

President

Aigner, Mr D'Ormesson, Mr Malangré, Mr Jonker, Mr Dalsass, Mr Estgen, Mr de Keersmaecker, Mr Herman, Mr Lücker, Mr Vandewiele, Mr Habsburg, Mr Seitlinger, Mr Pfennig, Mr Notenboom, Mr Fuchs, Mrs Gaiotti De Biase, Mr Janssen van Raay, Mrs Boot, Mr Helms, Mr Fruh, Mr Vergeer, Mr Alber, Mr Lenz, Mr Luster, Mr Majonica and Mr Schall on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D Group), Mr Scott-Hopkins, Lady Elles, Mr Normanton, Mr Prag, Mr Seligman, Lord Bethell, Mr Fergusson, Lord Douro and Mr Møller on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mr Bangemann, Mr Haagerup, Mr Irmer, Mr Jürgens, Mr Maher, Mr Nord, Mr B. Nielsen, Mr Damseaux, Mrs Pruvot, Mr Rey, Mr Rossi, Mr Berkhouwer, Mr Combe, Mr Pintat, Mrs von Alemann, Mrs Scrivener, Mr Calvez, Mr Delatte and Mr Baudis on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mr de la Malène on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mrs Bonino, Mrs Macciocchi and Mr Pannella on the arrest of the scientist Andrei Sakharov;

- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-773/79) tabled by

Mr Hord, Mr Harris, Mr Tyrrell, Mr Pfennig, Mr Konrad Schön, Mr von Wogau, Mr Ryan, Mr Sälzer, Mr Langes, Sir Peter Vanneck, Mr Cottrell, Mr J. M. Taylor, Mr J. D. Taylor, Miss Hooper, Miss Brookes, Mr Simmons, Mr Simpson, Mr Patterson, Mr Forth, Mr Normanton, Mr Sherlock, Mr Hutton, Mr Paisley, Mr Kellett-Bowman, Mrs Kellett-Bowman, Lord Harmer-Nicholls, Mr Fergusson, Mr Balfour, Mr Pürsten, Mr Schall, Mrs Rabbethge, Mr Curry, Mr Marshall and Lord Bethell on the action to be taken by the European Community following the invasion of Afghanistan by Russia and the outrageous treatment of Professor Sakharov; and

- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-779/79/rev.) tabled by

Mr Blumenfeld, Mr Vergeer, Mr Ryan, Mrs Maij-Weggen, Mr Lücker, Mr Alber, Mr Penders, Mr Martens, Mr Habsburg, Mr Zecchino, Mr Aigner, Mr Janssen van Raay, Mr Notenboom, Mrs Walz, Mrs Lenz, Mrs Boot, Mr Majonica, Mr Jonker, Mr Pürsten, Mr Wawrzik, Mr Bocklet, Mrs Rabbethge, Mr Lemmer, Mr Luster, Mr Pfennig, Mr Müller-Hermann, Mr Nordlohne, Mr Hoffmann, Mr van Hassel, Mr Van der Gun, Mr Goppel, Mr Scott-Hopkins, Lady Elles, Mr Prag, Lord Bethell, Lord Douro, Mr Normanton, Mr Møller, Mr Fergusson, Mr Seligman, Mr Berkhouwer, Mr Nord, Mr Haagerup, Mr Irmer, Mr Jürgens, Mr Maher, Mr B. Nielsen, Mrs Pruvot, Mr Rey, Mr Rossi, Mrs Scrivener, Mrs von Alemann, Mr Bangemann, Mr Damseaux, Mr Combe, Mr Calvez, Mrs Chouraqui, Mr Remilly, Mrs Ewing, Mr Gillot and Mr Deleau

on the Moscow Olympic Games.

The original motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Ripa di Meana and others (Doc. 1-749/79) has been withdrawn in the meantime.

I call Mr Ripa di Meana.

Mr Ripa di Meana. — (I) Madam President, colleagues, by discussing and voting on this resolution, tabled by 130 Members, on behalf of practically all the political groups, our Parliament is simply carrying out its strict duty in accordance with the signing by the European Community of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe on 1 August 1975.

Today the European Parliament is also assuming the **moral responsibility of clearly indicating to everyone that the Sakharov affair has not simply been recorded but is a live issue. I think it is most important** to show that this House, which is divided and will continue to be divided on most social, economic and political issues, has through this joint text reached an extremely wide consensus; a consensus which I find deeply moving and which will, I hope, be even wider by the end of this debate; a consensus on fundamental values which form the essence of our common European culture and tradition.

The Sakharov affair presents us with a problem of evaluation and initiative: evaluation of its implications concerning the internal situation in the Soviet Union and of its repercussions at international level. What is most striking is the indisputable fact that Sakharov's forced exile is not the result of any specific new moves by the scientist. The Soviet Government took a sudden decision to switch from bare tolerance to open repression of this Soviet citizen, winner of the Nobel Prize for Peace. What new development led to such a serious turn-about? — Simply the deterioration in the international situation following the Soviet invasion and occupation of Afghanistan.

It is therefore becoming increasingly evident not only that dissidents in the Soviet Union are not protected by internal laws but that they are hostages whose fate is cruelly dependent on developments in the Soviet Union's international policy. Furthermore, the fact that measures have been taken against the Soviet scientific community at the highest level shows the extent of the opposition organized by that community, as in the case of its long and courageous solidarity with Sakharov, and in those of the physicists Orlov and Nazarian, the cyberneticians Shcharansky and Bolonkin, the biologist Kovalev and the mathematician Velikanova, all arrested and sentenced to extremely severe penalties. It is therefore clear that the Soviet Government intends to break down the resistance of the scientific community by means of force, which is a disturbing sign of the re-militarization of Soviet society.

From the international point of view, Sakharov's arrest and exile, decided on 8 January 1980, has particularly serious implications, because they constitute open violation of the commitments undertaken by the USSR in Helsinki, which have been so often disregarded that it is clear that the Soviet Government considers them little more than pieces of paper.

di Meana

Is not this an attack on international *détente*?

Since the only alternative to *détente* is catastrophe, since peace must be resolutely pursued and preserved, we must, for these fundamental reasons, strongly condemn those who threaten *détente* and peace through acts of open defiance.

Détente is not served by silence or resignation, or a pretence that nothing of consequence has happened between Moscow and the 'closed city' of Gorky. On the contrary, *détente* is served by provoking public moral reaction against such acts, which, otherwise, will get caught in the spiral of aggression. This Parliament therefore has a duty not only to testify and condemn but to promote practical political initiatives designed to obtain the removal of the sanctions imposed on Sakharov.

The first opportunity will arise in Hamburg from 18 February to 4 March during the International Scientific Forum provided for in the Final Act of Helsinki with a view to — and I quote — 'promoting contact, communications and exchanges of information between scientific institutions and scientists'.

However, the most important opportunity will arise in November in Madrid at the conference which is to assess the application by the signatories of the Helsinki agreement. If by that time Sakharov and the other dissidents have not obtained their civil rights, including their right of dissent, the Soviet Union will be made more clearly aware than ever of its exact responsibility.

These are the reasons why it is essential for Parliament to make a clear and unequivocal statement, and it is desirable that the resolution should be supported by those political forces, such as the Italian Communist Members, who, although they have from the beginning adopted a position in many ways similar to that expressed in this resolution, have chosen to keep their position separate.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Hord.

Mr Hord. — Mr President, honourable Members, at the last part-session this House condemned the Russian invasion of Afghanistan. We called for an immediate review of economic and other relations with Russia. We also agreed to provide urgent and immediate aid to the Afghan refugees. Last Wednesday we voted 10.5 million units of account — even though this exceeded our one-twelfth rule — to ensure that this aid

went forthwith to those refugees. Since our last part-session, there has been no withdrawal of Russian tanks and troops from Afghanistan. There are no longer any press reports of actions and activities in Afghanistan. Oppression is total and the free world is faced with a *fait accompli*, Professor Sakharov has since been imprisoned in Gorky.

