide observance of 9 August 1981 as the International Day of Solidarity with the Struggle of Women in South Africa and Namibia,

Noting with appreciation the establishment of the International Committee of Solidarity with the Struggle of Women in South Africa and Namibia,

1. Invites all Governments and organizations to observe 9 August annually as the International Day of Solidarity with the Struggle of Women in South Africa and Namibia;

2. Encourages the Special Committee against Apartheid to intensify activities in support of women and children oppressed by apartheid, and authorizes it to organize conferences, seminars and missions for this purpose;

3. Appeals to all Governments and organizations to provide generous contributions to the projects of the national liberation movements and front-line States for assistance to refugee women and children from South Africa;

4. Invites the co-operation of all Governments and organizations with the Special Committee in promoting solidarity with and assistance to the women and children of South Africa in their struggle for liberation;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to ensure the closest co-operation by the Centre against Apartheid and the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs as well as the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat, with a view to maximum publicity for the plight of women and children under apartheid and their struggle for national liberation.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, 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, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: United Kingdom, United States.

#### Day of Solidarity (9 August)

On the recommendation of its Task Force on Women and Children under Apartheid, the Committee against Apartheid decided to observe 9 August 1981, the twenty-fifth anniversary of a demonstration by women against the South African pass laws in Pretoria, as the International Day of Solidarity with the Struggle of Women in South Africa and Namibia. At a meeting on 11 August, the Committee heard statements by United Nations and non-governmental organization officials and national liberation movement representatives. It received signatures from hundreds of organizations and individuals to a message of greetings to women of South Africa and Namibia, declaring solidarity with them and all those struggling to destroy the apartheid system. Special guests invited to the meeting decided to establish an International Committee of Solidarity with the Struggle of Women in South Africa and Namibia, with Jeanne Martin Cissé of Guinea as Convenor.

As recommended by the Committee in its annual report,<sup>(1)</sup> the General Assembly, in its resolution of 17 December on women and children under apartheid,<sup>(2)</sup> invited Governments and organizations to observe this Day annually on 9 August. Introducing the resolution, Indonesia said that by this observance the international community would express its solidarity with the women suffering under apartheid and its support for their righteous struggle to eliminate that repressive system.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/172 K, para. 1, 17 Dec. (above).

#### Economic and social survey

The Trade and Development Board of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), on 9 October 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> requested the UNCTAD Secretary-General to continue studies of the economic and social conditions of South Africa.

The UNCTAD secretariat submitted to the Board in August a report<sup>(1)</sup> prepared by a consultant, J. H. Mensah (Ghana), on economic conditions in Namibia (p. 1170) and South Africa. The report noted that the South African economy was the most industrially advanced in Africa, with the characteristics of a middle-rank industrialized country. Trade with neighbouring African countries provided a substantial outlet for manufactures, including machinery and equipment.

The report stated that black workers constituted some 68 per cent of the 9.3 million working population and were concentrated in agriculture and mining, where they made up some 90 per cent of the labour force. Under the migratory labour system, the African worker had no opportunity to acquire such rights as seniority, pensions and social security, to acquire skills or achieve a stable place in industrial production. Due to a growing shortage of skilled workers, however, industry had started to advocate the opening up of skilled jobs to Africans. On the other hand, the number of unemployed blacks continued to increase. The earnings gap between Africans and whites had tended to narrow in the tertiary sectors, to about one third of the average white wage, but in the most important production sectors it had tended to widen.

The report cited such aspects of South African economic and social life as resistance to full trade union rights for workers of all races; dissatisfaction over the inadequacy of housing, education, transport and recreational facilities for the black urban population; and an absence of development opportunities in the bantustans. It added that, while the business community had finally come to the conclusion that government policy must change, legislation and implementation of reforms proposed in 1979 by two South African commissions had met resistance. The changes required might well be left to a post-liberation government, and United Nations technical assistance should prepare the national liberation movements for that task.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNCTAD consultant, TD/B/869/Add.1.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>TDB (report, A/36/15), 238(XXIII), para. 2, 9 Oct.

#### Other aspects

Action against violations of human rights in South Africa (p. 943) was recommended in 1981 by the Commission on Human Rights.

The Economic and Social Council demanded on 8 May<sup>(1)</sup> the cessation of police and state interference in industrial disputes and the recognition of the right of the black trade union movements in South Africa to full freedom of association and to unimpeded collective bargaining. Also on that date,<sup>(2)</sup> the Council decided to transmit to the Commission's Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts on southern Africa allegations regarding infringement of trade union rights in South Africa received by the Secretary-General from the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, and requested the Group to report to the Commission and the Council in 1982.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/41, 8 May (p. 950). Dec.: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/155, 8 May (p. 950).

#### Encouragement of public action against apartheid

Throughout 1981, the Special Committee against Apartheid continued, with General Assembly approval, to encourage public action against apartheid by promoting a boycott of apartheid sports as well as a cultural and academic boycott and other activities (see below). Work continued on the drafting of an international convention against apartheid in sports, begun in 1978 (p. 203). An International Seminar on Publicity and the Role of the Mass Media in the International Mobilization against Apartheid made recommendations, which were endorsed by the Assembly, for greater involvement and co-operation of the mass media in the international anti-apartheid campaign (p. 204). The Committee organized and/or co-sponsored several conferences, seminars, meetings and other events, and observed a number of international days in solidarity with the liberation struggle in South Africa (p. 207).

#### Cultural, academic and sports boycotts

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID. The Committee against Apartheid continued in 1981 to promote an international campaign to achieve a total boycott of apartheid sports teams as well as a cultural and academic boycott. It issued statements commending countries and organizations that had refused to participate in matches with South African teams or to tour South Africa, and sent communications to other sports organizations urging them to end sports exchanges with that country. It repeatedly appealed to the Irish Rugby Football Union to cancel a proposed tour to South Africa, but the team went ahead with the tour in May.

In connection with a tour to New Zealand by the South African Springbok rugby team, the Committee repeatedly appealed for action to stop the tour and commended two players who

had decided not to play against the South African team. After the tour took place in July, the Chairman, in a statement of 14 September, expressed disappointment that the New Zealand Government, while expressing opposition, had not only failed to take action within its power to stop the tour, but had constantly attacked the anti-apartheid movement and provided police protection to the apartheid team.

In its 1981 report to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> and in a statement of 14 September, the Committee expressed serious disappointment at the fact that the United States Government had taken no action to prevent the United States tour of the South African team upon completion of its New Zealand tour. The Committee noted with satisfaction, however, that widespread public opposition to the United States tour and repeated appeals by the Committee Chairman to the authorities of the cities where the games were scheduled had resulted in cancellation of games in New York City and Rochester, New York.

In a message of 8 April to the Conference of European Ministers of Sport as well as in a press statement, the Chairman expressed concern that some sports bodies, administrators and promoters had been enticed by South African propaganda and by offers of enormous financial rewards to organize sports exchanges with South Africa. On 14 April, in a message to the Fourth Biennial Meeting of the South African Council on Sport (Durban, South Africa, 8 and 9 May) and in a press statement, the Chairman said the Committee admired the Council's continued efforts to uphold the principle of non-racialism in sports and denounced the seizure of its Secretary's passport in June 1980 on the eve of his departure for consultations at the United Nations.

The Chairman sent a letter on 23 October to the Permanent Representative of the Netherlands to the United Nations, requesting action with regard to a pamphlet issued by Royal Dutch Airlines (KLM) offering South Africa's white sports clubs assistance to compete internationally. The representative replied on 12 November that the head office of KLM had ordered its South African office to stop distributing the folder and to recall copies already sent.

On 8 December, the Chairman issued a statement commending the Welsh Rugby Union for cancelling its proposed tour of South Africa.

The first register of sports contacts with South Africa by organizations, individuals, promoters and administrators in Western and other States was published by the Committee on 15 May. The stated purpose was to enable Governments and organizations to take action with respect to sportsmen and sports administrators and promo-

ters collaborating with South Africa. The register, which was transmitted to the Organization of African Unity, was to be kept up to date and published from time to time.

In its annual report, the Committee noted with concern and regret that several sports organizations outside South Africa had promoted renewed sports contacts with that country and that some sportsmen had been enticed by exorbitant financial rewards to play in South Africa. It noted with particular regret the failure of several Governments, especially New Zealand and the United States, to take firm action to terminate sporting contacts with South Africa, and suggested that the General Assembly should deplore the attitudes of those Governments and appeal to them to co-operate in the campaign against apartheid in sports.

With regard to cultural contacts, the Committee noted with great satisfaction the movement inside South Africa to boycott tours by entertainers from abroad. It commended action by the Netherlands Parliament to terminate the cultural agreement between the Netherlands and South Africa, expressing hope that other countries would take similar action.

The Committee proposed to organize in 1982 an international conference of cultural personalities for action against apartheid and to sponsor international and national art exhibits and other events against apartheid. It also intended to initiate a register of cultural contacts with South Africa in order to promote an effective boycott.

In a press statement of 9 March, the Committee Chairman commended the organizations and individuals, including dancers, who had expressed opposition to a projected two-week tour of South Africa by the Boston Ballet of the United States, which the company's executive board had decided on 6 March to abandon in response to representations by a number of organizations.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(2)</sup> adopted by a recorded vote of 124 to 5, with 14 abstentions, the General Assembly commended the Committee against Apartheid for its efforts to promote academic, cultural and sports boycotts of South Africa and to mobilize academic, cultural and sports personalities in the campaign against apartheid. It endorsed the Committee's proposal to organize national and international conferences and exhibits to promote action by academic, cultural and sports personalities against apartheid and condemned sports organizations, sportsmen and promoters of sports events that had collaborated with South Africa. It also requested continued work by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against Apartheid in Sports (p. 203).

In a resolution of the same date on the work programme of the Committee against Apartheid,<sup>(3)</sup> the Assembly requested the Committee to give the highest priority in 1982 to promoting the participation of writers, artists and other cultural personalities in the international campaign against apartheid.

Introducing the 39-nation resolution on academic, cultural and sports boycotts, Barbados stated that there could be no normal sports or cultural environment in a country where racial discrimination was an integral part of the law.

Among those voting against the resolution, the Federal Republic of Germany said certain academic and cultural contacts with South Africa were necessary in order to maintain a dialogue, though it would continue, within its legal possibilities, to discourage sports organizations and athletes from having contacts with South Africa if they promoted and practised racial discrimination; moreover, the Federal Republic had reservations about singling out countries and about the register of sportsmen visiting South Africa. New Zealand, though declaring its support for the basic purpose of the text, objected to the criticism in the preamble directed at it and the United States for permitting tours of the Springbok rugby teams; with regard to the register, New Zealand was unconvinced that it was appropriate or defensible for a United Nations body to judge the actions of individuals. New Zealand voiced similar objections in explaining its abstention on the resolution endorsing the report and work programme of the Committee against Apartheid.

Also voting against, Portugal said contact must be kept with the people of South Africa. The United States reiterated its position that sports were not a matter for government control and added that it would be more practical and constructive to encourage integration in South African sports, as a spearhead of the movement towards greater integration in the country as a whole.

The United Kingdom, which also cast a negative vote, said the member States of the European Community strictly adhered to the Olympic principle of non-discrimination and would continue firmly to discourage sporting contacts involving racial discrimination, but they respected the independence of private sports organizations and the fundamental right to travel abroad freely.

Abstaining, Canada said that to end academic and cultural interchanges with South Africa would deny to the academic and cultural communities the opportunity of demonstrating in meetings and discussions the total unacceptability of apartheid and the need for change. The

Netherlands could not accept any infringement of certain traditional freedoms, such as the autonomy of sports organizations and the right of nationals to leave the country. Canada and the Netherlands also had reservations about the proposed convention (p. 204). Samoa believed the singling out of two States was neither necessary nor exhaustive. Australia, Austria and Solomon Islands abstained on similar grounds.

Though voting in favour, Fiji, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Spain and Thailand voiced reservations to the paragraph singling out New Zealand and the United States for criticism; Thailand remarked that New Zealand had opposed the Springbok tour and had a long record of opposition to apartheid Costa Rica, stating that it could not accept the legitimacy of requesting States to impose certain sanctions and limits on individuals, expressed reservations on the paragraph condemning sports organizations, sportsmen and promoters that had collaborated with South Africa. Japan also expressed reservations on the endorsement of the Committee's proposal to organize conferences and exhibits to promote action by academic, cultural and sports personalities.

Ireland said its support for the resolution should not give rise to expectations that it would restrict the constitutional right of its citizens to travel abroad. Speaking for the Nordic States, which also supported the text, Norway said that, in accordance with the Joint Nordic Programme of Action against South Africa, restrictive measures had been taken with regard to academic, cultural and sports exchanges; however, the Nordic States reserved their position on elements in the resolution which infringed their citizens' constitutional rights.

During the apartheid debate, the Gambia expressed the view that sports contacts with South Africa undermined efforts to isolate the regime diplomatically and conferred a de facto respectability on apartheid. Ghana stated that sports and cultural events with South African participation were on the increase because of the naivety and greed of some individuals, sporting organizations, impresarios and international agents; it hoped that, wherever possible, visas and other facilities would be withheld from those who had chosen to collaborate with the racist régime. Indonesia believed that sports, cultural and academic boycotts had a strong impact on the morale of the South African Government and should be intensified. Japan said it had decided not to issue visas to South Africans for cultural and educational exchanges or sports. Trinidad and Tobago thought that the sports boycott was the most effective weapon in the fight against apartheid.

New Zealand said it had fulfilled its commitment under the 1977 Gleneagles Agreement, in which the Commonwealth Governments had agreed that they would seek to discourage sporting contacts with South Africa by means consistent with their domestic laws and practices; however, New Zealand followed the principle that there should be no political interference in sports.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>36/172 I, 17 Dec., text following; <sup>(3)</sup>36/172 N, para. 2 (d), 17 Dec. (p. 214).

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 101-103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/172 I

124-5-14 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981  
39-nation draft (A/36/L.42 and Add.1); agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Barbados, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mozambique, Nigeria, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Academic, cultural and sports boycotts of South Africa

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 35/206 E and M of 16 December 1980,

Having considered the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid and the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against Apartheid in Sports,

Recognizing the importance of the participation of writers, musicians, artists, sportsmen, academic personalities and others in the international campaign against apartheid,

Commending all Governments, organizations and individuals that have taken action for the academic, cultural, sports and other boycotts of South Africa in solidarity with the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement,

Commending, in particular, the organizations and individuals in Ireland, New Zealand and the United States of America that have effectively demonstrated their opposition to exchanges with South African rugby teams,

Deploring the actions of those sports bodies and sportsmen that have continued to collaborate with South Africa, and the failure of several Governments to take firm action to terminate sporting contacts with South Africa, in particular the Governments of New Zealand and the United States of America, which have permitted tours by Springbok rugby teams despite widespread public protests in their countries and appeals by the Special Committee,

Emphasizing the urgent need for an international convention against apartheid in sports,

1. Commends the Special Committee against Apartheid for its efforts to promote effective academic, cultural and sports boycotts of South Africa and to mobilize academic, cultural and sports personalities in the campaign against apartheid;

2. Notes with appreciation the action of the Special Committee in publishing lists of sportsmen, entertainers and others visiting South Africa, in order to enable the Governments and organizations to take any action they may deem appropriate;

3. Condemns those sports organizations, sportsmen and promoters of sports events who have collaborated with South

Africa in violation of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the International Declaration against Apartheid in Sports;

4. Endorses the proposal of the Special Committee to organize national and international conferences and exhibits to promote action by academic, cultural and sports personalities against apartheid;

5. Requests the Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against Apartheid in Sports to continue its work with a view to submitting a draft convention as soon as possible;

6. Authorizes the Ad Hoc Committee to continue consultations with representatives of Governments and organizations concerned and experts on apartheid in sports.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, 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, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Germany, Federal Republic of, New Zealand, Portugal, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Guatemala, Iceland, Italy, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Samoa, Solomon Islands.

