

against *Apartheid* itself and available statistics showed that many countries, all over the world, carried on trade with South Africa to a far greater degree. The fact that Israel was singled out for condemnation was a sufficient indication of the way in which facts were distorted for the sole purpose of giving the Arab delegations a chance to score, as it were, another point against Israel and to cover up their own activities.

27. In the course of his statement in the exercise of the right of reply (964th meeting), he had read from an article in *The Observer* which mentioned a number of Arab countries that maintained trade and other relations with South Africa. Some of the Arab delegations had then sought to dilute the effect of that article by exercising their right of reply. One such delegation had denied that its country was selling oil to South Africa or maintaining relations with the Pretoria régime, thus refuting allegations which neither he himself nor the article in question had ever made. Another representative of an Arab country had stated that there was no discrimination in his country. That was a completely meaningless statement. The representative

in question might just as well have said that his country did not discriminate against polar bears, because there was simply no racial minority in existence in that country, just as there were no polar bears. Yet a third Arab representative, while denying the report in *The Observer*, had in fact conceded that there was trade between "some persons" in his country and South Africa and that his country was actually laying in some reserves of gold, without caring where the gold came from.

28. Yet, of course, no mention was made in the draft resolution, in any shape or form, of a single Arab country although a separate paragraph was devoted to condemning Israel. He wished to draw the attention of the Committee to that blatant display of hypocrisy and he reserved his delegation's right to speak again in explanation of its vote.

29. The CHAIRMAN said that draft resolution A/SPC/L.331 would not be put to the vote until the following day.

The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.

972nd meeting

Tuesday, 4 November 1975, at 3.10 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Roberto MARTINEZ ORDOÑEZ (Honduras).

A/SPC/SR.972

AGENDA ITEM 53

Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa (continued) (A/10050-S/11638, A/10052-S/11641, A/10103-S/11708, A/SPC/174, A/SPC/L.331, A/SPC/L.332):

- (a) Report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* (A/10022);
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General (A/10281)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (continued) (A/SPC/L.331, A/SPC/L.332)

1. Mr. RUPIA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that his delegation had the honour of introducing draft resolution A/SPC/L.332, entitled "Programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*", and he wished to announce that India, Mali, Senegal, the Sudan, the Upper Volta and Zambia had joined its sponsors. The draft resolution commended the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and the Unit on *Apartheid* for their efforts in the past and outlined their work programme for the coming year. It also set forth the specific action to be undertaken by the international community and the role of intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations in promoting the international campaign against *apartheid*. In conclusion, his delegation wished to remind the Committee that the effectiveness of the Special Committee depended on the support of the international community as a whole.

2. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.331.

At the request of the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic, the vote was taken by roll-call.

Laos, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Laos, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bahrain, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait.

Against: Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United

States of America, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan.

Abstaining: Lesotho, New Zealand, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Australia, Barbados, Colombia, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Iran.

The draft resolution was adopted by 83 votes to 15, with 13 abstentions.

3. Mr. SCARANTINO (Italy), speaking on behalf of the European Economic Community (EEC) and its nine member States, said that he would like to reaffirm their attitude towards the policy of *apartheid*. As had been said on other occasions, those countries' traditions of democracy, freedom and equality led them to condemn unreservedly the legal system and policies of South Africa. Their attitude could not be modified by the superficial changes introduced in the policy of *apartheid*, whose principles remained unchanged.

4. However, the members of EEC had been compelled regretfully to vote against the draft resolution because of the serious and varied objections to which it gave rise. Those objections were mainly concerned with the fact that the basic principle of the universality of the Organization was being questioned; he felt that it would not be helpful to deal with the objections in detail since they stemmed from points of view which the delegation of EEC had stated on a number of occasions in the course of the Committee's work.

5. Since the Committee was dealing with a doctrine as universally condemned as *apartheid*, the countries of EEC felt that a larger number of delegations could have been associated in the preparation of the draft and were deeply convinced that the condemnation of the international community would have more effect on South Africa if it had been unanimous.