But in the same month since we last met, Mr President, what has the Commission done? What action has it taken in response to Parliament's January resolution on the Russian invasion? It has agreed not to replace the grain exports now banned by the United States. Some sanction! It has decided not to sell fresh butter in bulk — for the time being. But prepackaged butter, fresh butter, will continue to be sold with a 70 % subsidy! Whoever heard of a more preposterous course of action in response to our resolution? How long is this House going to stomach this incredibly absurd, arrogant, insensitive and inept Commission policy?

We have also been told that the total cost of subsidies freely given by this Community in 1979 to Russia for one commodity alone — butter — amounts to approximately 236 million units of account. This subsidy on one commodity is 22 times as much as we approve for aiding those wretched refugees. What would those poor Afghans feel if they knew that their Russian oppressors were also receiving money — many times more money than they themselves, the refugees, were getting from this Community? But what do our electors and taxpayers feel when they witness their contribution to this European Community being paid out not only to the oppressed but to the oppressors as well, many times over? I can tell you what they feel. They feel angry and have bitter contempt for this institution. It is outrageous and totally unacceptable that such sales of subsidized goods continue to be sold to the USSR. Unlike so many other issues debated here, Mr President, this is one in which it is within the competence of Parliament, as joint budgetary authority, to act. I submit that we can and must act quickly. We must cease forthwith to sustain the Russian invaders and oppressors. It is highly hypocritical to aid the refugees whilst such trade with Russia continues.

Time is running out for millions of law-abiding and freedom-loving citizens, in the same way as time is running out for the credibility of this Parliament. Failure to approve this resolution, failure to take economic action against the Russian aggressors will not only destroy our credibility once and for all but will make each one of us a target for ridicule, both at home and on the other side of the Iron Curtain. I earnestly beg you all to support this motion.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Penders to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group).

Mr Penders. — (NL) Mr President, I would like to begin by expressing my satisfaction at the arguments advanced by Mr Ripa di Meana, who was the first of 118 Members to sign the motion for a resolution now under discussion. Frequently, there are considerable differences of opinion and divergencies between the main political groups, which we should not always try to avoid. On the other hand, it is extremely gratifying when, on such an important issue, cooperation between the main political groups is shown to be possible. The European Parliament is clearly able to arrive at a common policy concerning fundamental issues, of which human rights is certainly one. This is important both now and for the future, since we shall constantly be faced with such issues. Whenever the European Parliament is able to speak with one voice in such matters, this will constitute a gain, not only for the cause in question, but also for Parliament.

Mr President, there are of course those who question the value of adopting yet another resolution on the violation of human rights: at almost every meeting, similar resolutions are included in the agenda. In my opinion, such an attitude is mistaken. In the event of a serious violation of human rights, we in Parliament must make our voices heard and make it clear that we attach great importance to the Final Act of Helsinki. In this connection, I will quote a brief passage from my party programme: The European People's Party considers the implementation of the provisions on human rights in the Final Act to be an important step towards more human living conditions for the peoples of Eastern Europe. We realize that they are counting on our solidarity.

On the other hand, there are those who say that care is necessary in making such statements if *détente* is not to be endangered. Indeed, this must be avoided. What, however, is the value of *détente*, Mr President, when we see how human rights are so frequently treated? A scrupulous and correct implementation of human rights is essential to the process of *détente*, and it is in this spirit that we should go to the Conference of Madrid this autumn. I am convinced that my group will make a positive contribution to this conference and will measure its result against these criteria.

In the motion for a resolution, initially tabled by a member of my group, Mr Alber, mention was made of the sad plight of Mr Duchko and Mr Yakunin, members of the Committee for the Protection of the Interests of Christians in the Soviet Union. When the draft text was drawn up, this reference was deleted, which in itself is not too serious. I would, however, like to take advantage of this opportunity to mention the plight of these two members of the committee. In this type of debate, we often refer to Marxist reformers who are working in a good cause and whom we wholeheartedly support, but I must emphasize that in East European countries and in the Soviet Union Christian believers are persecuted because of their religion, and this is what we are denouncing.

Officially, Dr Sakharov has been exiled, but the word exile is a euphemism. All those visiting him are immediately interrogated by the authorities. To speak of Dr Sakharov's exile is inaccurate: rather we should refer to his house arrest. The time at which these measures are being taken is particularly scandalous. The fact that Moscow has dared to take such extreme measures, having angered the entire world by invading Afghanistan, demonstrates the utter contempt felt there for the letter and the spirit of the Final Act of Helsinki. The very timing of these measures adds to their effect.

We must not forget that the support of the European Parliament is important for the dissidents, who are in a difficult situation. Their telephones are tapped and communications between them are hindered. Nevertheless, according to press reports, they continue to visit each other and try to support each other. There can be no doubt that they come to hear of resolutions such as this. They know that we are discussing these issues and that we are adopting such resolutions. This will encourage them in their courageous attitude.

Finally, Mr President, I think it is essential that we in the European Parliament forward our resolution to the national parliaments of the Nine. This will encourage the peoples of Europe to speak out with one voice on issues concerning human rights. We may have differences of opinion, or a different approach concerning security measures, economic measures, grain exports and technology, but when we discuss issues concerning human rights in the strict sense of the word, there cannot be many differences. Therefore, I consider it important that we forward this resolution to the national parliaments of our Member States.

(Applause)

President. — I call Lord Bethell to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Lord Bethell. — Mr President, it has until recently been an axiom of free societies that the freedom of the individual should not be interfered with, and that as far as possible politics should be kept out of sport. It is this principle which has guided many individuals in the International Olympic Movement who have insisted that the Olympic Games should take place, in spite of pressure from a growing number of governments to the effect that the Games ought to be postponed, cancelled or moved to somewhere else.

I would like to draw your attention, Mr President, and that of my colleagues to how this matter is being viewed in the Soviet Union and to remind the House of some of the words that are being used in Moscow and some of the ideas that are being put forward among active Communist Party members in documents and in papers that are being distributed among

Lord Bethell

the population in preparation for the Games that will take place in July.

A copy of a document entitled *The Activist's Handbook* has recently come to the West. The language used in this document makes it clear exactly how the Soviet people are invited to view the possible holding of the Olympic Games in their country. It reads in part:

'The decision to give the honour of holding the Olympic Games to the capital of the world's first Socialist State bears convincing witness to the universal acceptance of our country's historic importance and correct foreign policy, of the great services rendered by the Soviet Union to peace.'

This is what the Soviet people are being told. They are being told that this is why our athletes will be going to Moscow: to demonstrate our conviction of the correctness of Soviet foreign policy. Later on in this document it is made quite clear that one of the purposes of the Olympic Games, from the Soviet point of view, is to sharpen the struggle between what they call the forces of progress and the forces of reaction. And in this same document the so-called forces of reaction are criticized for using the Olympic movement in the interests of the exploiting classes for purposes of commerce and business, as a means of propaganda for the bourgeois way of life and the capitalist system and as an attempt to distract young people from the class struggle.

So let there be no doubt about it. We see the Olympic movement in one way; those who are organizing the Olympic Games in Moscow see it in another way. I have the greatest sympathy for those athletes in our nine countries who have been preparing for these games. They want to go to Moscow. They don't want to condone aggression in Afghanistan. They don't want to support the arrest of Academician Sakharov. But I am sorry to have to say this: if they do go, they will be unwillingly, unwittingly giving support to these ideas at least in the eyes of the Soviet people. This is what will be seen by the Soviet people: our athletes, our people are going there to support Soviet foreign policy, Soviet aggression and Soviet arrests of dissidents. And so I say to our National Olympic Committees and to our individual athletes: think again, we sympathize with you; you don't mean to condone those oppressions, but if you go this is what you will be doing. I therefore urge the House to pass this resolution by a large majority and send the message out loud and clear to our Olympic committees and our athletes that this is what will happen if the Moscow Games take place in July.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Galluzzi.

Mr Galluzzi. — (I) Mr President, colleagues, in a motion for a resolution with request for urgent procedure, the Italian Communists and Allies have clearly expressed a strong condemnation of the repressive measures taken by the Soviet authorities against the physicist Andrei Sakharov, measures which we considered and still consider extremely serious, since they represent a violation of those rights and fundamental freedoms which should be respected everywhere.