#### Draft convention against apartheid in sports

The Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against Apartheid in Sports was again unable in 1981 to complete work on a draft convention because of disagreement over the sole remaining issue—a proposal that would require measures to be taken against non-parties to the convention if they acted contrary to its principles. The Committee reported to the General Assembly that a working group had considered several proposals in this regard. One of these, mentioned in its report,<sup>(1)</sup> was to expand the mandate of the International Commission against Apartheid in Sports, to be established under the convention, so that it could decide on action to be taken against teams and individuals from States not parties to the convention that violated the boycott of apartheid sports. The Committee felt that further consultations might enable it to reach a consensus.

The Committee, which began work on the draft convention in 1978,<sup>(3)</sup> recommended that its mandate be extended.

The General Assembly, in its resolution of 17 December on cultural, academic and sports boycotts against South Africa,<sup>(2)</sup> requested the Committee to continue its work with a view to submitting a draft convention as soon as possible,



and authorized it to continue consultations with representatives of Governments and organizations and with experts on apartheid in sports.

Canada, which abstained in the vote on this resolution, expressed reservations about the appropriateness and utility of the proposed convention, saying its generalizations and the constitutional framework of Canada's federal system would probably make it impossible for Canada to subscribe. The Netherlands also voiced reservations about the convention, while Ireland hoped the convention would not create legal or constitutional problems for its Government.

In the debate on apartheid and South Africa, Ghana expressed hope that the convention would soon become a reality.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on convention against apartheid in sports, A/36/36 & Corr.1.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/172 I, paras. 5 & 6, 17 Dec. (p. 203).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1978, p. 201.

Public information, public action and the mass media

SEMINAR ON PUBLICITY, THE MASS MEDIA AND APARTHEID. An International Seminar on Publicity and the Role of the Mass Media in the International Mobilization against Apartheid, organized by the Committee against Apartheid in co-operation with the Government and the Solidarity Committee of the German Democratic Republic, was held at Berlin from 31 August to 2 September 1981. Participants included representatives of Governments, United Nations bodies and agencies, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and national liberation movements of South Africa and Namibia, as well as individual experts.

On 2 September, the Seminar unanimously adopted the "Berlin Declaration", containing recommendations on the role and responsibility of the mass media in the struggle against apartheid. This stated that the media must publicize the legitimacy of that struggle, and make the world aware of the inhumanity of apartheid and the need for international action; they must expose the propaganda of the apartheid régime and its allies, including efforts to defame the national liberation movements; and they must expose the links of the apartheid régime with racist and fascist régimes and groups all over the world. The media must investigate, publicize and expose the sustenance of the apartheid régime by certain Western Powers and transnational corporations (TNCs).

The Seminar recommended that the United Nations, Governments, organizations and institutions should assist the national liberation movements in their information activities by

providing broadcasting facilities, printing and distributing publications, offering technical and professional training, providing equipment and supplies, and assisting in gathering information. Also, public campaigns against apartheid should be developed and co-ordinated. Specific suggestions were made for activities by the Committee against Apartheid, including monitoring distorted reports about events in South Africa and Namibia presented by major Western news agencies and other media, and encouraging journalists' organizations to establish awards for journalists with outstanding records of exposing the apartheid system.

With regard to government action, the Seminar recommended: that Governments inform the public through all media about the national liberation struggle in South Africa and Namibia and United Nations efforts to eliminate apartheid; that they prevent and counteract propaganda by the apartheid régime; and that they instruct their external information services and offices to help disseminate anti-apartheid information.

The Seminar called for support action, especially by media and media workers, for journalists subjected to repression by the apartheid régime. It called on trade unions with members in the media to consider discussing with management its editorial policy on news and information on southern Africa; Journalists' organizations and trade unions in developing countries, it suggested, should set up anti-apartheid committees to ensure that false and distorted information about South Africa and Namibia would not be automatically disseminated. It recommended steps to collect and disseminate news about the liberation struggle in South Africa and Namibia, with United Nations assistance.

On 1 September, the Seminar adopted an appeal to journalists, film-makers, organizations of writers and mass communicators, and all United Nations organizations to mobilize world public opinion against apartheid and expose and condemn the racist régime in South Africa and its external allies and accomplices. It called on them: to be vigilant against the clandestine apartheid propaganda paid for by South Africa; to express concern at the suppression of press freedom in, and manipulation of news by, South Africa; to expose in words and pictures those collaborating with the apartheid régime; to publicize the activities of the national liberation movements in southern Africa and extend solidarity to journalists, publicists and writers of those movements; to expose the crimes of the apartheid régime and the operations of TNCs in assisting apartheid; and to inform world public opinion of the decisions and activities of the United Nations and other international organizations against racism and apartheid.

The Berlin Declaration and the appeal, together with a Declaration on aggression by South Africa against Angola (p. 220), were transmitted to the Secretary-General by a letter of 10 September from the Acting Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid.

COMMUNICATION. On 16 June,<sup>(2)</sup> Guyana transmitted to the Secretary-General the Georgetown Declaration, adopted by the International Forum on the Liberation of Southern Africa, held at Georgetown, Guyana, from 30 April to 3 May, with the participation of representatives of 12 States, national liberation movement spokesmen and others. The participants reaffirmed the legitimacy of armed struggle and all other forms of struggle against the South African régime, condemned in the strongest terms the collaboration between South Africa and Western countries, and called for assistance to the liberation movements and the front-line States.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID. The Committee against Apartheid continued to encourage and promote dissemination of information against apartheid by the Secretariat's Centre against Apartheid and the Department of Public Information as well as by NGOs, through publications in several languages, radio programmes for broadcast to South Africa, television spots, films and other material. It promoted voluntary contributions to the Trust Fund for Publicity against Apartheid (p. 207) and co-sponsored conferences, seminars and other events with anti-apartheid movements and other NGOs (p. 207).

In its 1981 report,<sup>(3)</sup> the Committee made several recommendations concerning public action, in particular: the United Nations and States should consider political, financial and other assistance to anti-apartheid and solidarity movements to enable them to continue and expand their activities; the United Nations and other organizations should provide assistance and co-operation to promote youth and student activities against apartheid; the General Assembly should appeal to NGOs to desist from collaboration with the apartheid régime, and should request the Economic and Social Council and the Secretary-General to co-operate with the Committee in investigating and publicizing such collaboration so that action might be taken with respect to organizations which continued it; and the United Nations should make a special effort to inform parliamentarians on international action against apartheid, and should publicize and encourage anti-apartheid actions by local authorities.

With regard to public information, the Committee recommended that the General Assembly increase the United Nations budget appropria-

tion for publications on apartheid in various languages and appropriate \$5,000 for grants to writers in connection with the initiation of a feature service on apartheid.

ACTION BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY. By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(5)</sup> the General Assembly commended the Berlin Declaration to Governments, organizations and the media, and requested the Committee against Apartheid to take appropriate action towards implementing the recommendations in that document, including the publication of expert studies and the organization of journalists' seminars. It requested the Secretary-General and the Committee to encourage action by NGOs and the mass media in the anti-apartheid campaign, called on NGOs to desist from collaboration with the apartheid régime and institutions, and requested the Secretary-General to co-operate with the Committee in investigating and publicizing such collaboration and persuading those concerned to desist. It approved the Committee's recommendations to increase the budgetary provision for publications on apartheid and to initiate a feature service, and it requested the Committee to intensify co-operation with NGOs in the mobilization for sanctions against South Africa and aid to the national liberation movement.

The Assembly authorized the Committee to promote the International Conference of Trade Unions on Sanctions against South Africa (p. 179) and appealed for contributions to the Trust Fund for Publicity against Apartheid (p. 207).

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 126 to 2, with 19 abstentions.

By its resolution of the same day on the South Africa situation,<sup>(4)</sup> the Assembly requested Governments and organizations to co-operate with the Committee in publicizing the national liberation struggle in South Africa, its legitimate objectives and its wider significance.

Egypt introduced the 49-nation resolution on public information and public action against apartheid, stating that additional efforts should be made to keep the public informed of the South Africa situation with a view to isolating the apartheid régime and supporting the national liberation movement.

Explaining its negative vote on the resolution, the United States said that mobilizing world public opinion was an activity singularly unsuited to the United Nations; it feared that the gross distortions of truth found in the resolutions on apartheid could find their way into United Nations information activities. The United Kingdom, which also voted against, said the European Community (EC) member States (most of which abstained) could not support texts imply-

ing a limitation of freedom of information and expression; in particular, they could not support formulae implying that the press, broadcasting services or journalists were subject to government dictate.

Ireland abstained on the resolution because of reservations it shared with other EC members. New Zealand and Spain abstained on similar grounds; New Zealand added that it had a number of reservations concerning the Berlin Declaration. Australia, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands and the Nordic States abstained because of objections to the endorsement of the Declaration; the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands and Norway, the last speaking for the Nordic States, also held that the media could not be subjected to governmental interference. Austria abstained mostly for constitutional reasons which would prohibit implementation of the resolution at the national level. Also abstaining, Japan could not support the \$5,000 grant for feature writers.

Costa Rica and Greece, though voting in favour, reserved their position in respect of the endorsement of certain ideas and recommendations in the Berlin Declaration; Greece also had reservations on the paragraph endorsing the Committee's recommendations for activities to be financed from the United Nations budget. Ecuador supported the text on the understanding that it did not affect freedom of information. Botswana had reservations on the paragraphs on the Conference of trade unions and on mobilization for sanctions.

During the Assembly debate on apartheid and South Africa, Egypt favoured an international mobilization of opposition to apartheid concentrating on the countries that collaborated with the régime. As international public opinion became better acquainted with the evils of apartheid, said Iraq, Governments became more convinced of the necessity of adopting effective measures against South Africa. Poland remarked that, for joint anti-apartheid actions to be effective, there was need for the full co-operation of civic and political organizations, trade unions and student bodies. Trinidad and Tobago thought the mass media had a responsibility to bring their influence to bear on the side of patriots who sought to eliminate apartheid. Viet Nam thought that mobilization of international opinion to unmask and outlaw the actions of the South African régime, the complicity of Governments and corporations and the complacency of certain international organizations was one of the most important tasks of the United Nations.

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid Acting Chairman, transmitting documents of Seminar on publicity, mass

media and apartheid, 10 Sep., A/36/496-S/14686; <sup>(2)</sup>Guyana, 16 June, A/36/330-S/14548.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>36/172 A, para. 20, 17 Dec. (p. 163); <sup>(5)</sup>36/172 L, 17 Dec., text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 101-103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/172 L

126-2-19 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981  
49-nation draft (A/36/L.45 and Add.1); agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Comoros Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia; Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Public information and public action against apartheid and role of the mass media in the struggle against apartheid  
The General Assembly,

Recognizing the important role of non-governmental organizations and of public action in the international campaign against apartheid,

Recognizing further the importance of public information and the role of the mass media in combating apartheid and promoting international action for the eradication of apartheid,

Recognizing, in particular, the need to encourage trade union action for sanctions against South Africa,

Noting with appreciation the co-operation of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the International Labour Organisation and other agencies in this respect,

Noting with great regret the actions of some non-governmental organizations which are actively collaborating with the apartheid régime of South Africa,

Recognizing, in particular, the need to encourage trade union action for sanctions against apartheid,

Having considered the Declaration of the International Seminar on Publicity and the Role of the Mass Media in the International Mobilization against Apartheid, held at Berlin, German Democratic Republic, from 31 August to 2 September 1981.

Recalling and reaffirming its resolutions 34/93 L and M of 12 December 1979,

1. Commends all anti-apartheid and solidarity movements, trade unions, religious bodies, student and youth organizations and other non-governmental organizations that have made a vital contribution to the international campaign against apartheid;

2. Commends the Declaration of the International Seminar on Publicity and the Role of the Mass Media in the International Mobilization against Apartheid to the attention of all Governments and organizations and the media;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to take steps for the widest dissemination of the Berlin Declaration;

4. Requests the Special Committee against Apartheid to take all appropriate action towards the implementation of the recommendations of the International Seminar on Publicity and the Role of the Mass Media in the International Mobilization against Apartheid, including the publication of studies by experts and the organization of national and regional seminars for journalists;

5. Requests the Secretary-General and the Special Committee to give special attention to encouraging action by non-governmental organizations and the mass media in the international campaign against apartheid;

6. Authorizes the Special Committee to promote the organization of the International Conference of Trade Unions on Sanctions against South Africa;

7. Calls upon all non-governmental organizations that have not yet done so to desist from any form of collaboration with the apartheid régime and institutions based on racial discrimination in South Africa;

8. Requests the Secretary-General to lend his co-operation to the Special Committee in investigating and publicizing the collaboration of certain non-governmental organizations with the apartheid régime and institutions of South Africa, and in persuading them to desist from such collaboration;

9. Appeals to all Governments to contribute generously to the Trust Fund for Publicity against Apartheid;

10. Approves the recommendations of the Special Committee contained in paragraph 401 of its report and authorizes it to initiate a feature service on apartheid;

11. Requests the Special Committee to continue and intensify co-operation with non-governmental organizations and with the Non-Governmental Organizations Sub-Committee on Racism, Racial Discrimination, Apartheid and Decolonization in promoting the widest public mobilization for sanctions against South Africa and assistance to the national liberation movement of South Africa.

1981 CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE TRUST FUND  
FOR PUBLICITY AGAINST APARTHEID  
(As at 31 December 1981; in US dollar equivalent)

Country	1981 payment
Austria	4,500
Bahamas	500
Barbados	500
Brazil	40,000
Finland	12,008
Greece	2,000
India	500
Ireland	7,747
Japan	10,000
Malaysia	500
Mexico	1,000
Nigeria	10,000
Suriname	1,000
Syrian Arab Republic	1,000
Trinidad and Tobago	1,000
Turkey	1,000
Venezuela	1,000
Total	94,255

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/172 L, para. 9, 17 Dec. (above)

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

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

Against: United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

#### Trust Fund for Publicity against Apartheid

In its resolution of 17 December 1981 on public information, the mass media and apartheid, <sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly appealed to all Governments to contribute generously to the Trust Fund for Publicity against Apartheid. Such an appeal was suggested by the Committee against Apartheid in its 1981 report.<sup>(1)</sup>

During 1981, 17 Governments contributed a total of \$94,255 to the Fund, which was established in 1974 for the production of publications in languages other than the official languages of the United Nations and for grants to NGOs for reprinting and disseminating United Nations information material on apartheid. Details of the contributions received appear in the following table.

#### Meetings, missions and observances

During 1981, the Committee against Apartheid organized and/or co-sponsored several conferences, seminars and other events with anti-apartheid movements and other NGOs, including: the Conference of West European Parliamentarians on an Oil Embargo against South Africa (Brussels, Belgium, 30 and 31 January) (p. 175); the International Seminar on the Implementation and Reinforcement of the Arms Embargo against South Africa (London, 1-3 April) (p. 173); the International Seminar on Loans to South Africa (Zurich, Switzerland, 5-7 April) (p. 186); the Seminar on Effective Measures to Prevent Transnational Corporations and Other Established Interests from Collaborating with the Racist Régime of South Africa (Geneva, 29 June-3 July) (p. 188); and the International Seminar on Publicity and the Role of the Mass Media in the International Mobilization against Apartheid (Berlin, 31 August-2 September) (p. 204).

The Committee assisted and participated in the International Conference of Youth and Students in Solidarity with the Peoples, Youth and Students of Southern Africa (Luanda, Angola, 13-15 November).

On 27 March, the Committee held a hearing on legal aspects of the struggle against apartheid, to which representatives of several organizations and individuals were invited. The participants reaffirmed the legitimacy of the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement by all available means, including armed struggle, for the seizure of power by the people, the elimination of the apartheid régime and the exercise of self-determination by the people of South Africa.

They also were of the view that responsibility for the crime of apartheid was not confined to the South African régime, but extended to its accomplices which artificially kept it alive.