Moreover, we do not confine ourselves in that motion to strong condemnation; we also put forward a request for the sentence to be revoked, a request which, precisely because presented in an official document by the representatives of a party such as ours, which is the largest Communist party in the capitalist West, assumed and assumes now — since we are re-proposing and confirming the position here — an importance and a political significance of which no one, I think, can be unaware. We decided to table a separate resolution and, therefore, not to join in the resolution tabled by the majority of the political groups in the Assembly, because we felt, as we still do, Mr President and colleagues, that the problem of freedom for Sakharov and the more general problem of respect for freedom and human dignity can only be approached in an atmosphere of *détente*, dialogue and peaceful cooperation among peoples.

It is not by chance that the defence and assertion of human rights, viewed as an essential part of the process of *détente* and peaceful co-existence, are closely linked with the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference and directly governed by it. We consider this link to be essential at a time when — to use the Pope's words — 'suspicion and distrust are beginning to replace cooperation between peoples and States and are once more leading to the adoption of defensive positions, reprisals and withdrawal'.

We feel, therefore, that an Assembly such as ours, representing a Community which has much to lose from a return to the dark gloomy years of a divided Europe and the Cold War and which in recent years has succeeded in eliminating tension and re-opening dialogue and collaboration with all the States and peoples of Europe, cannot confine itself to condemnation and a request for reform but should also stress — as Willy Brandt rightly said — its willingness to do everything necessary to maintain the situation of stability and *détente* in Europe and extend it to other parts of the world. The vote of a section of this Parliament, a section of those same groups which tabled the motion on which a vote is now to be taken, prevented our motion from being debated by this Assembly and put to the vote.

We do not know, Mr President and colleagues, whether this is the result of bad conscience or old habits of discrimination, or an attempt to isolate us, to minimize our independence, and to make it seem as if the Italian Communists do not rise to the occasion

Galluzzi

when specific political responsibilities must be assumed with courage. What we do know is that these are petty and mistaken calculations which are turned against those who make them because they show a sectarian rigidity, political short-sightedness, and fear of open, honest confrontation, all of which have inevitably caused embarrassment, unease and the dissociation of a section of the press, many Members and various political representatives of this Parliament. For our part, we shall pursue the course we have taken up to now, we shall continue to assert ourselves, not for propaganda purposes or to cause disruption, but to promote agreement, collaboration and understanding among all the forces who believe in peace and genuinely and sincerely wish to work to defend in an atmosphere of peace all the fundamental rights of men and peoples.

For these reasons, Mr President, we shall abstain from voting as a matter of principle, in order to highlight what we consider to be a serious political shortcoming of the motion before us and to condemn an act of discrimination which is not only pointless but harmful to this Parliament because it prevents it from expressing, even with respect for the different positions and judgements, that wide, uniform will which is essential if it is to have real political weight and exercise an effective political influence for peace in Europe and the world.

(Applause)

President — I call Mr Haagerup to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Haagerup — *(DK)* Mr President, I would like on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group to express my wholehearted support for the motion for a resolution on the scientist Sakharov. We feel that the Soviet authorities' treatment of Mr Sakharov is outrageous and contrary both to the spirit and the letter of the Helsinki Declaration.

As a participant from the Liberal and Democratic Group in the concluding negotiations on the content of this motion, I would like to voice my appreciation — in line with what was said by Mr Penders — of the constructive spirit and the cooperativeness which pervaded these negotiations and the attitude of all those taking part. When adopting such a resolution, it is very important that it should be backed by a large majority. Given the broad spectrum of political views represented in this Parliament, unanimous resolutions are, as is well known, a rarity. However, if unanimity is not reflected in the vote on this matter, it will at all events emerge clearly who in this House opposes this unequivocal condemnation of the Soviet authorities' growing oppression of all those working to ensure respect for, and the defence of, human rights in the Soviet Union.

President — I call Mr Petronio.

Mr Petronio. — *(I)* Mr President, we join in the condemnation of Soviet Russia for its brutal intervention in Afghanistan and the measures taken against Professor Sakharov. We do so without reservations but would nevertheless like to add a few comments.

We feel that the debate on the Moscow Olympic Games has to some extent departed from its proper course. Various attempts have been made to have the debate revolve around two main themes: on the one hand, exaltation of the purity and independence of the sporting spirit — which the International Olympic Committee considers justification for competing in Moscow — and, on the other hand, the view that it would be immoral to take part in the Games when they are being organized by a State which has broken the basic rules of international society by using military aggression against another State.

Our position is quite clear. We feel that sport should be free from any kind of political interference but we also acknowledge the equally important connection between sport and a moral order which involves the entire sphere of public spirit. In view of this, we consider that the debate should be brought back to its proper level, which is sport. We have already made this point on several occasions and in several quarters.

We now turn to the representatives of the highest international sporting authority, which seems to be adopting an attitude of indignation over the injured reputation of the Olympics, and we say to them: 'Gentlemen of the IOC, since we must discuss this issue in a purely sporting context, have you not noticed, sensitive as you are about this matter, that for years a large number of the sportsmen from the so-called Socialist States do not meet the requirements for competing in the Olympics since they are not amateurs but full professionals? Sport in the Eastern bloc — this is the reality of the situation — is a compulsory business with factories for turning out champions, laboratories for the production of stimulants, and sportsmen paid by the régime. For years the world press has condemned this glaring abuse, and even sportsmen from those countries have testified to it. Were you gentlemen of the IOC not aware of all this? Were you not aware of the basic contradiction within your own Olympic organization, which, instead of defending athletic freedom and the essential attributes of this freedom based on honest training and the competitive ability of the athlete, has left unchallenged the biochemical training of athletes and competition between States instead of athletes?'

This is why we feel it is ridiculous that just now when exceptional events are taking place in the world, such as Afghanistan and the Sakharov affair, events with extremely serious implications because the illegitimate acts of the Soviets are no longer affecting just the pol-

Petronio

itical but also the civil sphere, the International Olympic Committee should start pointing to the non-political nature of the Games, when the same Olympic Committee has been unable, in these past years, to defend and to guarantee in line with its obligations and responsibilities the principle of athletic freedom and the independence of individuals in competitive sport.

In our view, therefore, the very decision to hold the Olympics in Moscow was an inadmissible act of surrender on the part of the Olympic authorities. If other unfortunate events have now made a large section of public opinion aware of the situation, so much the better. But the real problem remains as it was before.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Martin.

Mr Martin. — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and Gentlemen, everything which needed to be said about Mr Sakharov has already been said. The position of the French Communist Party is well known and has already been broadly stated in unequivocal terms.

As we are prevented from expressing our views properly by the time limits imposed by the majority of this Assembly, I shall keep my comments short.

I simply wish to say how much it would be appreciated if the virtuous indignation manifested, for example, by Mr Ripa di Meana, Lord Bethell and the other speakers on human rights, were to find equally forceful expression on the subject of the 'Berufsverbot' and all the other assaults on liberty and human rights in the European Community, in this famous free world of yours where seven million men and women are free to be unemployed.

As far as the Olympic Games are concerned, I would remind you of two points: first, there are the completely improper and intolerable remarks made in Washington by Mrs Veil, which led to my withdrawal from the delegation to the United States. As President of the European Assembly, Mrs Veil, regardless of what her personal opinions might be, should have respected the need for proper discretion . . .

President. — I cannot allow you to speak in that way: the President's statements were in conformity with the position taken by a majority of this House.

Mr Martin. — *(F)* Mr President, you are here to preside and not to interpret my comments!

As a Frenchwoman abroad, Mrs Veil should have remembered that it is not her function, even if she is in

Washington, to decide on the conduct of our country's policies. In the face of growing criticism, the President of our Assembly sought to justify herself here on Monday. Mrs Gredal endeavoured to fly to her rescue. Well, we can only say that it has misfired. No about-face, however acrobatically performed, can efface the oath of allegiance to Carter, delivered before an invited audience at the National Press Club in Washington, nor the unfortunate impression made on a number of those present.