On 24 March, the Committee held consultations with Bishop Desmond M. Tutu, General Secretary of the South African Council of Churches. On 27 March, the South African Prime Minister announced that Bishop Tutu's passport would be seized on his return to South Africa. By a statement of 10 April, the Committee Chairman appealed for wide support for the Bishop. In a statement of 17 April, he called on the international community not only to denounce the seizure of the passport, but also to institute total sanctions and to increase assistance to the oppressed people and their national liberation movements.

Observances in which the Committee participated included the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (21 March) (p. 877); Africa Liberation Day (25 May); the International Day of Solidarity with the Struggling People of South Africa (Soweto Day) (16 June); the International Day of Solidarity with the Struggle of Women in South Africa and Namibia (9 August) (p. 199); and the Day of Solidarity with South African Political Prisoners (11 October) (p. 197).

In its 1981 report,<sup>(1)</sup> the Committee recommended the organization of regional conferences or seminars in order to promote wider dissemination of information on the South Africa situation, greater public action against apartheid and the implementation of sanctions or other measures against South Africa. It proposed that in 1982 such meetings be organized in Latin America, to study action by Latin American countries against apartheid, as well as collaboration by certain Governments and corporations; and in Asia, to study the virtual alliance that had developed between South Africa and Taiwan, as well as reports concerning open and clandestine trade and other links between the apartheid régime and some Asian countries.

The General Assembly, by its resolution of 17 December on the Committee's work programme,<sup>(2)</sup> decided to make available for 1982, from the United Nations budget, funds for international and national conferences and seminars against apartheid

During the Assembly debate on apartheid, Viet Nam welcomed the Committee's proposal for a regional conference or seminar in Asia in 1982 to study the relations of certain Asian countries with South Africa.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22.

Resolution: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>36/172 N, para. 3 (a), 17 Dec. (p. 214).

Observance of the seventieth anniversary of ANC

By a letter of 19 November 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid transmitted to the Secretary-General a statement on the seventieth anniversary (8 January 1982) of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) appealing for international action in solidarity with the struggle of the South African people and for isolation of South Africa.

The Assembly, in its resolution of 17 December on the South Africa situation,<sup>(2)</sup> extended greetings to ANC on its seventieth anniversary.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid Chairman, 19 Nov., A/36/708.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>36/172 A, para. 19, 17 Dec. (p. 163).

### International assistance

Financial, educational and other United Nations assistance continued to be provided in 1981 to the two national liberation movements in South Africa recognized by the Organization of African Unit (OAU) – the African National Congress (ANC) and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) (see below). The United Nations programme of assistance to southern African student refugees (p. 210) entered its fifth year, having begun in February 1977. The United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa made nine grants totalling \$2,510,000 for legal aid, relief, education and other assistance to persons persecuted under repressive and discriminatory legislation in South Africa and Namibia, as well as for assistance to South African refugees (p. 211). Studying on scholarships granted by the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa, established in 1967, were 533 persons from South Africa (p. 212).

Assistance to national liberation movements

In its 1981 report,<sup>(2)</sup> the Special Committee against Apartheid emphasized the urgent need to assist the national liberation movement in the light of the grave situation in South Africa.

The Economic and Social Council, in a resolution of 22 July on assistance by organizations of the United Nations system to colonial countries and South Africans,<sup>(6)</sup> requested those organizations to intensify their support for the oppressed people of South Africa.

The Council President, on 2 July, reported on consultations held with the Chairmen of the Committee against Apartheid and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples on assistance by United Nations organizations to South Africans and their national liberation movement. According to his report,<sup>(3)</sup>

they agreed on the following conclusions: that the Council and the two committees should continue to maintain close co-operation in maximizing world support for the peoples under colonial and racist domination; that the United Nations commitment to assist peoples under colonial and racist domination should receive urgent priority; that United Nations organizations should provide moral and material assistance; that assistance to the national liberation movements recognized by OAU should be given utmost attention; and that United Nations organizations should contribute to the campaign for South Africa's total isolation.

**UNDP ACTIVITIES.** The Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), by a decision of 24 June,<sup>(10)</sup> requested the UNDP Administrator: to continue to assist efficiently and with maximum flexibility the national liberation movements recognized by OAU; to study the possibility of financing the participation of several liberation movement representatives in meetings convened by UNDP, including Council sessions; and to continue to report to the Council on assistance to the movements.

The Council took note of a report by the Administrator dated 18 March,<sup>(4)</sup> describing activities in 1980 and resources available for assistance to the national liberation movements. It stated that more than \$4 million was available for this purpose in 1981 from the United Nations Trust Fund for Assistance to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

According to a later report covering 1981 activities,<sup>(5)</sup> there were three UNDP projects each for ANC and PAC, involving educational assistance, promotion of self-reliance in housing and infrastructure construction, settlements planning and implementation, and food production for South Africans in the United Republic of Tanzania. In addition, UNDP supported four projects of health, vocational and educational assistance jointly benefiting both liberation movements. A fifth project enabled representatives of those movements to participate in sessions of the UNDP Council.

In September/October, an evaluation mission reviewed all ongoing UNDP-financed assistance to those liberation movements. The mission concluded that: UNDP assistance to African national liberation movements was achieving the intended development and humanitarian objectives; such assistance benefited only the targeted beneficiaries; and, while UNDP assistance to the liberation movements had improved conceptually and procedurally over the years, there was still room for improvement, particularly in such areas as data gathering, compilation and analysis as well as in project formulation, implementation, monitoring and co-ordination.

The mission's report served as a basis for consultations between UNDP, the national liberation movements, OAU and United Nations agencies at an inter-agency meeting held at Dar es Salaam, United Republic of Tanzania, from 8 to 11 December. Priority needs were identified for development assistance in the UNDP programming cycle for 1982-1986.

**UNCTAD ACTIVITIES.** By a resolution of 9 October 1981,<sup>(9)</sup> the Trade and Development Board of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) requested the UNCTAD Secretary-General to assist OAU-recognized national liberation movements of southern Africa on the most immediate issues facing their territories in the fields of trade and development, and give their leaders an opportunity to be more fully acquainted with UNCTAD activities in the area of international economic relations and negotiations. He was also asked to continue studies on economic and social conditions in South Africa (p. 200). The Board invited UNDP to make additional resources available to UNCTAD with a view to achieving those objectives, and invited the UNCTAD Secretary-General to submit progress reports on implementation of the resolution.

The General Assembly, by a resolution of 16 December on the work of UNCTAD,<sup>(7)</sup> took note of the Board's resolution. This provision was adopted in place of one in the original draft, proposed by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77 developing countries,<sup>(1)</sup> that would have had the Assembly endorse the resolution. The adopted text was submitted by a Vice-Chairman of the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on the basis of informal consultations.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** By its resolution, of 17 December on the South Africa situation,<sup>(8)</sup> the General Assembly appealed to States to provide humanitarian, educational, financial and other assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement. It urged UNDP and other United Nations bodies to expand their assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and to the South African liberation movements recognized by OAU, and decided to continue the authorization of adequate financial provision in the United Nations budget to enable those movements to maintain offices in New York in order to participate in the deliberations of the Committee against Apartheid and other bodies.

In explanation of vote, Canada objected to the allocation of United Nations funds to individual liberation movements. The Netherlands said that, while it supported the efforts of ANC and PAC as anti-apartheid movements, it did not recognize them as a liberation movement

because it did not regard the South African situation as colonial.

During the Assembly debate on apartheid, many States pledged to provide humanitarian assistance to the victims of apartheid and the South African liberation movement. For some countries, such as Japan, which argued that change could still be effected peacefully, such assistance excluded support of armed struggle. Others, including Malaysia and the Sudan, said they supported the struggle against apartheid by all means, including armed struggle. Nigeria said it would continue, regardless of the price and sacrifice, to give material resources to African freedom fighters for their just war against their racist oppressors.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.65.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22; <sup>(3)</sup>ESC President, E/1981/90; UNDP Administrator, <sup>(4)</sup>DP/513, <sup>(5)</sup>DP/1982/17.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: <sup>(6)</sup>ESC: 1981/54, para. 6, 22 July. (p. 1102). GA: <sup>(7)</sup>36/145, para. 2, 16 Dec. (p. 533); <sup>(8)</sup>36/172 A, paras. 16-18, 17 Dec. (p. 163). <sup>(9)</sup>TDB (report, A/36/15): 238(XXIII), 9 Oct.

Decision: <sup>(10)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1): 81/12, 24 June.

#### Assistance to southern African student refugees

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), designated as co-ordinator for the assistance programme for southern African student refugees, reported orally on 14 July 1981 to the Economic and Social Council that Namibian and South African refugee students in the four asylum countries—Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and Zambia—continued to benefit from UNHCR assistance. Primary and secondary level scholarships had been provided, as well as medical care and accommodation. Some 250 refugees were enrolled at universities in those countries. UNHCR had met the travel costs of some 200 students who had left Botswana, Lesotho and Zambia for further education elsewhere. The Council took note of the High Commissioner's report on 20 July.<sup>(3)</sup>

At the Secretary-General's request, UNHCR reviewed the assistance programmes and identified needs that had arisen as a result of the student refugees' presence in the asylum countries. In a report of 18 September by the Secretary-General to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> the High Commissioner concluded that the international community had provided valuable assistance to help host Governments provide accommodation, maintenance, care and education for the student refugees. Most of the original assistance projects had been successfully completed. The constant flow of student refugees would require interna-

tional assistance for some time, particularly for the expansion of higher educational institutions.

According to tables appended to the report, government contributions earmarked for refugee aid in the asylum countries, in response to a 1977 appeal by the High Commissioner, amounted to \$15,950,329 as at 15 July 1981, reflecting no increase since 24 May 1980.<sup>(4)</sup> Bilateral assistance reported to UNHCR amounted to an additional \$7,653,182. Also as at 15 July 1981, the cost of projects financed by UNHCR or in co-operation with it totalled more than \$13 million. The financial requirements for continuing projects or for new, related needs were estimated at more than \$5 million.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 16 December,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly endorsed the assessments and recommendations in the Secretary-General's report. It requested him, in co-operation with UNHCR, to continue to organize and implement a programme of educational and other appropriate assistance for the student refugees, and urged Member States and organizations to contribute. It appealed to United Nations programmes and international and non-governmental bodies to provide humanitarian and development assistance for the resettlement and integration of refugee families from South Africa in Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and Zambia, and called on all United Nations agencies and programmes to co-operate with the Secretary-General and UNHCR in humanitarian assistance programmes for the student refugees. Finally, it requested the Secretary-General to apprise the Economic and Social Council in 1982 of the status of the programmes and to report to the Assembly later in 1982.

The text, sponsored by 31 nations and introduced by Botswana, was adopted by the Assembly, without vote, on the recommendation of the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee, which approved it in like manner on 3 December.

In the Third Committee debate, Yugoslavia said the international community must continue to provide financial support for the creation of decent living conditions and the establishment of educational opportunities for the student refugees. Also appealing for assistance, Zambia said most refugees from South Africa and Namibia were school-age people who had been discriminated against in their own country; in view of their increasing numbers, countries of asylum were bearing an increasing burden.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/423.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/170, 16 Dec., text following. Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1981/169, 20 July (p. 1043).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1980, p. 238.

Meeting records: ESC: plenary, E/1981/SR.35, 38 (14,20 July). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.56-58, 60-65, 70,72 (19 Nov.-3 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.101 (16 Dec.).

**General Assembly resolution 36/170**

Adopted without vote Meeting 101 16 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/792) without vote, 3 December (meeting 72); 31-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.93); agenda item 12.

Sponsors: Algeria, Angola, Botswana, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Pakistan, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Swaziland, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

**Assistance to student refugees in southern Africa**

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/184 of 15 December 1980, in which it, *inter alia*, requested the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, to organize and implement an effective programme of educational and other appropriate assistance for student refugees from Namibia and South Africa who had taken asylum in Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and Zambia,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General containing the review by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees of the assistance programmes for student refugees from Namibia and South Africa,

Satisfied that some of the projects recommended in the report on assistance to student refugees in southern Africa have been successfully completed,

Noting with concern the continued influx into Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and Zambia of student refugees from South Africa as well as from Namibia,

Convinced that the discriminatory policies and repressive measures being applied in Namibia and South Africa will lead to a further exodus of student refugees from these countries,

Conscious of the burden placed on the limited financial, material and administrative resources of the host countries by the presence of those student refugees,

Appreciating the efforts of host countries to deal adequately with their present student refugee populations and also to be prepared to meet any new emergency by sharing the responsibilities and obligations with the international community,

Noting with satisfaction that provisions were made to allow former student refugees from Zimbabwe to complete their education in the country of asylum or to continue with their studies until alternative arrangements can be made for the completion of their education in their own country,

1. Endorses the assessments and recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary-General and commends him and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees for their efforts to mobilize resources and organize the programme of assistance to student refugees in the host countries of southern Africa;

2. Expresses its appreciation to the Governments of Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and Zambia for continuing to grant asylum and make educational and other facilities available to the student refugees in spite of the pressure which the continuing influx of those refugees exerts on facilities in their countries;

3. Expresses its appreciation to the Governments of Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and Zambia for the co-operation which they have extended to the Secretary-General and to the High Commissioner on matters concerning the welfare of those refugees;

4. Notes with appreciation the financial and material support provided for the student refugees by Member States, the High Commissioner, other bodies of the United Nations system and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations;

5. Requests the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the High Commissioner, to continue to organize and implement an effective programme of educational and other appropriate assistance for student refugees from Namibia and South Africa who have taken asylum in Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and Zambia;

6. Urges all Member States and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to contribute generously to

the assistance programmes for the student refugees, through financial support of the regular programmes of the High Commissioner, the projects identified in the report of the Secretary-General and the projects and programmes submitted to the International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa;

7. Appeals to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the World Food Programme, the World Bank and the United Nations Children's fund, as well as other international and non-governmental bodies, to provide humanitarian and development assistance to expedite the resettlement and integration of refugee families from South Africa who have been given asylum in Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and Zambia;

8. Calls upon all agencies and programmes of the United Nations system to co-operate with the Secretary-General and the High Commissioner in the implementation of humanitarian programmes of assistance for the student refugees in southern Africa;

9. Requests the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the High Commissioner, to continue to keep the matter under review, to apprise the Economic and Social Council, at its second regular session of 1982, of the current status of the programmes and to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the implementation of the present resolution.

**UN Trust Fund for South Africa**

The United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa made nine grants totalling \$2,510,000 in 1981, under a 1965 mandate from the General Assembly<sup>(2)</sup> authorizing it to make financial contributions to help persons persecuted under repressive and discriminatory legislation in South Africa and Namibia, as well as refugees from those countries. The funds were to be used for legal aid, relief, education and other assistance to such persons and, in some cases, to their families. Recipients of grants were voluntary organizations, Governments of host countries of South African refugees and other bodies.

In its annual report on the Fund, annexed to a report by the Secretary-General to the General Assembly dated 30 October 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Fund's Committee of Trustees noted that a large number of individuals faced persecution as a result of the nation-wide protests in South Africa in May during the observance of the twentieth anniversary of the Republic, school boycotts, strikes of workers, and community protests against increases in rents and bus fares. There had also been a series of new trials under the Terrorism Act and on treason charges. A number of journalists had been placed under restriction or had lost employment in the aftermath of a strike by the Media Workers' Association, and a large number of trade unionists had been persecuted in connection with strikes and other activities. Particularly alarming had been the imposition of death sentences in political trials (p. 195).

The Committee expressed grave concern at the precedents that might be set by the trials, the



repercussions likely to result from executions, and government moves to intimidate Bishop Desmond M. Tutu (p. 208), the South African Council of Churches and others engaged in humanitarian assistance to victims of apartheid. In the light of those developments, it called for additional efforts to promote greater contributions to the Trust Fund and to voluntary organizations assisting victims of repression and discriminatory legislation in South Africa and Namibia.