Secondly, I wish to convey, on behalf of the French group of Communists and Allies, my best wishes, to the participants in the Winter Games at Lake Placid and wish them every success for the 22nd Olympiad. This can and must represent an important occasion, it can and must allow the Olympic Games to show that they are the supreme sporting event, continuing a tradition which has only been interrupted by the two world wars. This is why we consider it of the utmost importance that the Olympic year, which began yesterday, should continue to the very end as planned by the International Olympic Committee and that the Winter Games in the United States should be followed by the Summer Games in the Soviet Union.

We regard physical and sporting activities as an essential element in the progress of mankind and as an aspect of culture. As the common language of the human race, sport is an important means of communication and understanding between nations. Cooperation and exchanges in the field of sport correspond to the nations' desire for friendship, peace and universal brotherhood.

These are the fundamental reasons why we believe that the Olympic Committees and the IOC, which has just expressed its firm intention to honour the Olympic agreement concluded with the Soviet Union and is thus true to its commitments, are the only bodies qualified to decide the conditions under which the Games are to be held every four years.

We therefore feel the greatest indignation at Carter's hysterical threats and attempts at blackmail. Disregarding the autonomy of sport, Jimmy Carter seeks to weigh the Olympic Games against his ambitions and paltry self-interests which Pierre de Coubertin in his day condemned by describing them as commercial and electoral. It is intolerable that governments should be trying to hold sport hostage. Anyone who claims to be seeking peace, friendship and universal brotherhood must resist all pressure to cancel, postpone or transfer the Games. This is the reasoning behind the amendment which I have tabled on behalf of the French Group of Communists and Allies and which, if adopted, would be a credit to our Assembly.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, long live the Olympic Games!

President. — I call Mr De Goede.

Mr De Goede. — (NL) Mr President, dear colleagues, our opinion on the three motions for resolutions before us is as follows.

Firstly, we wholeheartedly condemn both the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the exile of Dr Sakharov to Gorky. The first is a flagrant violation by the Soviet Union of international law, while the exile of Dr Sakharov is a violation of human rights running counter to the agreements of Helsinki.

My second comment relates to *détente*, which is now under severe pressure but which must not be totally abandoned. This is not because we are insufficiently repelled by events, but because the only alternative to *détente* is a return to the Cold War. The inherent risk of an escalation of disputes to the point of using atomic weapons is so great as to be totally unacceptable. It is a case of one world or none, and therefore our renewed efforts towards *détente* must increase rather than slacken.

My third comment relates to the sanctions. We and others must certainly consider a boycott of the Olympic Games and a reduction or total stoppage of exports of grain and technology; but great care is necessary in view of what I have just said about *détente*. For this reason, the extent of the sanctions and the dates on which they are to come into force must be very carefully considered in order to give the Soviet Union the opportunity to take the necessary measures, thus enabling us to remove or reduce the sanctions.

Mr President, with this in mind we will vote in favour of the resolution tabled by Mr Ripa di Meana and others, but we shall abstain on the resolutions tabled by Mr Hord and Mr Blumenfeld.

President — I call Mr Fergusson.

Mr Fergusson. — Mr President, I will intrude on the patience of the House for a few moments only. The resolutions before us now on the Moscow Olympics, on the price the Soviet Government must pay for what it has done in Afghanistan and on the arrest and banishment of Andrei Sakharov, a winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, have rightly been considered together here this morning.

The motion for a resolution on the Olympic Games flows directly from the warning resolution passed here a month ago. It is a consequence of the growing presence of the Soviet forces on the territory of a people who did not threaten them, did not invite them in and wish only to be rid of them. The treatment of Professor Sakharov, a man who, because he chose to speak the truth, has literally been ostracized, is a new development, but no more acceptable and no less brutish. We approach these matters together because the Afghan invasion, the victimization of Sakharov, the

future of the Moscow Olympics and the survival of *détente* are intimately related with each other. Professor Sakharov, as we know, has been the closest associate of the monitors of the Soviet Union's observance, or I should say, its betrayal, of the terms of the Final Act of Helsinki. When considering his elimination without trial from the Moscow scene and the arrest and imprisonment of his fellow dissidents, together with the displacement of racial minorities, notably Jews and including children, from the vicinity of the Olympic site, what are we to make of this odious business of tarring up the image of the Soviet State for public exhibition? What are we to make of the absence of Andrei Sakharov, of his wife, Yelena Bonner, and of Yuri Orlov from next week's meeting of international scientists, to be held in Hamburg under the aegis of the Helsinki Agreement? Is it the Kremlin's view that *détente* is divisible, not only geographically, as Afghanistan has shown, but economically and culturally as well? Why is it that the eyes now cast by Moscow on Yugoslavia today appear to us not as the eyes of an anxious friend, but the eyes of a circling vulture? There are two reasons: firstly, Afghanistan and secondly Sakharov. There, Mr President, we have the two hideous faces of the Soviet system paraded side by side: aggression without and oppression within. Of the connection between Sakharov and the Olympics we have only this to say to Mr Martin: the one contribution which the Soviet Government has made towards keeping politics out of sport has been to remove Andrei Sakharov and his brave friends from where the Games were to be. I have said enough to explain our vote this morning and there is no more time, but how much more need anyone say here to condemn the Soviet Government when that government, with this one ferocious, frightened gesture, has itself already said so much?

(Applause)

President — I call Mr Berkhouwer.

Mr Berkhouwer — (NL) Mr President, in the absence of Mr Blumenfeld and Mr Scott-Hopkins, it falls to me to present the resolution concerning the Olympic Games, already mentioned by a number of speakers in connection with the resolution on the arrest of Dr Sakharov.

My initial comment is that we realize only too well that we can live in one world or no world and that there is no alternative to *détente*. But with this in mind, we also realize who is at present responsible for endangering *détente*.

Concerning the Olympic Games themselves, I do not consider it correct to refer to a boycott. There is no question of boycotting the Olympic Games as such. In our opinion — and I am glad that, after a great effort, this Parliament has finally reached agreement con-

Berkhouwer

cerning both Dr Sakharov and the Olympic Games — as things now stand the Games cannot be held in Moscow. That is the view we are defending. We, as politicians from the free Western world, do not use athletes as pawns or political hostages, as is the case with dictatorships, where athletes are reared in batteries by the state and for the greater glory of the state. We appeal to the athletes themselves, the free athletes from the free world, and to their own sense of responsibility as citizens of their countries and as citizens of this world, and we urge them not to go to a country which is at war.

The Olympic Games are a symbol of peace. In answer to the cynicism with which a French Member quoted Pierre de Coubertin, in ancient Greece no city at war with another city in Greece could go to Olympia to participate in the Olympic Games.

In view of this custom, I consider that there is all the more reason not to go to a country which is openly at war, engaged in a war of aggression with a neighbouring country despite the latter's adherence to the same political camp and the same political doctrine.

In these circumstances, we considered it expedient and appropriate to refer in our joint motion to the proposal made by President Karamanlis to depoliticize the Olympic Games and to establish a permanent site for them, which could be declared neutral territory by virtue of international law. One possibility, to which we would have no objection, is Olympia itself.

Mr President, we are forced to disregard the fine-sounding words uttered by the French Communist Member and the fraternity to which he referred. Unfortunately, there is no question of fraternity. If only there were! The Olympic Games of 1980 in Moscow would glorify this régime just as the Olympic Games of 1936 glorified the tyrannical Hitlerite régime, thanks to which the Olympic Games of 1940 could not be held. This was a personal experience for me, since between 1936 and 1940 I was training to represent the Netherlands in the 1940 Olympic Games. Therefore I know from experience the feeling of overwhelming frustration on learning that years of training have all been for nothing, and I can certainly understand the disappointment of athletes who will be unable to go to Moscow.

But to return to what I said about pawns and hostages, these athletes are also citizens with their own sense of responsibility, to which we now appeal. For this reason, the resolution tabled by us does not attempt to force countries and federations into line. Next week, our ministers will once more be meeting. We are not asking them to use force. We are requesting them to urge the Olympic Games organizations of their respective countries to ask their athletes to consider once more whether or not they wish to go to Moscow.