Government contributions to the Trust Fund for South Africa totalled \$2,002,032 during the year ended 31 December 1981. They came from 35 States, as follows:

1981 CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS TRUST FUND FOR SOUTH AFRICA (as at 31 December 1981; in US dollar equivalent)	
Country	1981 payments
Australia	27,317
Austria	34,500
Barbados	500
Brazil	20,000
Canada	16,667
China	20,000
Denmark	261,011
Finland	96,061
France	45,045
Germany, Federal Republic of	60,398
Greece	4,500
Hungary	2,500
Iceland	4,400
India	2,000
Iran	4,000
Ireland	42,326
Italy	15,000
Jamaica	392
Japan	20,000
Malaysia	1,000
Mexico	1,000
Netherlands	85,349
New Zealand	6,848
Nigeria	40,000
Norway	281,963
Pakistan	3,000
Philippines	5,000
Singapore	500
Suriname	1,000
Sweden	492,505
Syrian Arab Republic	1,000
Trinidad and Tobago	1,250
United States	400,000
Venezuela	1,000
Yugoslavia	4,000
Total	<hr/> 2,002,032

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(3)</sup> adopted without vote, the General Assembly commended the Secretary-General and the Committee of Trustees for their efforts, and expressed appreciation to the Fund's contributors and the voluntary agencies aiding victims of apartheid and racial discrimination. It appealed for generous and increased contributions to the Fund and for direct contributions to the voluntary agencies concerned.

The resolution was sponsored by 50 States. Introducing the text, Norway stated that, until apartheid was totally eradicated, the international

community had to do whatever it could to alleviate the suffering caused by that policy and to assist its victims.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, annexing Committee of Trustees report, A/36/619 & Corr.1.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>2054 B (XX), 15 Dec. 1965 (YUN 1965, p. 119); <sup>(3)</sup>36/172 P, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA, plenary, A/36/PV.75-79,81,102,103 (27 Nov.- 17 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/172 P

Adopted without vote Meeting 102 17 December 1981  
50-nation draft (A/36/L.49 and Add.1): agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Angola, Australia, Austria, Benin, Canada, Congo, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Liberia, Mali, Malta, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

#### United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa

The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General, to which is annexed the report of the Committee of Trustees of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa,

Gravely concerned at the continued and increased repression against opponents of apartheid and racial discrimination in South Africa, and the institution of numerous trials under arbitrary security legislation, as well as continued repression in Namibia,

Reaffirming that increased humanitarian assistance by the international community to those persecuted under repressive and discriminatory legislation in South Africa and Namibia is appropriate and essential,

Recognizing that increased contributions to the Trust Fund and to the voluntary agencies concerned are necessary to enable them to meet the increased needs for humanitarian and legal assistance,

1. Commends the Secretary-General and the Committee of Trustees of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa for their efforts to promote humanitarian and legal assistance to persons persecuted under repressive and discriminatory legislation in South Africa and Namibia, as well as assistance to their families and to refugees from South Africa;

2. Expresses its appreciation to the Governments, organizations and individuals that have contributed to the Trust Fund and to the voluntary agencies engaged in rendering humanitarian and legal assistance to the victims of apartheid and racial discrimination;

3. Appeals for generous and increased contributions to the Trust Fund;

4. Also appeals for direct contributions to the voluntary agencies engaged in assistance to the victims of apartheid and racial discrimination in South Africa and Namibia.

#### UN Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa

During 1981, 533 persons from South Africa were studying in 24 countries on scholarships granted by the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa (p. 1117). According to the Secretary-General's annual report on the Programme, dated 6 October 1981, <sup>(1)</sup>786 applications were received from South Africans and 52 new scholarship awards were granted between 1 October 1980 and 30 September 1981. Of the 533 recipients, 246 were

studying in Africa, 167 in North America, 72 in Asia and 48 in Europe.

On 24 November,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly appealed for greater financial and other support to ensure the Programme's continuation, effectiveness and expansion.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/147.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/53, 24 Nov. (p. 1118).

### Work programme of the Committee against Apartheid

In its annual report to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> the Special Committee against Apartheid recommended that the annual budget allocation for special projects to promote the international mobilization against apartheid, which had been \$150,000 in 1981, should be increased to \$300,000 in 1982, and that the Committee should be authorized to seek voluntary contributions for such projects. In making this recommendation, it cited the need for a great expansion of activity in view of the grave situation in South Africa and the proposed International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa (p. 177), as well as for more Secretariat services.

The Assembly, by a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(2)</sup> decided to make a special \$300,000 allocation to the Committee for 1982 from the regular United Nations budget, for special projects to promote the international campaign against apartheid through conferences, other promotional efforts and studies, and requested Governments and organizations to assist and contribute towards such projects. Endorsing the Committee's recommendations on its work programme, the Assembly requested the Committee to give the highest priority in 1982 to mobilizing support for sanctions against South Africa (p. 167), reviewing the implementation of United Nations resolutions on apartheid and especially on embargoes, publicizing developments on collaboration with South Africa, promoting the participation of cultural personalities in the anti-apartheid campaign (p. 202) and promoting the campaign for the release of persons imprisoned or restricted for their opposition to apartheid (p. 197).

The resolution, sponsored by 50 States and introduced by Nigeria, was adopted by a recorded vote of 139 to 1, with 5 abstentions.

Japan abstained in the vote, saying that it could not accept the proposal to increase the special allocation to the Committee by 100 per cent or the provision that would enable the Committee to solicit and receive contributions for its own projects. New Zealand also abstained, taking exception to the Committee's comments and recommendations about New Zealand's actions in regard to apartheid and sports (p. 200).

Though voting in favour, Botswana reserved its position on the request for priority to mobilizing support for sanctions, while Greece had difficulties with certain points in the list of the Committee's priorities. The Netherlands voiced reservations on provisions entrusting the Committee with tasks within the competence of the Security Council's Committee on an arms embargo. Portugal expressed reservations on the request for voluntary contributions or other assistance for special projects, particularly in regard to the International Year for Mobilization of Sanctions against South Africa.

During the Assembly debate on apartheid, Jamaica favoured an expansion of the Committee's membership.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/172 N, 17 Dec., text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79,81,101-103 (27 Nov.- 17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/172 N

139-1-5 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981  
50-nation draft (A/36/L.47 and Add.1): agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Burundi, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid

The General Assembly,

Having considered the reports of the Special Committee against Apartheid,

Recalling and reaffirming its resolution 35/206 P of 16 December 1980,

Commending the Special Committee for its activities in the discharge of the mandate given to it by the General Assembly,

Noting with appreciation the work of the Centre against Apartheid of the Secretariat in assisting the Special Committee,

Recognizing the urgent need for the expansion of activity by the Special Committee and the Centre against Apartheid during 1982,

1. Reaffirms the mandate of the Special Committee against Apartheid for the promotion of the international campaign against apartheid in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and endorses the report of the Special Committee to the Assembly at its thirty-sixth session, in particular the recommendations of the Committee on its programme of work contained in paragraphs 409 to 415 of its report:

2. Requests the Special Committee to give the highest priority in 1982 to:

(a) Mobilizing support for sanctions against South Africa;

(b) Reviewing the implementation of United Nations resolutions on apartheid, especially those for the promotion and effective monitoring of military, nuclear and oil embargoes against South Africa;

(c) Publicizing all developments concerning military, nuclear, economic, political and other collaboration with the racist regime of South Africa;

(d) Promoting the participation of writers, artists and other cultural personalities in the international campaign against apartheid;

(e) Promoting the world campaign for the unconditional release of all persons imprisoned or restricted for their opposition to apartheid;

3. Decides to make a special allocation of \$300,000 to the Special Committee for 1982 from the regular budget of the United Nations for the cost of special projects to be decided on by the Committee in order to promote the international campaign against apartheid, in particular:

(a) Organization and co-sponsorship, and financial assistance, to international and national conferences and seminars against apartheid;

(b) Assistance to enable national liberation movements to participate in such conferences;

(c) Promotion of the widest observance of international days against apartheid and of international campaigns against apartheid;

(d) Studies by experts on apartheid;

4. Requests Governments and organizations to make voluntary contributions or provide other assistance for the special projects of the Special Committee, particularly in order to promote the effective observance of the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa;

5. Requests the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Special Committee, to make urgent and necessary administrative arrangements for effective services to the Committee, as indicated in paragraphs 413 to 415 of its report;

6. Requests all Governments, specialized agencies and other institutions in the United Nations system and other organizations to co-operate with the Special Committee in the discharge of its responsibilities.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

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

Against: United States.

Abstaining: France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Japan, New Zealand, United Kingdom

## Other questions involving South Africa

Relations between South Africa and neighbouring States were again on the United Nations agenda in 1981. South Africa was charged with aggression against its neighbours (see below), including attacks against Angola (p. 217) and armed incursions into Mozambique (p. 221). A border incident with Lesotho was

the subject of letters to the Secretary-General (p. 221). The Security Council established a commission of inquiry to investigate an armed attack against Seychelles (p. 226). No progress was reported in attempts to secure the independence of Namibia, which remained under illegal South African occupation (p. 1126).

Lesotho continued to benefit from a special economic assistance programme authorized by the General Assembly (p. 513).

### Relations with neighbouring States

The Special Committee against Apartheid, in its 1981 report to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> stated that South Africa had committed numerous acts of aggression against the neighbouring front-line States during the previous few years. Such aggression had become inseparable from apartheid. The Committee therefore considered that the United Nations must recognize the breaches of peace and acts of aggression in southern Africa, declare the apartheid regime as the aggressor and decide on comprehensive and mandatory sanctions. It noted that the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa (p. 165), in its Paris Declaration of 27 May,<sup>(3)</sup> had viewed the situation as threatening a wider conflict with grave repercussions in Africa and the world.

The Commission on Human Rights, in resolutions adopted on 23 February in connection with the report of its Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts on Southern Africa (p. 944), called on South Africa to desist from its aggression and violations of the territory of African States,<sup>(4)</sup> and condemned those attacks as a breach of international law.<sup>(5)</sup> It repeated this condemnation in a resolution of 6 March on the self-determination of peoples (p. 891) and requested that help be given to the front-line States to buttress their determination to support the liberation struggle in southern Africa.<sup>(6)</sup>

The Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, in a consensus on the Namibia question (p. 1138) adopted on 14 August,<sup>(2)</sup> condemned the repeated acts of aggression perpetrated by South African forces against neighbouring States and the use of Namibian territory to launch those attacks. It called on States to extend moral and material assistance to Angola and other front-line States to help them defend their sovereignty and territorial integrity against such aggression.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 14 September, in a resolution on the Namibia question,<sup>(7)</sup> the General Assembly condemned South Africa for its armed attacks against neighbouring States, particularly Angola, and called on the

international community to extend support and assistance, including military assistance, to the front-line States to enable them to defend their sovereignty and territory against South African aggression.

By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(13)</sup> adopted in connection with its consideration of apartheid and South Africa, the Assembly condemned the unprovoked acts of aggression by South Africa against Angola, Seychelles (p. 227) and other independent African States. It urged the Security Council to adopt effective measures under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations to prevent breaches of the peace and acts of aggression by the apartheid régime, and thereby avert the grave threat to international peace and security. The Assembly called on States and organizations to provide moral and material support to Angola and other African States subjected to aggression, subversion and terrorism by the apartheid régime, and requested the Committee against Apartheid to publicize those acts and promote support to the front-line States. It also demanded the withdrawal of South African troops from Angola and the payment of compensation (p. 221). The resolution, sponsored by 48 States, was adopted by a recorded vote of 136 to 1, with 8 abstentions.

The Assembly, in another resolution of 17 December on the South Africa situation,<sup>(12)</sup> vehemently condemned the apartheid régime for its repeated acts of aggression, subversion and terrorism against African States, designed to destabilize southern Africa.

In a resolution of 28 October on racial discrimination,<sup>(8)</sup> the Assembly vigorously condemned the repeated acts of aggression by South Africa against neighbouring States, particularly Angola, Botswana, Mozambique and Zambia, and expressed solidarity with the front-line States that were victims of South Africa's aggression and destabilization attempts.

In a resolution of 24 November on United Nations organizations and decolonization,<sup>(9)</sup> the Assembly urged the specialized agencies and other United Nations organizations and institutions to extend, as a matter of priority, substantial material assistance to the front-line States in order to enable them more effectively to support the Namibian struggle for freedom and independence and to resist the violation of their territory by South African armed forces, directly or, as in Angola, through puppet traitor groups in the service of Pretoria.

Provisions relating to the front-line States were included in two resolutions on the Namibia situation adopted on 10 December. In one of these,<sup>(10)</sup> the Assembly called on the international community to extend full support and assis-

tance, including military assistance, to the front-line States to enable them to defend their sovereignty and territorial integrity against the repeated aggression of South Africa. In the second resolution,<sup>(11)</sup> the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to prepare, in consultation with the United Nations Development Programme, a comprehensive programme of assistance to States neighbouring South Africa and Namibia, to help them overcome short-term difficulties and move towards complete self-reliance.

Nigeria, introducing the 17 December resolution on aggression against States neighbouring South Africa, said the text urged the Security Council to carry out its duty concerning the maintenance of international peace and security by imposing mandatory sanctions.

Speaking in explanation of vote, the United States said it deplored the recent South African action in Angola and any escalation of violence in southern Africa from any quarter; however, it had to oppose the resolution for its obvious flaws.

France, abstaining, said the resolution introduced elements not contained in the draft resolution on Angola submitted in the Security Council (p. 218), which France had supported.

Among those voting in favour, Botswana voiced reservations on the clause concerning Council action; some proposed courses of action, it said, presented it with considerable problems because of its geopolitical situation. The Netherlands stated that the call for support to African States subjected to South African aggression was consonant with its own support for their efforts towards increased mutual co-operation and self-reliance. Spain declared that, although it disagreed with some of the ideas contained in the resolution, it would cast a positive vote because it considered that the continuing acts of aggression by South Africa against independent countries deserved serious condemnation.

Canada supported the resolution because of the overwhelming political importance of opposition to aggression, but it expressed reservations on the reference to Seychelles, as well as on the preambular paragraph referring to the United States vote in the Security Council on the armed attack against Angola; also, the paragraph urging the Council to take enforcement action trespassed on the Council's prerogatives. Also voicing reservations with regard to the mention of the armed attack against Seychelles were Australia, Ireland, the Netherlands and New Zealand (p. 227).

Reservations were expressed by Portugal in regard to the provision in the resolution on the Namibia question calling for military assistance to the front-line States.

During the debate on apartheid, many speak-

ers, including Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Gabon, the German Democratic Republic, Kenya, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Romania, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the United Republic of Cameroon, and Zambia, denounced South Africa's aggression against neighbouring States or described it as threatening a wider conflict.

Ghana stated that South Africa's military incursions had been stepped up because of the open political support given it by certain Western Governments, coupled with the knowledge that international action against it would be frustrated by certain permanent members of the Security Council. As long as the racist regime persisted, said Madagascar, South Africa would remain a threat to African countries and a favourable ground for hatching plots to destabilize Governments that opposed apartheid colonialism and imperialism. Mozambique, Uganda and the USSR viewed such action as designed to intimidate and destabilize States and force them to give up their assistance to the national liberation movements in southern Africa. Trinidad and Tobago held it essential that the international community protect the territorial integrity of South Africa's neighbouring States by invoking appropriate measures under Chapter VII of the Charter.

Zimbabwe stated that, based on the instability of the region, South Africa hoped to erect a constellation of States, as an indication of its determination to see that democracy and freedom were destroyed in order to make the region safe for apartheid.