Unfortunately, there can be no question of fraternity. The Soviet Government's view of these games has

already been mentioned. It has been openly admitted in so many words that the Games are to contribute to the glorification of the Soviet Communist régime.

The heads of the secret services, including, I believe, Mr Andropov, have already received orders to remove dissidents from Moscow, and other religious minorities also appear to have been forced to leave Moscow for the duration of the Olympic Games. Young people are being sent to the countryside in order to avoid at all costs contamination by contact with people from the free Western world and with their ideas.

Finally, one may ask why a sanction should be imposed at this moment, and why this advice is being given to our governments and athletes. Mr President, unfortunately, if no butter is sent to the Soviet Union the authorities will probably conceal this from the people. The man in the street in the Soviet Union will notice very little, since he already receives insufficient bread and grain and must queue for hours for a little fruit. Thus, such measures will go almost unnoticed by the man in the street or the housewife.

But as we now see, a number of important countries will be absent from the Games — for example, America, Germany and Kenya, an African country of great importance in the field of athletics, having first-class athletes and always likely to win a few medals. In fact, the Games are doomed to failure, all the more so since many Arab countries are also staying away.

And what will be the outcome? If the Olympic Games are called off, the Soviet authorities will have to provide some explanation to their people, since they will be unable to conceal the fact. If this glorious event does not take place, they will be accountable to their people. Therefore, the initiators of this resolution, on which such broad agreement has been reached, hope that its formulation, *fortiter in re, sed suaviter in modo*, will meet with the approval of as many fellow Members of Parliament as possible.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — (B) Mr President and colleagues, by now a large number of countries have announced that they will not be participating in the Olympic Games in Moscow. Clearly, therefore, the Games have lost their essential features of universality and fraternal competition without which the Olympic spirit cannot exist.

The question before us today, therefore, is no longer if one is 'for' or 'against' the boycott of the Moscow Games. The problem can no longer be seen in terms of whether to participate or not, thus aligning oneself with one or other of the two opposing camps. The Olympic Games, which we have seen degraded since

Glinne

1936, are dead for 1980 in Moscow, for 1984 in Los Angeles and for the foreseeable future. The main need now is to suggest a new conception of the Olympic ideal, free from the taints of profiteering, over-commercialization, nationalism and chauvinism. The sportsmen alone should determine the form which a new competition should take and which would be held every four years at a permanent site in a country which can provide the necessary infrastructures. The site for the new Games should be permanent so as to be largely preserved from the extraordinary and inauspicious disputes about prestige which, under the present arrangements, place the states' *amour propre* and their ideological and political pretensions before the true values of sport itself.

This is the spirit in which I personally shall vote against all the resolutions before this Assembly on the Moscow Games.

President. — I call Mr Pürsten.

Mr Pürsten. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, While Mr Glinne was speaking I thought towards the end that he would now be forced to draw the logical conclusion from what he had said, and I regret that he is unwilling or unable to draw this logical conclusion.

Ladies and gentlemen, those who tabled this motion are in no doubt whatsoever as to the prestige and importance of the Olympic Games, particularly for young people throughout the world. On the contrary, it is precisely our love of sport and enthusiasm for the Olympic Games which leads us to try to prevent these being abused and degraded, because this would certainly be the end of the Olympic ideal, ladies and gentlemen.

(Applause)

It is simply an illusion to assume that a distinction can be made between sport, the Olympic Games and political events, as though sport or the Olympic Games were taking place in a vacuum. Ladies and gentlemen, the Olympic Games have always been a show-piece and a source of prestige for the host country. The clearest illustration of this was, of course, in my own country when people said, now he has been recognized by the world. And because this is so, I believe we must today issue a warning to protect our sportsmen from becoming, as Mr Berkhouwer said, puppets of one particular system.

(Applause)

Unfortunately, ladies and gentlemen, success in the field of sport is becoming more and more permeated with ideology and perverted to represent the success of a particular political or ideological system. It is no

longer a particular man or woman who triumphs, but the social system, the social order. Could the Olympic ideal have become any more perverted?

When we talk boycotting, we should note that it is precisely the Soviet Union, in which the Olympic Games are taking place, that has boycotted so many sporting events. In the last 15 years, the Soviet Union and the Eastern bloc have boycotted 10 world championships; they did not go to Argentina, Berlin or Madrid because they disapproved of the prevailing system or of political events which were taking place. This should not be forgotten . . .

(Applause)

. . . Now it is proposed to hold the Olympic Games for the first time in a country which has invaded another country and occupied it. I ask you in all seriousness: can we really expect the world's young sportsmen and women to take part in Olympic Games in a country which has violated the most fundamental obligation under the Olympic ideal namely, to maintain peace in the world? Hence our appeal, our recommendation to the Soviet Union to withdraw its troops so as to give the world and the young people in the world a chance to meet together again in peace. This appeal must come from the House as a whole.

Mr Berkhouwer has mentioned the bitter disappointment for sportsmen who have made sacrifices for many years and given up a great deal in order to be able to take part in these games. To them we can say only one thing: there are more important tasks and overriding values namely, the values of peace and humanity which must take priority even over the aims which they have set themselves.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr Glinne rightly said that the Olympic ideal had become perverted to a very great extent. It has become a show, it has in part become chauvinist and, ladies and gentlemen, commercial interests are dominating sport more and more. Here we need to think again. Next year our colleagues from Greece, representing the mother country of the Olympic Games, will be sitting amongst us. Should not this newly-emerging Europe also take up this idea anew and consider together with our Greek colleagues — on this point, Mr Glinne, I agree with you entirely — whether a new beginning could not be made in cooperation with representatives from the world of sport? We can only operate in a helping capacity. But if we as a Parliament, as a unified Europe, made this offer to venture a new beginning down there, in the mother country of the Olympic Games, on a more modest scale so that smaller countries too could participate, excluding commercial interests and solely guided by Coubertin's idea, then this would be a genuine contribution on our part to the Olympic Games.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Hänsch.

Mr Hänsch. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Berkhouwer has claimed that we are not dealing with a boycott but that we are debating and passing a resolution that the Olympic Games should not be held in Moscow this summer. In my opinion this argument will not hold water. It is based on flimsy pretexts and misleading statements.

On behalf of my German colleagues in the Socialist Group, I should like to summarize the three basic arguments put forward in the debate until now: the moral argument, the punishment argument and the argument that sanctions must be taken against the Soviet Union, the aggressor in Afghanistan, whose actions in this country we condemn just as we condemn the exiling of Sakharov. The moral argument, ladies and gentlemen, is cant. When the decision was taken in 1974 to hold the Olympic Games in Moscow, it was clear to everyone, the Olympic committees and all the governments, in what country these Olympic Games were to be held. Even then human rights were being violated in the Soviet Union. Nothing has changed since then, and those who put forward moral arguments today should reflect on what they did six years ago.

(Cries from Mr Bangemann)

Mr Bangemann, six years before 1974 the Soviet Union had marched into Czechoslovakia. Your moral arguments are basically only arguments for a certain period after which one can afford to forget. In a year's time, you will notice that we are in the process of destroying the instruments for a better, sensible co-existence with the nations of Eastern Europe which it has taken a decade to create. We shall live to regret this.

The second argument, ladies and gentleman, the punishment argument, is dangerous because it will have the opposite effect to that intended. In fact you will forge even closer links between the East European states and the Soviet Union, and instead of freeing the mass of the Soviet population from its régime, you will engender a feeling of solidarity, which is precisely what we do not want.

Finally, there is the argument about the need for sanctions. We are not prepared to do anything that would harm our business transactions with the Soviet Union; and obviously we cannot afford to do so: it is the sportmen who now are to bear the brunt. But everyone knows, ladies and gentlemen, that a boycott of the Olympic Games will not make the Soviet Union withdraw its troops from Afghanistan; a boycott of the Olympic Games will not make the Soviet Union recall Sakharov from exile. Nothing useful will be achieved by this boycott; instead, we shall be killing the Olympic Games not only for 1980 but in all probability for ever. Let us put this debate in its proper perspective.

Let us say the Olympic Games are finished. Fair enough; it is not the end of the world, the world will go on even without the Olympic Games. But we wish to say to the sportsmen that as long as it is at all possible, we wish to see the Games continue to take place. If today you wish to kill off the Olympic Games, so be it. But then take care that you do this for reasons which will still be accepted by the world 10 or 20 years hence.

President. — I call Mr Sarre.

Mr Sarre. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Olympic Games cannot be used as a political weapon. This would not represent a responsible approach to politics. In the present situation, it is incumbent upon us to do everything in our power to maintain *détente* and to refuse to toe the line slavishly.

To my knowledge, participation in the Olympic Games has never constituted an evaluation, and far less approval of the political systems in the host states. Although we clearly and unequivocally condemn military intervention, either, as now, in Afghanistan or, as was previously the case, in Vietnam, we know that a return to the cold war can only increase tension and danger, particularly in Europe.

We must prevent this happening.

For the time being, it is a question of preserving this opportunity for sportsmen from all over the world to meet. We should not accept that athletes are forbidden to meet in Moscow while daily exchanges are taking place with visits by industrialists and financiers. Such incredible hypocrisy can only serve to gull and mislead the public. Let us, ladies and gentlemen, not be duped by a manoeuvre the implications of which, will doubtless be revealed before very long!

President. — I call Mr Cariglia.

Mr Cariglia. — (I) Mr President, I think that no one in this Assembly can be unaware of the fact that the invasion of Afghanistan was and is a threat to world peace. As our colleague Willy Brandt pointed out at a meeting of this Assembly's Political Affairs Committee, this has been the greatest threat to world peace since the end of the war. We are therefore facing an extremely serious situation.

I now ask this Assembly to recognize that the seriousness of the world political situation is not compatible with the objectives of the Olympic Games. This incompatibility is therefore a fact which is acknowledged by world public opinion.

The second point on which I would like the Assembly to reflect is that the Games are now jeopardized and

Cariglia

that the countries which do not wish to boycott the Games run the risk of being used by the Soviet Union against those countries which have boycotted the Games.

Now I think it must be quite obvious that no one wants to use or be used. We must therefore realize that these events have taken place and that countries where freedom of opinion and the fundamental freedoms do not exist can take the liberty — without being accountable to anyone — of invading another country and doubting its independence. These, unfortunately, are indisputable facts. Although we can only take note of them, we must not in any way associate ourselves with the policy being pursued by the Soviet Union in the world today.

I have made this brief declaration, Mr President, on behalf of other colleagues also: Ripa di Meana, Puletti, Ferri, Orlandi and Pelikan, of the Socialist Group.

President. — I call Mr Haferkamp.

Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission. — (D) Mr President, the debate in Parliament on 16 January showed that while it is not particularly difficult to arrive at agreement on basic issues, it is more difficult when it is a question of establishing what definite steps can and should be taken. The Commission is again today completely in agreement with Parliament on the basic issues which have been discussed — namely, the condemnation of aggression and the violation of human rights.

As regards what positive action can be taken, the Commission must act within the limits of Community policy and the instruments available to the Community. On 16 January, we explained how the range of possibilities varied according to different sectors of Community activities.

Since then the Community has deployed the instruments available within the limits of Community policy; it has improved them and made them keener. This applies to agricultural policy within the Community, as explained on 16 January and also later to the Political Affairs Committee, particularly by the President, Mr Jenkins. It also applies to export credits: on 5 February, the Member States decided to accept a proposal from the Commission not to make use of the possibilities under the OECD agreement on credits to make exceptions in favour of the Soviet Union.

In its resolution of 16 January, Parliament demanded that all economic relations with the Soviet Union be re-examined and a report submitted to the Council. I can inform you that this re-examination is currently taking place.

I have referred to Community policy, the instruments available to the Community and the need for the Commission to adhere to these. Clearly the subject of the Olympic Games, which is being discussed here today, does not belong in this category. I can, therefore, not comment on this on behalf of the Commission. But perhaps you will allow me to make a personal comment on this issue, which is of such concern to us and so many people in Europe. The year 1936 has been mentioned. At that time I was a schoolboy, but after 1945 I met many older people who had belonged to the resistance during the Nazi régime and who had been persecuted, imprisoned and who had emigrated. They told me after 1945 that for years after 1933 they had still harboured hopes in the battle against dictatorship and for freedom. But they also told me that their hopes had largely been dashed when in 1936 the world went to Berlin.

(Loud applause)

President. — The debate is closed. Before passing to the vote, we shall now hear the explanations of vote.

I call Mr Rogers.

Mr Rogers. — Mr President, I shall support the resolutions that approve sending a team to the Olympic Games on very specific grounds.

The first one is that very recently some of my colleagues, who seem to be applying double standards, very warmly welcomed China back into the Olympic movement without forgetting that the country next to Afghanistan, Tibet, is still occupied by a Chinese army without the invitation of the Tibetan people, many of whom have fled to India. And, indeed, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom very recently welcomed the President of China. Let us remember that.

Secondly, I shall support sending a team because during the Vietnam war, which every one, I presume, here abhorred, every country in Europe maintained sporting relations with the United States. Therefore, I do not believe we ought to apply double standards here.

Thirdly, countries in Europe such as Switzerland and Italy, where Stanley Adams languished in jail without trial for exposing the activities of multinational companies, which one of the leaders of our colleagues on the other side of the House called the ugly face of capitalism . . .

(Protests)

Fourthly, I would not like to deprive our heavily sponsored 'free' athletes from fulfilling their ambitions.

(Protests)

Rogers

I accept that political double standards operate at all levels. But let us not extend them to our young athletes, who have been training very hard. Yes, I certainly accept that they are citizens and have the right to exercise their rights as well, and if they do not wish to go then they should not go. I am very proud indeed that, when the British Lions toured South Africa, the only person who had the courage, after being selected, to stand up and say he would not support a régime like South Africa was John Taylor, a Welshman.

Search your consciences! If you are happy with Chinese troops in Tibet, if you are happy with Vietnam, if you are happy with what the Swiss and Italian legal systems are doing to Stanley Adams, than apply your double standards. I am not going to apply them on your behalf.

President. — I call Mr van Minnen.

Mr van Minnen. — (NL) Mr President, explanations of vote are often superfluous, since the vote itself is sufficiently clear. Nevertheless, now that we have become involved in a black-and-white situation, an explanation of vote is in my opinion necessary, since the reasons for our vote may be wrongly interpreted.

I would oppose the immediate declaration of a boycott, because I absolutely refuse to allow myself to be used in the 'Carter for President' campaign. I also refuse to allow myself to be dragged along in the wake of a political reaction which would totally destroy *détente* and whose objectives I cannot accept. An explanation is required since simply voting against the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Blumenfeld would not make matters clear. Equally, I do not wish to be identified with the reprehensible attitude of certain members of the IOC and similar organizations, with those who still maintain that sport and politics can remain separate in their Olympic jubilee, with those who, moreover, continue to demonstrate that their political views are even further to the right than those of the right wing of this Parliament, themselves extreme in this case. Such people do not care, and have never cared, whether or not they organize festivities in stadiums in which political prisoners have been kept. They cannot see any further than their own reception halls; they only care about banquets and, given the chance, would have organized the 1944 Olympic Games in Dachau. I do not wish my vote against the boycott to be in any way interpreted as even a shimmer of trust in such hypocrisy as that displayed by certain sports officials.

Mr President, the problem is not whether or not we are to hold the 1980 Olympic Games in Moscow. The problem is, I must confess, the possibility that we may become incurably corrupted by Olympic Games such as these.

President. — I call Mrs Bonino.

Mrs Bonino. — (I) Mr President, colleagues, I shall vote in favour of the resolution tabled by Mr Blumenfeld and others on the Olympic Games.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

I shall vote in favour because I am against violence, and the best means of non-violent resistance and combat is refusal to collaborate: refusal to collaborate with the perpetrators of violence, refusal to collaborate with invaders. It is true that today I shall probably find myself voting with many colleagues who adopted a different attitude when there was question of boycotting the final of the Davis Cup in Chile; but that simply shows your inconsistency, since we have always adopted a coherent policy of non-violence. We wanted a boycott of the Davis Cup in Chile just as we now want a boycott of the Olympic Games in Moscow.