Ireland, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Sudan and Uganda called for assistance to the front-line States to reduce their dependence on South Africa, defend their territory and compensate them for economic losses. The Netherlands said that, together with its partners in the European Community, it attached priority to providing financial aid to the front-line States. Sweden said it was assisting those States in their efforts to reduce their economic dependence on South Africa and their vulnerability to sanctions.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22; <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev.1; <sup>(3)</sup>Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, A/CONF.107/8. Resolutions: Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): <sup>(4)</sup>4(XXXVII), para. 9, 23 Feb.; <sup>(5)</sup>5(XXXVII), para. 3, 23 Feb.; <sup>(6)</sup>14(XXXVII), para. 5, 6 Mar. GA: <sup>(7)</sup>ES-8/2, paras. 5 & 7, 14 Sep. (p. 1128); <sup>(8)</sup>36/8, paras. 5 & 6, 28 Oct. (p. 864); <sup>(9)</sup>36/52, para. 17, 24 Nov. (p. 1098). <sup>(10)</sup>36/121 A, para. 28, 10 Dec. (p. 1156); <sup>(11)</sup>36/121 B, paras. 26 & 27, 10 Dec. (p. 1128); <sup>(12)</sup>36/172 A, para. 2, 17 Dec. (p. 157); <sup>(13)</sup>36/172 C, 17 Dec., text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79,81,101-103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/172 C

136-1-8 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981  
48-nation draft (A/36/L.36 and Add. 1): agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Acts of aggression by the apartheid regime against  
Angola and other independent African States

The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid,

Gravely concerned at the explosive situation in southern Africa resulting from the policies and actions of the apartheid regime of South Africa,

Condemning the continuing acts of aggression committed by the apartheid regime against independent African States, in particular its raid on Matola, Mozambique, in January 1981, its large-scale invasion of Angola since July 1981 and its recent invasion of Seychelles on 25 November 1981,

Noting with grave concern that the Security Council was unable on 31 August 1981, owing to the veto by the United States of America, to adopt a resolution condemning the unprovoked and massive armed aggression of South Africa against Angola.

Commending the Government and people of Angola, as well as the Governments and peoples of other front-line States, for their sacrifices in the cause of the liberation of South Africa and Namibia,

Recognizing that the apartheid regime of South Africa is guilty of repeated breaches of the peace and acts of aggression which constitute an ever-growing threat to international peace and security,

Condemning any encouragement to the apartheid regime in its acts of aggression, direct or indirect, as hostile to the interest of peace and freedom,

Commending all States that have provided assistance to Angola and other front-line States in accordance with relevant resolutions of the United Nations,

1. Condemns the unprovoked acts of aggression committed by the racist regime of South Africa against Angola, Seychelles and other independent African States;

2. Urges the Security Council to adopt effective measures, under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, to prevent breaches of the peace and acts of aggression by the apartheid regime, and thereby avert the grave threat to international peace and security;

3. Demands the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all troops of the apartheid regime of South Africa from Angola and demands that South Africa respect fully the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola and other States;

4. Further demands that the Government of South Africa pay full compensation to Angola for the damage to life and property caused by its acts of aggression;

5. Calls upon all States and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to provide moral and material support to the Government and people of Angola and other independent African States subjected to acts of aggression, subversion and terrorism by the apartheid regime;

6. Requests the Special Committee against Apartheid to publicize the criminal acts of aggression, subversion and terrorism by the apartheid regime and to promote moral and material support to Angola and other front-line States.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian

SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahirlyya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Vendruela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States.

Abstaining: Belgium, Chile, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Guatemala, Japan, Luxembourg, United Kingdom.

### Angola and South Africa

Following a series of letters from Angola complaining of armed attacks by South African forces across the Angolan border with Namibia, the Security Council met in August 1981 to consider an Angolan complaint of a large-scale invasion and occupation of the southern part of its territory. Because of a negative vote by a permanent member (the United States) the Council did not adopt a draft resolution<sup>(1)</sup> condemning South Africa and demanding the withdrawal of its troops. Following further charges by Angola, the General Assembly, on 17 December, demanded the immediate withdrawal of all South African troops.<sup>(34)</sup>

COMMUNICATIONS (JANUARY-AUGUST). By a letter of 19 January,<sup>(6)</sup> Angola drew the Secretary-General's attention to a series of armed attacks into Cunene and Huila provinces by South African army units and helicopters beginning on 12 January, which had left a number of people dead or wounded. In further letters of 22 January<sup>(7)</sup> and 24 February,<sup>(8)</sup> the latter annexing a communique by the Ministry of Defence, Angola indicated that the attacks were continuing.

In a letter of 23 June,<sup>(9)</sup> Angola charged that more than 95,000 South African troops and mercenaries were in Namibia, ready to invade Angola. On 30 July,<sup>(11)</sup> Angola stated that an infantry brigade and three battalions of South African troops and mercenaries, supported by aircraft, had carried out a massive invasion. Annexed to an Angolan letter of 25 August<sup>(12)</sup> was a letter of the same date from the President of Angola, stating that more than 45,000 South African troops were concentrated in the border area and warning that Angola might be forced to resort to Article 51 of the United Nations Charter (on individual and collective self-defence).

To a letter of 26 August<sup>(13)</sup> was annexed a communique from the Acting Foreign Minister of Angola describing aerial attacks against the towns of Cahama and Tchibemba—more than 200 and 300 kilometres, respectively, inside Angola's borders—as well as continuing ground attacks near Xangongo and Catequero, 100 and 150 kilometres from the border.

On 13 July,<sup>(10)</sup> Angola transmitted the Declaration on the People's Republic of Angola adopted at Nairobi, Kenya, in June by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), expressing concern about steps by the United States Administration to have the Congress revise existing legislation with a view to giving direct military assistance to groups of Angolan traitors in the pay of the Pretoria regime, and voicing Africa's commitment to stand by Angola for the defence of its sovereignty and territory.

On 26 August,<sup>(14)</sup> Angola transmitted a letter from its President requesting an urgent meeting of the Security Council to deal with a rapidly deteriorating situation as a result of an attack by three to four brigades of South African troops, supported by aircraft and about 135 tanks, operating more than 100 kilometres inside the border. Angola reiterated its request for a meeting in a letter of 27 August to the Council President.<sup>(15)</sup>

Letters or notes verbales on this situation were sent to the Secretary-General or the Council President by Spain, on 27 August,<sup>(28)</sup> China,<sup>(21)</sup> Egypt<sup>(23)</sup> and the USSR,<sup>(31)</sup> on 28 August; Mongolia, on 29 August,<sup>(25)</sup> and Algeria Botswana<sup>(20)</sup> and Suriname,<sup>(29)</sup> on 31 August. They transmitted official statements or communiqués condemning South Africa's aggression against Angola, expressing solidarity with the Angolan Government and people, and calling for the immediate withdrawal of South African troops. Algeria called for the immediate imposition of sanctions against South Africa.

In addition, calls for Security Council action were made by the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at a 28 August meeting in New York, in a communique annexed to a Cuban letter of 29 August,<sup>(22)</sup> and by the President of Kenya as current OAU Chairman, in a telegram annexed to a letter from Kenya dated 29 August.<sup>(24)</sup> The non-aligned countries called on the Council to apply Chapter VII of the Charter.

By a letter of 26 August to the Secretary-General,<sup>(2)</sup> the Acting Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid transmitted a Committee statement of the same date dealing with various aspects of the South Africa situation (p. 158); with regard to the armed attack against Angola,

the Committee called for urgent action on Angola's request to put an end to the successive acts of aggression against it and neutralize the imminent and large-scale invasion prepared by South Africa. The Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, by a letter of 28 August,<sup>(18)</sup> transmitted to the Secretary-General a statement of the same date condemning the invasion of Angola and calling for the strongest measures against South Africa by the international community and by the Security Council in particular.

By a letter of 27 August,<sup>(27)</sup> South Africa transmitted a letter of the same date from its Minister for Foreign Affairs and Information, stating that premeditated attacks conducted from across the border by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) had escalated to new levels of intensity during the previous weeks. SWAPO sought to build a terrorist force in neighbouring countries, dependent on the USSR and Cuba for its philosophy, training, armament and supplies. In countering the incursions, South Africa had limited its response to SWAPO targets. It invited Security Council representatives to visit Namibia to observe the situation.

**OTHER ACTION.** The United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (p. 689), by a resolution of 21 August,<sup>(32)</sup> deplored all South African military activities in Namibia and Angola, which were having serious ecological consequences, thereby limiting the future capacity to develop new and renewable energy sources. The Conference demanded the complete and unconditional withdrawal of all South African troops from the occupied Angolan provinces of Cunene and Kuando Kubango.

**SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION.** The Security Council met between 28 and 31 August to discuss Angola's complaint of an armed attack by South Africa. On 31 August, a draft resolution<sup>(1)</sup> sponsored and twice revised by Mexico, the Niger, Panama, the Philippines, Tunisia and Uganda received 13 votes in favour but was not adopted because of the negative vote of a permanent member; there was one abstention.

This draft would have had the Council strongly condemn South Africa for its premeditated, unprovoked and persistent armed invasion perpetrated against Angola and its utilization of the illegally occupied Territory of Namibia as a springboard for armed invasions and destabilization of Angola. The Council would have declared the armed invasion a flagrant violation of Angola's sovereignty and territorial integrity, and a danger to international peace and security. It would have demanded the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all South African troops from Angola; strongly condemned South

Africa's use of mercenaries against Angola; and condemned the aggressive campaign and other hostile activities aimed at destabilizing Angola.

The Council would have urged all Member States urgently to extend material assistance to Angola in order to enable it to defend its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, and called on all States to implement fully the arms embargo imposed against South Africa in 1977.<sup>(35)</sup> It would have called for full and adequate compensation to Angola by South Africa for the damage to life and property resulting from the armed invasion. The Council would have decided to send immediately to Angola an investigation commission of five Council members for an on-the-spot evaluation of the critical situation resulting from the invasion, with a mandate to report to the Council by 30 September. Finally, the Council would have decided to remain seized of the question and to meet again to consider the implementation of the resolution.

The vote on this draft was as follows:

In favour: China, France, German Democratic Republic, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, USSR.

Against: United States.

Abstaining: United Kingdom.

The text was revised twice before the vote. By the first revision, a paragraph by which the Council would have decided to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter was deleted. By the second, the six references to "acts of aggression" were replaced by "armed invasion", and the invasion was described as a danger to rather than a breach of international peace and security.

Explaining its negative vote, the United States said the draft blamed South Africa alone for the escalation of violence, whereas the presence of foreign-particularly Cuban-combat forces and USSR military advisers in Angola, along with the provision to SWAPO of arms of USSR origin, fuelled the explosive atmosphere of confrontation and violence. The United Kingdom, abstaining, said that although it could support much of the draft, particularly the demand for troop withdrawal, it did not believe that offensive characterizations and highly coloured rhetoric contributed to peaceful solutions; moreover, it did not regard the text as constituting a determination under Article 39 of the Charter (on the existence of a threat to peace, breach of peace or act of aggression).

The USSR said it had voted for the draft because it reflected the demands of the victim of the aggression as well as the position and interests of Africa; the negative vote of the United States had been cast in the context of its new

southern Africa strategy, aimed at destabilizing Angola and reversing decolonization by forcing its South African partner on the continent.

Angola said the veto would be seen by Africa and the third world as support for South Africa's racism, its flouting of United Nations resolutions and its disregard for human dignity and life; as stated in its letter of 25 August (see above), Angola might have no option but to invoke Article 51 of the Charter. Uganda, a sponsor of the draft resolution, expressed disappointment that the draft, though not containing any references to Chapter VII and to the fact of aggression, had been blocked by a single veto—an action which would make the victim of aggression more vulnerable, give comfort and encouragement to South Africa and deal a blow to the Namibians in their search for self-determination.

For the discussion preceding the voting, the Council invited Angola, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, the Federal Republic of Germany, India, Kenya, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mozambique, South Africa, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe, at their request, to participate without vote. At Tunisia's request, contained in a letter of 29 August,<sup>(30)</sup> the Council also extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure<sup>a</sup> to the Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States to the United Nations.

At the start of the debate, Angola gave an account of the invasion by South Africa, stating that the invasion force, which included gangs of mercenaries, had been accompanied by 135 tanks, 140 armoured vehicles, 38 helicopters and three artillery units, as well as aircraft used for reconnaissance, bombing and strafing. The invaders had occupied or destroyed a number of towns and inflicted brutalities on civilians. Warning that the situation could provoke a widespread conflagration, Angola demanded redress, the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African troops and assistance to strengthen its defences against South Africa's military and nuclear might.

South Africa rejected the charges of aggression against Angola, saying that any action by South African security forces was aimed solely at SWAPO, not at Angola and its people. Between July 1978 and September 1980, there had been almost 1,000 SWAPO attacks across the Angola-Namibia border, involving the murder of almost 300 Namibians, the abduction of 390 schoolchildren and serious injuries to 250 inhabitants of the Territory. The perpetrators had fled back to their sanctuaries in Angola. Rather than a liberation struggle, SWAPO had been conducting a systematic campaign to terrorize and intimidate Namibians with a view to taking over the Territory's government by armed force. The African

States had nothing to fear from South Africa, provided they chose the road of peaceful coexistence. The Chief of the South African Defence Force had announced on 28 August that the forces involved in follow-up operations against SWAPO elements in southern Angola were returning to their bases and advance groups were already back in Namibia.

Most speakers, among them Brazil, China, Cuba, France, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, India, Ireland, Japan, Kenya (speaking for the OAU members), the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Niger, Panama, the Philippines, Spain, the USSR, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia, considered that the Council must condemn South Africa's invasion, which most regarded as a clear violation of Angolan sovereignty and territory and a threat to peace and security. These States, together with Canada, the United Kingdom, the United States and Zimbabwe, the last speaking as Chairman of the African Group, called for urgent Council action to ensure the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the South African troops.

A number of countries, such as Brazil, China, the German Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Niger, Panama, the Philippines and Viet Nam, supported Angola's demand for full compensation for the human and material losses caused by the invasion. Others, including France, Ireland and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, said the Council must demand that South Africa respect Angola's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The United Kingdom called on the Council to agree urgently on a simple and direct appeal to South Africa to terminate its military action in Angola. The United States believed the Council should call urgently and immediately for the cessation of violence from every quarter and by all parties. Spain expressed the view that a Council condemnation of South Africa's aggression and a request that it unconditionally withdraw all its forces would not prevent the Council from continuing to work on a resolution of wider scope.

China stated that South Africa was so reckless in attacking neighbouring States because of the connivance and support of a super-Power that had sided with it.

In the view of the USSR and Viet Nam, the purpose of Pretoria's action was to destabilize the progressive regime in Angola, with support and encouragement from imperialist and racist

<sup>a</sup> Rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure reads: "The Security Council may invite members of the Secretariat or other persons, whom it consist competent for the purpose, to supply it with information or to give other assistance in examining matters within its competence."



forces in the West. Cuba voiced a similar opinion, saying the refusal by the United States to allow the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa meant a manifest decision to protect the aggressor. The German Democratic Republic and the USSR said it was time for the Council to act in accordance with its June 1980 resolution on Angola and South Africa, when it decided to meet again in the event of further South African violation of Angola's territory in order to consider more effective measures under the Charter, including Chapter VII.<sup>(36)</sup> The German Democratic Republic favoured an appeal to States to provide Angola with all necessary assistance in order to bring South African aggression to an immediate end.

Tunisia said international peace and security, as well as the Council's authority and credibility, would be reinforced by the adoption of mandatory sanctions. The call for sanctions was supported by several others, such as the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Uganda. Yugoslavia said the demand of the non-aligned countries for sanctions had become more acute and more universal. In Brazil's view, the Council would have no other resort but the use of Chapter VII if South Africa did not meet the request to withdraw its troops and pay full compensation for the human and material losses caused by its invasion.

Ireland charged that South Africa had utilized its illegal occupation of Namibia to attack Angola on the pretext of a pre-emptive strike; Ireland wondered whether those attacks might not ultimately be aimed at promoting instability throughout southern Africa. In Japan's opinion, South Africa's military actions in Angola went against all United Nations efforts to find a settlement of the Namibian problem.