Mr President, I should be grateful if you would allow me to continue. The fact that not all those who now want a boycott of the Games in the USSR protested then against the Pinochet dictatorship shows an inconsistency on their part which is certainly not in their favour, but that is their problem, not ours. I am not worried either by the accusation that I am supporting Carter's policy: we are so far from having anything in common with him that any apparent point of agreement does not bother us in the least.

I wish to state here again the view of the Soviet dissidents Bukhovsky and Ginzburg, who, as early as 1976, asked for a boycott of the Moscow Olympic Games, not of course in connection with Afghanistan but with the violation of civil rights in the Soviet Union. I think it is important that their view should be expressed here, as it has been confirmed to me in the past few days. The Olympics are not a question of sport, and I agree with Mr Glinne that the whole matter should be redefined and that it would be better to have a permanent venue for the Games. However, in the meantime, as things stand, I think a boycott of the Moscow Games is necessary, because refusal to collaborate with the perpetrators of violence, refusal to collaborate with invaders, is the only course open to us.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Seal.

Mr Seal. — Mr President, one of the most dangerous situations you can arrive at is one of mutual incomprehension, and that is a state that we often reach in this Chamber. It is because of this that we need to maintain all possible links with the Russians — in culture, science and sport. We must pursue *détente* with the Russians. And it is no good the other side of the House

Seal

booing and shouting, because surely we have always known how bad the Russian system is. We have always known what the Russians are like. It has not suddenly dawned on us now, as it seems to have suddenly dawned upon Jimmy Carter. And why should we support Jimmy Carter in his election campaign? Even in the USA, people are acknowledging that he is only taking a tough stand over the Olympic Games because of the pressure he is coming under from Kennedy over his weak attitude to the Russians in Cuba. And so he is having to react.

I am going to support the amendment, Mr President, which says we should continue with the Olympic Games in Moscow, and I am going to vote to reject the motion.

Some people here have mentioned South Africa. And some of the Conservatives have said that sport and politics do not mix. What absolute nonsense! Sport and politics do mix, but the difference between the situation in South Africa and this situation is that in South Africa race is built into sport. That is not the case with the Russians.

It is no new thing to have to deal with dictatorships: two-thirds of the world happens to be ruled by dictatorships at the moment. I did not hear any of the Conservatives or any one else opposing the World Cup when that was held in Argentina — held under a most repressive régime at that particular time.

I feel, Mr President, that we in this House must react in a balanced way. We must pursue *détente*, we must hold the Olympic Games in Moscow.

(Applause from certain quarters on the left)

President. — I call Mrs Van den Heuvel.

Mrs Van den Heuvel. — *(NL)* Mr President, I have repeatedly expressed my views in this Chamber on the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. After that invasion, I spoke in favour of taking part in the Olympic Games because I considered that at all costs we should avoid any action likely to endanger *détente* and that politics and sport are closely interlinked. Anyone maintaining the contrary is simply using this fiction as an alibi to defend his own position.

I have always maintained — in my opinion, consistently — that every opportunity should be taken to support those who suffer from the violation of human rights in dictatorial countries. I have been more consistent than the large majority of this Parliament, which now suddenly realizes what must be done concerning the Olympic Games in Moscow but which, on numerous other occasions, has shown a complete lack of interest.

In view of Dr Sakharov's exile and the measures taken against those who act according to their consciences and not according to the dictates of the State, I must say that I have considerable doubts as to the purpose of taking part in the Moscow Olympic Games, since the object to which I have always aspired can no longer be attained. However, I wish to reserve my final judgement for as long as possible, thus allowing for a response to any change of heart by the Soviet Union. I am not very optimistic in this respect, but wish to allow for the possibility.

As things now stand, I shall vote against all resolutions and their amendments concerning the Olympic Games.

President. — I call Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul.

Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul. — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I shall vote against the motion tabled by Mr Blumenfeld and others calling for a boycott of the Olympic Games. But I also do not wish to support the position expressed here by Mr Martin. I believe that in both cases double standards are being applied, with which I do not wish to be associated. In my opinion, the only person who so far has produced credible moral arguments on the subject of a boycott of the Olympic Games, is Mrs Bonino. I am quite prepared to believe that she is sincere on this issue, but if one demands a boycott of the games, as proposed by the Christian Democrats and Conservatives, while having remained silent on other occasions, then I find that it is impossible to adopt a convincing moral position and it is apparent that human rights are simply being used as a tactical device in the political arena. I believe that this detracts from their importance and moral necessity. Before all these events took place, I personally supported a Dutch committee which had advocated taking part in the Olympic Games and then making representations on behalf of dissidents on the spot in Moscow.

(Laughter)

I supported this proposal and was also in favour of not boycotting the World Cup but of attending and protesting against dictatorial régimes which trample on human rights and torture their opponents. Where were you, the right-wing Members of this Parliament, when the question of a boycott or a protest in Argentina, where a right-wing régime is in power, arose? Where were you, I should like to know?

(Sporadic applause from the left)

Anyone who adopts such a partisan attitude deprives his arguments in favour of human rights of all validity. In the case of some Conservatives and Christian Democrats — and I stress, some — they are simply concerned to exploit the present situation to prevent a

Wieczorek-Zeul

dialogue between East and West. God knows, I am no supporter of the ideal of these Olympic Games, because it has been sufficiently degraded, but I am of the opinion that opportunities for contact and discussions should not be rejected out of hand, because contact between Eastern and Western Europe is absolutely essential for us Western Europeans.

We shall be the ones to suffer if the cold-war climate intensifies. As Western Europeans, we must adopt an independent attitude and not allow ourselves to be guided by the domestic political affairs of others. It is these issues of principle relating to human rights and the need to keep the options for *détente* open which will lead me to vote against the proposal from the Christian Democrats and Conservatives. At the same time, I do not wish to be associated with the position formulated by a French Communist. His position is, of course, equally unacceptable. Because what position have the French Communists adopted in relation to Afghanistan? In their assessment of Afghanistan, they have taken over wholesale the official ideology of the Soviet Union, and that is a position which I expressly reject and condemn.

President. — I call Mr Herman on a point of order.

Mr Herman. — (F) Mr President, the majority of speakers are clearly abusing the provisions of Rule 26 (3) of the Rules of Procedure. The entire debate is being repeated.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

The explanations of vote allow at least a hundred people three minutes each, and we have just seen that this period of time may be extended, so that the entire function of the explanation of vote is perverted and our proceedings completely disrupted.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

Mr President, as the person responsible for the orderly conduct of business, I would ask that you no longer accept explanations of vote which exceed the limits allowed by the Rules of Procedure.

President. — Mr Herman, I always value your advice. Nevertheless, I think I have adhered strictly to the Rules. One may, of course, regret the fact that the Rules allow an unlimited number of explanations of vote, but they do impose a time-limit of three minutes, which none of the speakers so far has exceeded. As for imposing a censorship on the content of speeches, I have no intention of doing so.

(Sporadic applause)

I call Miss Flesch.

Miss Flesch. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as a Member of this Parliament who has taken part in three Olympic Games as an athlete and two Olympic Games as an official and who now is active in politics, I should like to explain why I shall be voting in favour of the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Blumenfeld and others: Mr President, from this day forth the spirit of the Olympic Games is dead.

(Loud applause from the centre and right)

President. — I call Mr Gabert.

Mr Gabert. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I regret very much that the gratifying unanimity which prevailed in the discussion of the scandalous treatment meted out to Mr Sakharov by the Soviet Government, which is important for this Parliament, has given way to a discussion of this kind. I was one of the signatories to the Sakharov motion because, as one of those persecuted by the National Socialists, I would never hesitate to protest against violations of human rights anywhere, regardless of the type of régime involved. I shall, therefore, do so passionately at every opportunity.