Kenya, as Chairman of OAU, said Angola was the target of the invasion, not SWAPO and its bases. Mozambique believed that South Africa's invasion of Angola and its January attack on Matola, Mozambique (p. 211, were meant to destabilize the situation in both countries and make it more difficult for them to express political and material solidarity with national liberation movements. The Niger remarked that the conduct of the operations, their timing and objective ruled out the possibility of improvisation or chance; they were outright acts of aggression, backed with sufficient means. The Philippines saw the invasion as part of South Africa's scheme to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia. India expressed a similar opinion and urged the Council to take appropriate and resolute action, including the application of Chapter VII.

Uganda saw four South African objectives in

committing aggression against Angola: to make the world safe for apartheid; to eliminate all patriotic elements within and outside Namibia so as to consolidate its illegal hold on the Territory and frustrate self-determination; to intimidate the front-line States and inhibit them from expressing solidarity with the liberation movements and refugees; and to weaken the economies of the neighbouring States so as to make them dependent on South Africa.

In Canada's view, the situation re-emphasized the acute need for a solution to the Namibia question. France said South Africa's argument that it was acting in self-defence against incursions by SWAPO fighters was not at all valid, as South African territory was not in danger; the direct cause of the dangerous situation in southern Africa was the unjustified maintenance in Namibia of a South African presence and Pretoria's refusal to accept the United Nations settlement plan for Namibia. The Federal Republic of Germany expressed the conviction that efforts for a peaceful solution to that question could succeed only if all parties exercised the utmost restraint and desisted from any action likely to endanger peace and security in the area.

Mexico stated that South Africa's impunity was largely the result of the Council's ambiguous conduct; it had not reacted with sufficient decisiveness when faced with an obvious fact. Panama said the gravity of South Africa's aggression required the adoption of forceful coercive measures; States could not remain neutral when faced with the constant institutional erosion produced in the United Nations by that country's stubborn and delinquent attitude.

FURTHER COMMUNICATIONS (SEPTEMBER-NOVEMBER). On 3 September<sup>(19)</sup> and 8 September,<sup>(26)</sup> respectively, Bangladesh and Pakistan transmitted government statements denouncing the acts of aggression against Angola, expressing solidarity with it and calling for international action to terminate the attack and ensure withdrawal of the South African troops.

The Acting Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid, by a letter dated 10 September,<sup>(3)</sup> transmitted to the Secretary-General a Declaration on the Aggression by the South African Racist Regime against the People's Republic of Angola, adopted on 31 August by the International Seminar on Publicity and the Role of the Mass Media in the International Mobilization against Apartheid, held at Berlin (p. 204). The Seminar, condemning the invasion, requested that the Security Council declare South Africa as the aggressor, demand the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of its forces, declare its liability for full reparations, adopt comprehensive and mandatory sanctions and call on all

## Africa

States, individually and collectively, to assist Angola to defend its sovereignty and territory.

On 17 September,<sup>(5)</sup> Algeria, on behalf of the African Group, transmitted to the Secretary-General a communique issued at the end of an emergent summit of the front-line States and Nigeria Lagos, Nigeria, 11 September), in which the participating heads of State and Government appealed for international assistance for Angola's defence and reconstruction, expressed dismay at the United States veto in the Security Council, condemned that country's support of South Africa and expressed their views on the Namibia question (p. 1128).

Angola, by letters of 28 October<sup>(16)</sup> and 11 November,<sup>(17)</sup> charged that South Africa's aggression against it continued unabated and that South African forces continued to occupy the southern part of the country.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. In a resolution of 28 October on self-determination of peoples,<sup>(33)</sup> the General Assembly strongly condemned the invasion and occupation of part of Angolan territory by South African troops.

By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(34)</sup> adopted under the agenda item on apartheid and South Africa, the Assembly condemned the unprovoked acts of aggression by South Africa against Angola and other African States, and urged the Security Council to adopt effective measures to prevent breaches of peace and acts of aggression by the apartheid regime. It demanded that South Africa withdraw all its troops from Angola immediately and unconditionally, respect fully the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola and other States, and pay full compensation to Angola for the damage to life and property caused by its acts of aggression. It called on States and organizations to provide moral and material support to Angola and other African States subjected to aggression, subversion and terrorism by the apartheid regime, and requested the Committee against Apartheid to publicize those acts of aggression and to promote moral and material support to Angola and other front-line States.

During the debate on apartheid, a number of States criticized South Africa for committing aggression against Angola. The German Democratic Republic and Uganda said such action was intended to weaken and destabilize Angola; another aim, said Uganda, was to insulate South Africa from the liberation movements fighting against apartheid. Mozambique said South Africa must get out of Angolan territory and pay indemnities to that country.

Ghana and the Syrian Arab Republic said the United States veto in the Security Council of the draft resolution on the invasion of Angola fur-

thered the protection and encouragement of the South African regime. In Sierra Leone's view, the veto indicated double standards and double-talk; it was inconsistent to condemn one proven case of aggression and refuse to condemn another in similar circumstances.

Draft resolution not adopted: <sup>(1)</sup>Mexico, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Tunisia, Uganda, S/14664/Rev.2.

Letters and notes verbales (nv):

Committee against Apartheid Acting Chairman: <sup>(2)</sup>26 Aug., A/36/459-S/14656; <sup>(3)</sup>10 Sep., A/36/496-S/14686.

Algeria: <sup>(4)</sup>31 Aug., S/14672 (nv); <sup>(5)</sup>17 Sep., for African Group, A/36/525.

Angola: <sup>(6)</sup>19 Jan., S/14335; <sup>(7)</sup>22 Jan., S/14340; <sup>(8)</sup>24 Feb., S/14385; <sup>(9)</sup>23 June, S/14571; <sup>(10)</sup>13 July, S/14587; <sup>(11)</sup>30 July, S/14623; <sup>(12)</sup>25 Aug., S/14643; <sup>(13)</sup>26 Aug., S/14646; <sup>(14)</sup>26 Aug., S/14647; <sup>(15)</sup>27 Aug., S/14654; <sup>(16)</sup>28 Oct., S/14740; <sup>(17)</sup>11 Nov., S/14749.

Others: <sup>(18)</sup>Council for Namibia Acting President, 28 Aug., A/36/467-S/14671. <sup>(19)</sup>Bangladesh, 3 Sep., S/14682. <sup>(20)</sup>Botswana, 31 Aug., S/14669. <sup>(21)</sup>China, 28 Aug., S/14665. <sup>(22)</sup>Cuba, for non-aligned countries, 29 Aug., S/14661. <sup>(23)</sup>Egypt, 28 Aug., S/14655. <sup>(24)</sup>Kenya, 29 Aug., S/14663. <sup>(25)</sup>Mongolia, 29 Aug., S/14662. <sup>(26)</sup>Pakistan, 8 Sep., S/14680. South Africa, 27 Aug., S/14652. <sup>(28)</sup>Spain, 27 Aug., S/14650. <sup>(29)</sup>Suriname, 31 Aug., S/14674 (nv). <sup>(30)</sup>Tunisia, 29 Aug., S/14666. <sup>(31)</sup>USSR, 28 Aug., S/14658.

Resolutions: <sup>(32)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (report, A/CONF.100/11, Sales No. E.81.L.24): 4 paras. 2 & 4, 21 Aug. GA: (33)36/g, para. 8, 28 Oct. (p. 895); <sup>(34)</sup>36/172 C, 17 Dec. (p. 214). SC: <sup>(35)</sup>418(1977), 4 Nov. 1977 (YUN 1977, p. 161); <sup>(36)</sup>475(1980), para. 7, 27 June 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 257).

Meeting records: SC, S/PV.2296-2300 (28-31 Aug.).

## Lesotho and South Africa

By a letter of 9 October 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> Lesotho informed the Secretary-General that, on 8 October, mortars and machine-guns had been fired from South African territory at the barracks of a Lesotho paramilitary unit stationed near the border. Annexed to the letter was a protest note addressed to the South African Government.

South Africa transmitted to the Secretary-General on the same day a letter from its Minister for Foreign Affairs and Information<sup>(2)</sup> rejecting the inference that South Africa had been involved in the attack and pointing out that opposition elements in Lesotho had openly claimed responsibility for past acts of violence against the Lesotho Government. The letter further stated that South Africa had acted against armed persons or groups endeavouring to traverse South African territory en route to Lesotho. It requested the Secretary-General to dispatch a fact-finding mission.

Letters: ("Lesotho, 9 Oct., S/14721; <sup>(2)</sup>South Africa, 9 Oct., S/14720.

## Mozambique and South Africa

By a letter of 2 February 1981 to the Secretary-General,<sup>(2)</sup> Mozambique stated that, on 30 January, a group of South African commandos had

invaded its territory at Matola (near the capital of Maputo) and killed 11 South African refugees who were members of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), as well as a Portuguese technician; it described the attack as part of a concerted plan to weaken, terrorize and destabilize southern African countries. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mozambique, by a letter of 5 February,<sup>(3)</sup> informed the Secretary-General that South Africa had recalled its personnel in Maputo for consultations and continued to concentrate a large number of troops and war equipment along the border and to violate Mozambique airspace; Mozambique believed that South Africa was preparing another aggression and requested the Secretary-General to take immediate action to dissuade it.

Replying on 6 February,<sup>(5)</sup> South Africa transmitted to the Secretary-General a letter of the same day from its Minister for Foreign Affairs and Information, stating that the action by the South African Defence Force had been directed solely at ANC terrorists; it had followed several warnings to Mozambique that, unless steps were taken to put an end to terrorist activities against South Africa from its territory, South Africa would be forced to act.

The Acting Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid condemned the attack in a press statement of 3 February and urged the Security Council to impose sanctions against South Africa to force it to end its criminal acts of aggression.<sup>(7)</sup>

On 9 February,<sup>(1)</sup> India conveyed to the Council President a message from the Secretary-General of the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries (New Delhi, 9-13 February) in which the Conference strongly condemned the South African military action against Mozambique and appealed for increased assistance to strengthen the defence of the African front-line States and for United Nations action to prevent such acts of aggression.

By a telegram of 18 March to the Secretary-General,<sup>(4)</sup> the Foreign Minister of Mozambique stated that, on 17 March, about 50 South African soldiers had crossed the border into Mozambique and opened fire against a unit of border guards near the town of Ponta do Ouro, seriously injuring one guard while losing two of their own soldiers; large numbers of South African troops were still positioned along the border.

South Africa, on 20 March,<sup>(6)</sup> transmitted to the Secretary-General a message of 17 March addressed to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Mozambique, in which the South African Department of Foreign Affairs and Information stated that the South African border unit involved in the incident had accidentally strayed

across the unmarked border due to a navigational and map-reading error; South Africa protested the killing of one of its soldiers.

Letters and telegram (i): <sup>(1)</sup>India, for non-aligned countries: 9 Feb., S/14370. Mozambique: <sup>(2)</sup>2 Feb., A/36/90-S/14358; <sup>(3)</sup>5 Feb., A/36/96-S/14363; (4)18 Mar., S/14412 (i). South Africa: <sup>(5)</sup>6 Feb., S/14367; <sup>(6)</sup>20 Mar., S/14415.

Report: <sup>(7)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22.

## Chad situation

During 1981, the situation in Chad was the subject of several communications to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council.

By a letter of 18 February,<sup>(6)</sup> Sierra Leone transmitted to the Council President three documents relating to Chad, including the final communique issued at Lomé, Togo, on 14 January 1981 by the Bureau of the seventeenth summit (1980) of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the OAU Standing Committee on Chad. By that communiqué, the participants called on Chad and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to set aside the reported merger agreement between them, affirmed that only a democratically elected government could commit Chad in such a fundamental agreement, called on the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and other Powers immediately to withdraw their troops and military personnel from Chad, called on OAU members to refuse the use of their territory by extra-African Powers or dissident Chadian groups as sanctuaries or bases for mounting armed attacks against Chad, mandated the OAU Secretary-General to organize elections in Chad by the end of April 1981, and decided to send to Chad a Monitoring Commission and an African peace-keeping force composed of troops from Benin, the Congo, Guinea and Togo.

By a letter of 20 February,<sup>(\*)</sup> Chad declared that the January communique had not been approved by the OAU Assembly of Heads of State and Government and did not commit Chad, as it had been adopted in Chad's absence; peace had returned to Chad since the defeat of the rebel group and Chad firmly opposed any consideration of the situation by the Security Council.

By a letter dated 22 April,<sup>(2)</sup> Chad charged that Egypt and the Sudan were threatening it with armed aggression. Both countries denied these charges by letters of 24 April<sup>(4)</sup> and 27 April,<sup>(7)</sup> respectively; the Egyptian letter annexed a 24 April letter from its Minister for Foreign Affairs to the Council President.

The Sudan, on 16 September,<sup>(8)</sup> stated that the occupying Libyan forces in Chad had committed three acts of aggression against the

Sudan, bombing villages on 10 and 15 September and overflying the city of El Geneina on 15 September. Chad, on 21 September,<sup>(3)</sup> termed these charges baseless and said they were aimed at covering up the repeated military incursions launched against it from the Sudan by perpetrators assisted and protected by the Government. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya also responded to the Sudanese letter on 13 October in the context of its relations with the Sudan (p. 225).

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, by a letter of 24 November,<sup>(5)</sup> maintained that the presence of its forces in Chad, requested in 1980 by the Transitional National Union Government of President Goukouni Oueddi, had helped put an end to the civil war that had lasted since 1965; at the Government's request, all Libyan forces had been withdrawn by the third week of November 1981.

Letters: Chad: <sup>(1)</sup>20 Feb., S/14380; <sup>(2)</sup>22 Apr., S/14455; <sup>(3)</sup>21 Sep., S/14702. <sup>(4)</sup>Egypt: 24 Apr., S/14465. <sup>(5)</sup>Libyan Arab Jamahiriya: 24 Nov., S/14767. <sup>(6)</sup>Sierra Leone, transmitting OAU documents; 18 Feb., S/14378. Sudan: 127 Apr., S/14466; <sup>(8)</sup>16 Sep., S/14693.

## Status of the Comorian Island of Mayotte

The sovereignty of the Comoros over the Island of Mayotte was reaffirmed by the General Assembly in 1981, and France, which retained the island under its jurisdiction, was invited to resume its negotiations with the Comoros on the question.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL. In response to a 1980 Assembly request,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General submitted a report dated 3 December 1981<sup>(1)</sup> on the question of the Comorian island of Mayotte. The report contained information from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of the Comoros, the Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations and OAU.

The Comoros, by a note verbale of 9 July, told the Secretary-General that new elements in French policy and the election of a President whose party had opposed the separation of Mayotte from the Comoros raised hopes for a solution; the Comoros wished to raise the issue shortly with the new French Government. France, by a note verbale of 14 September, informed the Secretary-General that its new Government had re-examined the question, and consultations with the Comoros had begun and would continue in the coming weeks.

The OAU activities on the question were indicated in three documents which that organiza-

tion transmitted to the Secretary-General on 2 December. By a resolution adopted in June, the OAU Council of Ministers called on the organization's Ad Hoc Committee of Seven on the Comorian Island of Mayotte, which had not been able to meet as requested by the Council in 1980,<sup>(5)</sup> to convene at Moroni, Comoros, before the Council's next session, to study the situation and recommend a settlement. This Committee, meeting at Moroni from 9 to 11 November, decided to send a mission to consult with French authorities on measures to return the island to the Comoros as soon as possible, and instructed the African Group to set in motion any United Nations action to hasten that return. The Committee also adopted a declaration reiterating its rejection of any recourse to a referendum or to any form of consultation in Mayotte, which would be considered null and void.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 10 December,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly reaffirmed the sovereignty of the Comoros over Mayotte and invited France to honour the commitments entered into prior to the 1974 referendum on self-determination of the Comoro Archipelago, concerning respect for the unity and territorial integrity of the Comoros. France was also invited to resume and actively pursue negotiations with the Comoros, with a view to ensuring the island's return to the Comoros as soon as possible. The Assembly requested the Secretary-General to follow developments, in conjunction with the OAU Secretary-General, and to report again in 1982.

This resolution, sponsored by 15 States and introduced by the Comoros, was adopted by a recorded vote of 117 to 1, with 20 abstentions.

The question was also referred to in a resolution of 28 October on the self-determination of peoples, in which the Assembly took note of the contacts between the Comoros and France in the search for a just 'solution to the integration of Mayotte into the Comoros.'<sup>(3)</sup>

Explaining its vote against the resolution on Mayotte, France regretted that the question was again on the Assembly's agenda, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and despite the fact that the debate was not likely to bring a solution closer. The French President had stated that France was committed actively to seek a solution in the context of its national and of international law. It hoped that solution would take account of geographical, ethnic and historical links between the islands of the Archipelago. But France could not be expected to go counter to the sacred principle of self-determination; the inhabitants of Mayotte must freely choose their destiny. Mayotte's status was provisional and did not close the door to any evolution. France

encouraged the development of economic, commercial, human, cultural and other relations between Mayotte and the other Comorian islands, and relied on the Comoros' willingness to make it easier to strengthen such ties. France hoped to continue a constructive dialogue aimed at a solution consistent with the wishes of the inhabitants of all the islands.

The Comoros affirmed that Mayotte was a Comorian island and that the four Comorian islands, including Mayotte, constituted a single entity with a homogeneous population sharing the same language and culture and practising the same religion. During an official visit to France from 4 to 15 October, the President of the Comoros had been assured by the French President that France wished to end the dispute quickly. That position had been reiterated at a Conference of Heads of State of France and Africa (Paris, 4-6 November), when the French President had recalled that as a Deputy he had stood in 1974 and 1975 for the independence of the Comoros in unity. If France did not act speedily to find a solution, the Comoros' future would be jeopardized and tension in the Indian Ocean aggravated.

Australia said its abstention in the vote should not be interpreted as compromising its long-standing view that colonial Territories should be brought to independence on the basis of unity and territorial integrity.

The Ivory Coast said its positive vote could be interpreted only as encouraging negotiations to eliminate any cloud hovering over Franco-Comorian relations.

During the debate, most speakers welcomed the negotiations between France and the Comoros concerning Mayotte. The necessity of respecting the unity and territorial integrity of the Comoro Archipelago and of respecting prior commitments was reaffirmed by Botswana, Cuba, Gabon, Morocco, Senegal, Singapore and Zambia.

Gabon, Chairman of the OAU Committee on Mayotte, said that, since its creation, the Committee had undertaken unceasing efforts and innumerable mediation activities between the parties; its members had no doubt that a just and satisfactory solution could soon be achieved. Senegal, also a Committee member, said the strengthening of co-operation in all fields between France and the Comoros was proof of their desire to overcome the technical difficulties they faced; the United Nations should do more to contribute to the process they had started with a view to finding a solution.

Botswana asked why France, which had been able to decolonize its vast colonies in Africa without losing much face, should seem to want

to hang on to one island and run the risk of damaging its image in Africa. In Morocco's opinion, France could only increase its standing in the eyes of Africa and of the Comorian people if it responded positively to the Comoros' legitimate claims. Zambia said the dismemberment of the Comoros, if tolerated by the Assembly, would constitute a dangerous precedent, with grave implications for many small and weak countries. Singapore, speaking on behalf of the countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations, expressed a similar view.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/671.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/43, para. 4, 28 Nov. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 259); <sup>(3)</sup>36/9, para. 5, 28 Oct. 1981 (p. 895); <sup>(4)</sup>36/105, 10 Dec., text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 258.

Meeting record: GA, A/136/PV.92 (10 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/105

1 17-1-20 (recorded vote) Meeting 92 10 December 1981

15-nation draft (A/36/L.54 and Add.1); agenda item 27.

Sponsors: Benin, Botswana, Cape Verde, Comoros, Egypt, Gabon, Gambia, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Lesotho, Sierra Leone, Somalia, United Arab Emirates Zambia.

Question of the Comorian island of Mayotte

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960, containing the Declaration on the Granting of independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and 2621 (XXV) of 12 October 1970, containing the programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration.

Recalling also its previous resolutions, in particular resolutions 3161 (XXVIII) of 14 December 1973, 3291 (XXIX) of 13 December 1974, 31/4 of 21 October 1976, 32/7 of 1 November 1977, 34/69 of 6 December 1979 and 35/4:3 of 28 November 1980, in which it, inter alia, affirmed the unity and territorial integrity of the Comoros,

Recalling, in particular, its resolution 3385(XXX) of 12 November 1975 on the admission of the Comoros to membership in the United Nations, in which it reaffirmed the necessity of respecting the unity and territorial integrity of the Comoro Archipelago, composed of the islands of Anjouan, Grande-Comore, Mayotte and Mohéli.

Recalling further that, in accordance with the agreements signed on 15 June 1973 between the Comoros and France concerning the accession of the Comoros to independence, the results of the referendum of 22 December 1974 were to be considered on a global basis and not island by island,

Convinced that a just and lasting solution to the question of Mayotte is to be found in respect for the sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of the Comoro Archipelago,

Taking note of the talks opened between the Government of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros and the Government of the French Republic,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General,

Bearing in mind the decisions of the Organization of African Unity, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Organization of the Islamic Conference concerning this question,

1. Reaffirms the sovereignty of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros over the island of Mayotte;

2. Invites the Government of France to honour the commitments entered into prior to the referendum on the self-determination of the Comoro Archipelago of 22 December 1974 concerning respect for the unity and territorial integrity of the Comoros;

3. Also invites the Government of France to resume and actively pursue the negotiations with the Government of the

Comoros with a view to ensuring the effective return of the island of Mayotte to the Comoros as soon as possible;

4. Requests the Secretary-General of the United Nations to follow developments concerning this question, in conjunction with the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity, and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

5. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Question of the Comorian island of Mayotte".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, 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 SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: France.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mauritania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, United Kingdom, United States.

Denying these charges in a letter of 11 August,<sup>(5)</sup> the Sudan described them as an attempt to cover up Libyan designs of aggression and intervention in the internal affairs of other States; it reiterated a suggestion that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya accept impartial inspection to ascertain the presence of foreign troops in the two countries, and declared that co-operation between Egypt and the Sudan should not be construed as a threat against any State.

On 13 October,<sup>(3)</sup> the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya transmitted to the Council President a letter from the People's Committee of the People's Bureau for Foreign Liaison, charging that the Sudan had escalated the mobilization of Sudanese and Egyptian troops on their borders with the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and had established an airlift between Egypt and the Sudan to transport troops and equipment to the border area, with the aim of covering up foreign intervention in support of the insurgency against Chad (p. 223).

Letters: Libyan Arab Jamahiriya: <sup>(1)</sup>14 Apr., A/36/206; <sup>(2)</sup>31 July, S/14624; <sup>(3)</sup>13 Oct., S/14722. Sudan: <sup>(4)</sup>23 Apr., A/36/223; <sup>(5)</sup>11 Aug., S/14628.

## Egypt, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Sudan

In several communications during 1981, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya charged Egypt and the Sudan with harbouring hostile plans against it, which the two countries denied.

By a letter of 14 April,<sup>(1)</sup> the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya transmitted to the Secretary-General a letter to the Arab kings and heads of State from its own head of State and Leader of the First of September Revolution, charging that the President of the Sudan, in a statement published by the International Herald Tribune of Paris, had offered to assist anyone willing to kill the Libyan leader. The Sudan denied the charges by a letter of 23 April.<sup>(4)</sup>

On 31 July,<sup>(2)</sup> the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya transmitted to the President of the Security Council a telegram of 30 July from the Secretary of the People's Committee of the Libyan People's Bureau for Foreign Liaison, stating that repeated hostile statements by the Presidents of Egypt and the Sudan, and the stationing of 90,000 Egyptian troops in the Sudan near the Libyan border, made it evident that a plan for military aggression by the two countries against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya was being hatched in co-ordination with Israel and the United States.

## Status of Malagasy islands in the Indian Ocean

In response to a 1980 General Assembly request for follow-up and report,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General addressed communications to the Governments of France and Madagascar on 2 April 1981, inviting them to inform him of any developments since December 1980 on the question of the Malagasy islands of Glorieuses, Juan de Nova, Europa and Bassas da India.

Reporting on 25 November 1981<sup>(1)</sup> on the information supplied in response to his request, the Secretary-General said Madagascar had informed him that the question had been discussed in June by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity, which decided to keep the matter under consideration. France had informed him that it had no information to provide. The Secretary-General reported that the Presidents of the two countries had met in Paris on 30 September, and if either party transmitted additional information he would reproduce it for the Assembly.

By a decision of 16 December,<sup>(3)</sup> adopted without vote on the recommendation of the Special Political Committee, the Assembly decided to include the question in the provisional agenda of its 1982 session. The decision was approved

by the Committee in similar fashion on 2 December on an oral proposal by its Chairman, who told the Committee that Madagascar, following consultations with interested delegations, had requested deferral of the item.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/718.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 35/1123, para. 5, 11 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 263). Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/432, 16 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: G.A.: General Committee, A/BUR/36/SR.1 (16 Sep.); SPC, A/SPC/36/SR.47 (2 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

General Assembly decision 36/432

Adopted without vote

Approved by SPC (A/36/813) without vote. 2 December (meeting 47): oral proposal by Chairman on suggestion by Madagascar; agenda item 65.

Question of the Malagasy islands of Glorieuses, Juan de Nova, Europa and Bassas da India

At its 100th plenary meeting, on 16 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Special Political Committee, decided to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Question of the Malagasy islands of Glorieuses, Juan de Nova, Europa and Bassas da India".

## Armed attack against Seychelles

On 25 November 1981, an armed group landed in a civil aircraft at Seychelles International Airport on the main island of Mahé, fought at the airport with the Seychelles People's Defence Force and hijacked another aircraft to the South African port of Durban. Seychelles charged that South Africa had been involved in the incident and requested a Security Council meeting. The Council, by a resolution unanimously adopted on 15 December,<sup>(7)</sup> condemned the attack and established a commission of inquiry to investigate the incident.

COMMUNICATIONS. On 26 November,<sup>(2)</sup> Seychelles transmitted a telegram of the same date from its Minister for Foreign Affairs, stating that a group of mercenaries, presumably of South African origin, had attacked Seychelles International Airport on 25 November and taken its personnel hostage after landing on board a scheduled flight of Royal Air Swazi. The Seychelles People's Defence Force had brought the situation under control, freed most of the hostages and subjugated several invaders; others had fled, hijacking an Air India aircraft and diverting it to Durban with all passengers on board.

By a letter of 1 December,<sup>(3)</sup> Seychelles transmitted to the Secretary-General a note from its Foreign Ministry announcing strict security measures as a result of the attack and other recent airspace violations, and declaring that aircraft committing further violations would be shot down without warning. On 8 December, Sey-

chelles requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council on the incident.<sup>(4)</sup>

Also on 8 December, Kenya transmitted a government statement rejecting allegations made by one of the captured mercenaries that it was involved in the attempted coup.<sup>(1)</sup>

SECURITY COUNCIL ACTION. By a resolution of 15 December,<sup>(7)</sup> prepared during consultations among its members and adopted unanimously, the Security Council affirmed that the territorial integrity and political independence of Seychelles must be respected and condemned the mercenary aggression against Seychelles and the subsequent hijacking. It decided to send a commission of three of its members to investigate the origin, background and financing of that aggression, as well as to assess and evaluate economic damages, and to report to the Council with recommendations not later than 31 January 1982. The members were to be appointed after consultations between the Council's President and members and Seychelles.

Before this action, the Council invited Botswana and Seychelles, at their request, to participate without vote in the discussion, which took place at its meeting of 15 December.

Giving its account of the attack, Seychelles said that Royal Air Swazi, on whose flight the 44 foreign mercenaries had arrived, had confirmed that they had boarded the aircraft after arriving at Matsapha Airport in Swaziland by coach from South Africa, posing as members of a sports club. On their arrival at the Seychelles airport, security forces had been alerted after a sub-machine-gun was found in their luggage. The mercenaries had then taken control of the airport and of the 70 persons present. In the subsequent fighting, one mercenary had been killed and six captured, and damage estimated at \$30 million had been caused. Only five of the mercenaries escaping to Durban had been charged by South Africa with kidnapping and released on trivial bail, while the others had been set free without being charged, despite Seychelles' request that they be returned to Seychelles to stand trial before an international tribunal appointed by the United Nations.

The incident was condemned or deplored by most Council members, including China, France, the German Democratic Republic, Ireland, Japan, the Niger, Tunisia, Uganda, the USSR and the United Kingdom. The dispatch of a commission of inquiry—which had been requested by Seychelles—was specifically endorsed by the majority of speakers, including Botswana, France, the German Democratic Republic, Ireland, Japan, the Niger, the USSR and the United Kingdom. Japan recalled that it had repeatedly stressed the need to strengthen

the fact-finding capacity of United Nations organs, including the Security Council.

The United States, though joining the consensus on the resolution, said the Council should reflect on three broader issues: whether the intervention was a purely internal affair; whether the Council was prejudging the investigation by assuming that another State was involved; and whether a Government which had survived an attempted coup—and even one which had not—could always legitimately request a United Nations investigation and perhaps redress.

In the Niger's view, the incident was an armed attempt to overthrow an established Government, a violation of the territorial integrity of a sovereign State and an attempt to destabilize it. Botswana, Tunisia and Uganda expressed similar views. China said the invasion posed a grave threat to the sovereignty and security of an independent State. Ireland regarded the events not simply as an attempted coup d'état, but as a major attack from outside on a small State particularly vulnerable to such attack. Spain stated that the use of international banditry and mercenaries endangered world peace and security.

Botswana, speaking for the African Group, felt that South Africa's action and its attitude towards the mercenaries cast serious doubts and suspicion on its protestations of innocence. Uganda considered that the evidence of South Africa's involvement, widely reported by many independent sources, could not be ignored. The German Democratic Republic said it was typical that the mercenaries who had committed the attack were set free by South Africa. Mexico said that, according to the initial evidence, the aggression against Seychelles was part of a long chain of attacks from South Africa against neighbouring States.

Tunisia believed that, after having studied the inquiry commission's report, the Council would have to take measures required by the gravity of such acts. The USSR expressed its conviction that the Council, on receiving the report, would act to defend the sovereignty of Seychelles and to prevent acts of international terrorism carried out by mercenaries against the independence of developing States.

The United Kingdom announced that it had agreed to implement a previous agreement on aid to Seychelles and would view sympathetically any request for assistance in repairing the damage done to the airport.

The Council President, by a note of 24 December,<sup>(\*)</sup> reported that agreement had been reached in consultations with the Council members and Seychelles that the commission of inquiry would be composed of Ireland, Japan and Panama.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. In its resolution of 17 December entitled "Acts of aggression by the apartheid régime against Angola and other independent African States",<sup>(6)</sup> the General Assembly condemned unprovoked acts of aggression by South Africa against Angola, Seychelles and other African States. The November invasion of Seychelles was mentioned, together with the January raid against Mozambique and the July invasion of Angola (p. 221), in a preambular paragraph condemning South African aggression.

In explanation of vote on this resolution, Australia, Ireland and the Netherlands, which voted in favour, said they wished to await the report of the Security Council's commission of inquiry in regard to Seychelles. New Zealand, though also supporting the text, believed that no country should be condemned before the evidence established the facts beyond reasonable doubt; it added that in the case of the Seychelles events, the circumstances were not clear. Canada also expressed reservations regarding the charge against South Africa in regard to Seychelles.

Responding to these remarks, Seychelles said it would be surprising if South Africa had not known about the invasion, given the number of white mercenaries involved with ties to its security services.