As far as the Olympic Games are concerned, I should like to say that it is extremely difficult for a parliament to take a decision on this matter. I have followed all the arguments very closely. I shall abstain from voting on the Blumenfeld motion. I believe that in this case we should leave the decision in the first instance to the sportsmen themselves and in particular the International Olympic Committee. I feel that this issue goes beyond Parliament's competence, and we have heard opinions enough. I shall, as I said, abstain from voting on this issue.

President. — I call Mr Puletti.

Mr Puletti. — (I) Mr President, for the very same reasons that Sakharov, from his exile in Gorky, requested the free peoples of the West not to participate in the Games, I shall vote in favour of the Blumenfeld resolution against participation in the Olympic Games. Sport and politics are inseparable and those who claim that sport is independent forget that at a serious time like this, measures such as those normally adopted by the Soviet Union against its dissidents cannot be ignored.

I should also like to explain why I interrupted my friend and colleague, Mr Rogers. He referred to Italy as a country which exercises repression and mentioned the Adams case. As the chairman of my group will confirm, we received Adams just a month ago; he is free, has never been in prison in Italy and has received regular assistance from the movement to which I

Puletti

belong. Anyone who describes Italy as repressive is only spurring on the terrorist forces we have to fight.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* Mr President, I do not know if my friend and colleague Mr Puletti was very active at the time to achieve a boycott of the sporting events organized in Latin America. We were, and have not changed our position today.

(Loud cries from certain quarters)

Mr President, we have always opposed any ostensibly sporting event in any totalitarian situation or where human rights are not respected. At 50, I am old enough to be able to say that, as a radical, it is the approach which I have had the opportunity to follow since the time when, as some of you here have witnessed, I was Italian student president in 1953 until the present day.

No alibi for an ideal which has been pronounced dead and which has never been what it was supposed to be! The realities of race, class and money have always been in the background of this so-called Olympic ideal. Does Olympia have the same meaning for someone who lives in sub-proletarian poverty in Africa, Asia or Bangladesh as for someone who lives in Moscow, Rome or elsewhere? You will discover the old contradictions!

It is even said that science is not entirely neutral with regard to politics and class. How can you expect the organization of sport to be so? The Italian radicals and pacifists believe that freedom is like life itself. Either one respects it in every case or one is never credible when one claims to be respecting it after the event. Mr President, a parliament and politicians who seem indifferent to a holocaust which consumes 40 million people a year are not credible when they proclaim to terrorist murderers that life is sacred. If the life of Italian politicians is sacred, then also the lives of the 18 million children who are murdered by depriving them of bread is sacred. Freedom is like life, Mr President: I believe that those who fought against imperialism and against the actions of the United States in Vietnam were qualified to take part in this march.

President. — I call Mr Kirk.

Mr Kirk. — *(DK)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I wish to say that I intend to vote for the motion for a resolution for the following reasons: the Soviet Union has shown — and we have known it for many years — that it does not respect human rights. It has shown this, for example, by banishing Sakharov to

Gorky. However, the Soviet Union also demonstrated over Christmas that it does not respect the rights of nations either. I feel that this is just as serious as the failure to respect the rights of individual human beings. Their lack of respect for the rights of nations means that we are confronted with a threat to the Western world.

I am convinced that the Soviet Union will not refrain from mixing politics and sport if the Olympic Games are held in Moscow. Precisely in view of the prospect that politics will be mixed with sport, I feel that the Western world must show that it refuses to participate and thereby be a party to the Soviet Union's continuing violation of the rights of individuals and of the sovereignty of individual countries.

(Applause from various quarters in the European Democratic Group)

President. — I call Mr Pelikan.

Mr Pelikan. — *(I)* Mr President, I did not intend to speak, but I must explain my vote in favour of a boycott of the Olympic Games, since other colleagues — including some from my own group — have expressed different views, which I respect.

I want to appeal to all of you European Members not to think of the leaders or groups of leaders of these countries when you are taking decisions like this. You should think of the peoples, because they too are European, and it is not true that they always identify with their leaders. I was personally in favour of going to the Olympic Games in order to raise the human rights issue there. However, after the expulsion of Sakharov and the arrest of hundreds of other dissidents who are fighting for application of the Helsinki Agreements, I feel there is very little scope for dialogue in Moscow, particularly since a large number of countries have announced that they will not take part and since participation with which is regarded by the Soviet leaders as support for their policy, has become a political referendum.

I therefore ask you to imagine the feelings of Yuri Orlov, who was condemned to seven years in prison simply because he asked for respect of the Helsinki Agreements and who received two further sentences after he had been imprisoned, when he sees on television — if they force him to look at it — the flags of so many people on parade. The same applies to hundreds and thousands of political prisoners in the Soviet Union. Even Sakharov will be forced to watch these Olympic Games from his forced exile in the closed city of Gorky. I should like to repeat what Mr Haferkamp very courageously said: if there is such a thing as hope, let us hope that a price will be paid for every act of aggression and every violation of human rights.

Pelikan

To those who say that the boycott poses a threat to *détente*, I must reply that it definitely does not, because I am in favour of *détente* and the Olympic Games are not the only instrument of international policy: there are many fields in which we can continue the dialogue. What I am saying is that the price of *détente* should not be silence on injustices and acts of aggression.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Macciocchi.

Mrs Macciocchi. — (I) Mr President, I am in favour of this resolution, that is, I am against holding the Olympic Games in Moscow.

In addition to this briefstatement, I should like to point out that some of us in this Parliament had the courage to adopt a similar position at the sitting of 11-12 January and did not allow ourselves to be influenced by political groups or factions. I think we are now living at a time when the individual and therefore — here — the European deputy, is able to react to dramatic events, violence and bloodshed in accordance with his own morals and ethics rather than those of right or left-wing groups, which, as we have seen from the speakers of this Parliament's Socialist Group and parties of the left, can no longer be regarded in the old orthodox way. Voices have been raised in disagreement, voices of deputies who had difficulty in adopting a certain line; voices of deputies — such as Mr Pelikan — who have reminded us that today's decision concerns the feelings of the Soviet people before the array of flags of all nations which will be seen on Soviet television by all those who are suffering in concentration camps and who, like Sakharov, are condemned to exile and imprisonment.

Détente will be threatened by those who, by adopting an attitude of impotence and ideological and moral weakness, in a passive, cowardly way accept the acts of aggression perpetrated by the Soviet Union against Afghanistan and Sakharov; it is pure hypocrisy for Europe's left to talk of human rights if it adopts such an attitude. And if the only course open to us — empty-handed as we are — is condemnation, at least let it be realized that all those who say 'No' to the Olympic Games in Moscow will be supporting peace and *détente* by saying to the Soviet Union that we are committed people determined to fight for freedom and human rights in a genuine rather than a hypocritical way.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

President. — We now proceed to the vote.

I put to the vote the *Ripa di Meana* et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-778/79/rev.II): *Arrest of the scientist Andrei Sakharov.*

The resolution is adopted.¹

I put to the vote the *Hord* et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-773/79): *Invasion of Afghanistan by Russia and the outrageous treatment of Professor Sakharov.*

The resolution is adopted.¹

We proceed to the *Blumenfeld* et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-779/79/rev.): *Moscow Olympic Games.*

I have Amendment No 1, by Mr Martin, replacing the whole of the motion for a resolution with the following new text:

- considering the Olympic Games as a major demonstration of peace and friendship between the nations, young people and athletes of the whole world.
- considering the fact that, except during the two World Wars, their organization has never been called into question.
- considering the International Olympic Committee's sovereign decision to confirm the City of Moscow as the venue of the 1980 Games.
 1. Considers that no argument should be allowed to jeopardize the holding of the Moscow Olympic Games;
 2. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and Commission and to the authorities of the Member States.

I put Amendment No 1 to the vote.

Amendment No 1 is rejected.

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

I call Mr Seal on a point of order.

Mr Seal. — Mr President, my point of order relates to the system used in this House for notifying Members that a vote is about to take place. Would it not be possible to ring the bells early enough to enable Members outside the Chamber to return to their seats in time to vote? It seems pointless ringing the bells during or after the vote.

8. Agenda

President. — I call Mr Chambeiron on a point of order.

¹ OTC. . .