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Kenya: 8 Dec., A/36/808/S/14785. Seychelles: <sup>(2)</sup>26 Nov., S/14769 & Corr.1; <sup>(3)</sup>1 Dec., S/14777; <sup>(4)</sup>8 Dec., S/14783.

Note: <sup>(5)</sup>SC President, S/14816.

Resolutions: <sup>(6)</sup>GA, 36/172 C, para. 1, 17 Dec. (p. 216); <sup>(7)</sup>SC, 496(1981), 15 Dec., text following.

Meeting record: SC, S/PV.2314 (15 Dec.).

Security Council resolution 496(1981)

Adopted unanimously Meeting 2314 15 December 1981  
Draft prepared in consultations among Council members S/1 4793).

The Security Council,

Taking note of the letter dated 8 December 1981 from the Charge d'affaires of the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Seychelles to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council,

Having heard the statement of the representative of the Republic of Seychelles,

Bearing in mind that all Member States must refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations,

1. Affirms that the territorial integrity and political independence of the Republic of Seychelles must be respected;

2. Condemns the recent mercenary aggression against the Republic of Seychelles and the subsequent hijacking;

3. Decides to send a commission of inquiry composed of three members of the Security Council in order to investigate the origin, background and financing of the mercenary aggression of 25 November 1981 against the Republic of Seychelles, as well as assess and evaluate economic damages, and to report to the Council with recommendations no later than 31 January 1982;



4. Decides that the members of the commission of inquiry will be appointed after consultations between the President and the members of the Security Council and the Republic of Seychelles;
5. Requests the Secretary-General to provide the commission of inquiry with the necessary assistance;
6. Decides to remain seized of the question.

## Co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity

In 1981, co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity (OAU) continued in a number of areas, and the General Assembly called for a strengthening of co-operative activities between the two organizations.

In a report to the General Assembly,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General reviewed developments in five areas: a meeting at Geneva from 13 to 16 April between representatives of the OAU General Secretariat and the secretariats of the United Nations system; consultations and exchange of information; co-operation with regard to the situation in southern Africa; co-operation on economic and social development; and co-operation on information and publicity. The report also gave highlights of assistance rendered to African countries by the United Nations system.

The report noted that the Secretary-General had addressed the eighteenth OAU Assembly of Heads of State and Government, held from 15 to 26 June at Nairobi, Kenya, where he also had held talks on matters of common concern with the OAU Chairman and other African leaders.

The report summarized the conclusions reached at the Geneva meeting of secretariat officials in April, which was attended by representatives of 37 United Nations organizations and units.

In regard to public information, the participants agreed on a regular exchange of programme material between an OAU radio service to be established and the United Nations radio service and other United Nations offices producing radio programmes. They further agreed that OAU should make available to the United Nations and the specialized agencies as soon as possible information on its activities and all press releases issued by it, invite heads of missions and delegations and representatives of agencies to its press conferences, and welcome the publication of articles on questions of interest to Africa in journals published by the United Nations and other organizations.

Concerning research relating to development

and science and technology, the meeting stressed the importance of facilitating OAU access to the results of such research conducted by the United Nations system, and said it would be useful to exchange visits and agree on lines of research. African research programmes and centres needed to be strengthened through bilateral and multilateral assistance, with United Nations help.

With regard to the training of personnel, it was agreed that the United Nations system should continue to orient its programmes to the needs of African countries and that it would be useful for the OAU secretariat to draw up training priorities. OAU also requested international organizations to consider helping to train the personnel of national liberation movements in various fields, according to their needs.

Other topics discussed at the meeting were the employment of Africans in United Nations organizations (p. 1319), refugees and assistance to liberation movements.

Instances mentioned in the Secretary-General's report of co-operation between the United Nations and OAU in regard to southern Africa included: collaboration by the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia in implementing projects of the OAU Bureau for Placement and Education of African Refugees; OAU participation in sectoral workshops for development of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia (p. 1174); OAU co-operation with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in organizing meetings with national liberation movements on plans for assisting their humanitarian and development needs (p. 1098); a meeting organized by the International Labour Organisation (Livingstone, Zambia, 4-8 May) 'to help plan a joint programme of action against apartheid, in co-operation with OAU and the Special Committee against Apartheid; and a February visit by an OAU committee to the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), to discuss possible assistance to front-line States in southern Africa.

In the field of economic and social development, the report stated that the Information Service of the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) and the OAU Bureau for refugees had jointly disseminated information on the 1981 International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa (p. 1039). The ECA Information Service had also contributed towards the establishment of the Pan-African News Agency, participating in preparatory meetings. An ECA/OAU committee on modalities for implementing the 1980 Lagos Plan of Action for the Implementation of the Monrovia Strategy for the Economic Development of Africa (p. 611) had begun to meet.

OAU, ECA and UNIDO had co-sponsored the Sixth Conference of African Ministers of Industry (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 23-25 November) (p. 621). UNIDO had convened a working group (Vienna, March 1981) at which it discussed with ECA and OAU representatives the outline of a joint programme to assist in implementing the Industrial Development Decade for Africa (1980-1990). As part of UNDP co-operation with OAU, projects had been approved relating to the social implications of the Lagos Plan of Action (UNDP contribution, \$411,266) and strengthening of OAU/UNDP co-operation (UNDP contribution, \$47,500).

The 54 resolutions and a declaration adopted by the OAU Council of Ministers at its thirty-seventh ordinary session (Nairobi, 15-26 June) and the two resolutions and two decisions adopted by the OAU Assembly of Heads of State and Government at its eighteenth ordinary session (Nairobi, 24-27 June) were transmitted to the Secretary-General by a letter of 18 September from Algeria.<sup>(1)</sup>

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** The OAU Chairman for 1981/1982, Daniel T. arap Moi, President of Kenya, addressed the General Assembly on 24 September 1981, discussing political and economic questions of concern to Africa. He saw no alternative to taking whatever steps were necessary to bring independence to Namibia, declared that there could be no compromise with apartheid and demanded the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African forces from Angola. He asked Ethiopia and Somalia to apply the fundamental OAU principles of respect for boundaries and non-interference in internal affairs. He requested additional international assistance to alleviate Africa's refugee problems and said Africans recognized the need to deal with the causes of those problems. He called for new development strategies based on collective self-reliance and Africa's immense resources, since past strategies, dependent on foreign aid and export of primary commodities, had failed. He stressed Africa's needs in regard to food, industrial development, and transport and communications.

By a resolution of 9 December,<sup>(3)</sup> sponsored by 50 African States and adopted without vote, the General Assembly approved the decisions, recommendations, proposals and arrangements contained in the conclusions of the Geneva meeting of secretariat officials of OAU and the United Nations system, and called on United Nations organizations and bodies to consider those recommendations and proposals with the object of enhancing co-operation with OAU. The Assembly requested that the next such meeting be arranged at Rome, Italy, in April 1982. It asked

that adequate provision be made for technical assistance to the OAU secretariat and that measures be taken to strengthen political, economic, cultural and administrative co-operation with OAU. It called on United Nations bodies to continue to associate OAU closely with all their work concerning Africa and urged United Nations organizations to expand their co-operation with OAU and, through it, their assistance to national liberation movements.

In other provisions the Assembly urged support for economic assistance programmes in Africa (p. 497), recognized the importance of co-operative work for the social and economic development of Africa (p. 611) and called for increased aid to refugees in Africa (p. 1040) and equitable representation of Africans in secretariats of the United Nations system (p. 1319).

Explaining its position on the resolution, the United States commended OAU efforts to seek regional solutions to regional problems but voiced reservations with regard to references to the Lagos Plan of Action, regarded it as totally inappropriate to channel funds of the United Nations system through liberation movements, and objected to the use of the phrase "acts of aggression" in reference to South Africa's actions against front-line States, on the ground that the Assembly could not override the Security Council's discretion. Sierra Leone, on the other hand, stated that the co-operation of the specialized agencies with the liberation movements had always been of a humanitarian character; also, the definition of aggression by the Security Council, although left to the Council's discretion, should not be capricious.

The Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom reaffirmed their view that the Assembly should not in principle approve decisions taken in forums other than those of the United Nations. France expressed concern that it would be difficult to control the financial implications of the recommendations of the Geneva meeting.

Speaking in the debate, Botswana, as Chairman of the African Group, declared that OAU was determined to make its co-operation with the United Nations work.

The United Kingdom, on behalf of the European Community members, supported United Nations efforts to reinforce and intensify assistance to OAU and promised that the Community would continue to work closely with all African countries in promoting economic and social development. Endorsing these views, Belgium supported any regional effort to help Africa solve its problems.

The USSR expressed its conviction that continuing and growing co-operation between the

United Nations and OAU was in keeping with the interests of the struggle to eliminate the vestiges of colonialism, racism and apartheid and the task of consolidating peace and international security. The German Democratic Republic voiced appreciation for OAU efforts to strengthen co-operation among African States and solve the continent's problems.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, annexing OAU resolutions, 18 Sep., A/36/534.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/317 & Add.1, 2.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/80, 9 Dec., text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/793; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/85.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.11, 90 (24 Sep., 9 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.66 (8 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/80

Adopted without vote Meeting 90 9 December 1981  
50-nation draft (A/36/L.19 and Corr.1); agenda item 29.

Sponsors: Algeria, Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity

The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity,

Recalling its previous resolutions on the promotion of co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity and the practical measures taken for their implementation, in particular resolution 35/117 of 10 December 1980,

Taking note of the relevant resolutions, decisions and declarations adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity at its thirty-seventh ordinary session and by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of that organization at its eighteenth ordinary session, which were held at Nairobi from 15 to 27 June 1981,

Considering the important statement made by the current Chairman of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity before the General Assembly on 24 September 1981, particularly on matters of concern to the two organizations,

Noting with satisfaction the continued co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity in areas of common interest,

Deeply conscious of the special needs of the newly independent African States, particularly with regard to the consolidation of their national independence, their endeavours towards social and economic betterment and the adverse impact on their economies of the current international economic situation,

Gravely concerned about the adverse effect on African economies of the current international economic situation,

Recalling in this connection the Lagos Plan of Action for the Implementation of the Monrovia Strategy for the Economic Development of Africa, adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its second extraordinary session, held at Lagos on 28 and 29 April 1980,

Recognizing the need for closer co-operation between the Organization of African Unity and all specialized organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system in realiz-

ing the goals and objectives set forth in the Lagos Plan of Action,

Convinced that the attendance at the International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa, held at Geneva on 9 and 10 April 1981, bears evidence to the fact that the Conference drew international public attention to the grave situation and massive needs of African refugees,

Gravely concerned also at the need for special economic and emergency assistance programmes for a number of African States which face serious economic problems, in particular problems of displaced persons, resulting from natural or other disasters, to enable them to pursue effective economic development,

Gravely concerned further at the deteriorating situation in southern Africa arising from the continued domination of the peoples of the area by the minority racist régime of South Africa and conscious of the need to provide increased assistance to the peoples of the region and to their liberation movements in their struggle against colonialism, racial discrimination and apartheid,

Conscious of its responsibilities to provide economic, material and humanitarian assistance to independent States in southern Africa to help them to cope with the situation caused by the acts of aggression committed against their territories by the apartheid régime of South Africa.

Recognizing the importance of taking effective steps to give the widest possible dissemination of information relating to the liberation struggle of the peoples of southern Africa,

Recognizing the need for continuous liaison, exchange of information at the secretariat level and technical co-operation on such matters as training and research between the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the meeting between representatives of the General Secretariat of the Organization of African Unity and the secretariats of the United Nations and other organizations of the United Nations system, held at Geneva from 13 to 16 April 1981,

Noting with satisfaction the useful decisions and proposals which emerged from the Geneva meeting for enhancing co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity,

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity and commends his efforts in strengthening such co-operation;

2. Notes with appreciation the increasing participation of the Organization of African Unity in the work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies and its constructive contribution to that work;

3. Commends the continued efforts of the Organization of African Unity to promote multilateral co-operation among African States and to find solutions to African problems of vital importance to the international community and notes with satisfaction the increased collaboration of various United Nations agencies in support of those efforts;

4. Reiterates the determination of the United Nations, in co-operation with the Organization of African Unity, to intensify its efforts to eliminate colonialism, racial discrimination and apartheid in southern Africa;

5. Approves the decisions, recommendations, proposals and arrangements contained in the conclusions of the Geneva meeting of representatives of the General Secretariat of the Organization of African Unity and the secretariats of the United Nations and other organizations of the United Nations system;

6. Calls upon the competent organizations and bodies of the United Nations system to give urgent consideration to the various recommendations and proposals contained in the conclusions of the Geneva meeting with the objective of enhancing co-operation between the United Nations system and the Organization of African Unity;

7. Calls upon the competent organs, specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to ensure that their personnel and recruitment policies provide

for the just and equitable representation of Africa at all levels at their respective headquarters and in their regional and field operations and to give due consideration to the various suggestions and proposals in the relevant paragraphs of the conclusions and recommendations of the meeting;

8. Recommends that the pertinent organs and organizations of the United Nations system should take into account the various recommendations and proposals of the Geneva meeting in the fields of information, research and training;

9. Requests the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity, to arrange for the next meeting between representatives of the General Secretariat of that organization and the secretariats of the United Nations and other organizations of the United Nations system to be held at Rome in April 1982, as called for in the conclusions of the meeting held at Nairobi in June 1980;

10. Recognizes the importance of continued close association by the United Nations and the specialized agencies, where appropriate, with the efforts of the Organization of African Unity to promote social and economic development and to advance intra-African co-operation in this vital field;

11. Reaffirms the determination of the United Nations to work closely with the Organization of African Unity towards the establishment of the new international economic order in accordance with the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and, in that regard, to take full account of the Lagos Plan of Action for the implementation of the Monrovia Strategy for the Economic Development of Africa in the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade;

12. Reiterates its appreciation to the Secretary-General for his efforts, on behalf of the international community, to organize and mobilize special economic assistance programmes for African States experiencing grave economic difficulties, in particular for newly independent African States and the front-line States, to help them to cope with the situation caused by the acts of aggression committed against their territories by the apartheid régime of South Africa;

13. Calls upon all Member States, regional and international organizations and organizations of the United Nations system to participate actively in the implementation of those special economic assistance programmes;

14. Requests the Secretary-General to keep the Organization of African Unity informed periodically of the response of the international community to those programmes and to coordinate efforts with all similar programmes initiated by the Organization of African Unity;

15. Requests the Secretary-General and the organizations

of the United Nations system to ensure that adequate facilities shall continue to be made available for the provision of technical assistance to the General Secretariat of the Organization of African Unity as required;

16. Requests the Secretary-General to continue to take the necessary measures to strengthen co-operation at the political, economic, cultural and administrative levels between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, particularly with regard to the provision of assistance to the victims of colonialism and apartheid in southern Africa, and in this connection draws once again the attention of the international community to the need to contribute to the Assistance Fund for the Struggle against Colonialism and Apartheid established by the Organization of African Unity;

17. Calls upon all Member States and organizations of the United Nations system to increase their assistance to the African States affected by serious economic problems, in particular problems of displaced persons, resulting from natural or other disasters, by mobilizing special economic and emergency assistance programmes;

18. Calls upon all Member States and regional and international organizations, in particular those of the United Nations system, and non-governmental organizations to increase substantially their aid to refugees in Africa;

19. Requests the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat and all the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to give wider publicity to and intensify the dissemination of information on social and economic development matters concerning Africa;

20. Calls upon United Nations bodies, in particular the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Special Committee against Apartheid and the United Nations Council for Namibia, to continue to associate closely the Organization of African Unity with all their work concerning Africa;

21. Urges the specialized agencies and the other organizations concerned within the United Nations system to continue and expand their co-operation with the Organization of African Unity and, through it, their assistance to the liberation movements recognized by that organization;

22. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session a report on the implementation of the present resolution and on the development of co-operation between the Organization of African Unity and the organizations concerned within the United Nations system.