6. Mr. KAMOSHIDA (Japan) said that his delegation was firmly opposed to the policy of *apartheid* pursued by the Government of South Africa but had been compelled with regret to vote against the draft resolution. It had done so because it had difficulty with a number of the paragraphs which contained specific references to certain States and because it felt that references such as the one to his own country in operative paragraph 3 did not contribute positively to the common action against *apartheid*. If the draft resolution had been formulated differently, his delegation would have been happy to vote for it.

7. Mr. BRIGHTY (United Kingdom) said that the representative of Italy, speaking in his capacity as President in office of EEC and on behalf of the nine member States, had already made an explanatory statement with which his delegation whole-heartedly associated itself. That statement had made clear the total opposition of all nine States to the abhorrent policy of *apartheid* while at the same time noting that the draft resolution just adopted was unacceptable for a variety of reasons. His delegation would like to make it clear that it did not accept those parts of the text which asserted that a situation existed in South Africa which would justify the application of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

8. Mr. DE LATAILLADE (France) said that, in addition to objecting to the attack on the principle of universality in the United Nations to which it remained deeply attached, his delegation could not accept the reference to Chapter VII of the Charter in operative paragraph 16 of the draft resolution.

9. Mr. BJARNASON (Iceland) said that the position of his delegation in the past had clearly demonstrated his Government's opposition to the policy and practice of *apartheid* in South Africa. It was therefore regrettable that his delegation had been unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution because of what it considered to be its inappropriate and objectionable wording. Indeed, if a separate vote had been taken on operative paragraphs 4, 5 and 6, his delegation would have had to vote against them. However, it had chosen to abstain in the vote in order to indicate its sympathy with the basic thrust of the draft resolution.

10. Mr. HECKSCHER (Sweden) said that it had been with great regret that his delegation had found itself unable to support the draft resolution. The attitude of the Swedish Government and people towards the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa was well known. They abhorred it and had made that attitude abundantly clear time and again.

11. However, his delegation had unfortunately found a number of important points in the draft resolution which it had been unable to accept. It had been unable to support the manner in which the draft resolution had singled out specific countries for condemnation, since it felt that only concerted action in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter, which Sweden was prepared to support, would have any chance of proving effective. Furthermore, it did not believe that the United Nations should, even by implication, legitimize the use of violence. Finally, his delegation had always insisted on the principle of universality in the United Nations, in the sense that all Governments exercising control over their territory should be represented in it even when their policies gave rise to strong disapproval, as in the case of South Africa. At the twenty-ninth session, the draft resolution on the situation in South Africa adopted by the Committee and subsequently adopted by the General Assembly as resolution 3324 E (XXIX) had called, *inter alia*, for the total exclusion of the South African delegation from participation in the work of the United Nations, and his delegation had been compelled to vote against it. Draft resolution A/SPC/L.331 made no mention of any such total exclusion, but the wording of the text was ambiguous in that regard and, in the circumstances, his delegation had abstained in the vote. It went without saying that his delegation concurred in the strong condemnation expressed in the draft resolution of the racist régime in South Africa.

12. Mr. PIETINEN (Finland) said that his delegation's position on the question of the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa was well known. The people and Government of Finland rejected racial discrimination in any form, since that practice affronted their sense of justice and was completely incompatible with their concept of human rights based on the equality of the individual. They were strongly opposed to the cruel system of *apartheid* and the policies practised by the South African Government in

defiance of United Nations resolutions, in violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in contravention of South Africa's obligations under the Charter. They believed that the elimination of the system of *apartheid* must be one of the main objectives of the United Nations and were ready to participate in any measures to achieve that aim by peaceful means.

13. His delegation appreciated the significance of draft resolution A/SPC/L.331 and thought it most regrettable that it had been unable to vote in favour of it. Some of the paragraphs were not in line with its views on the principles embodied in the Charter, and if a separate vote had been taken on operative paragraphs 5 and 6, his delegation would have voted against them. It would also have abstained in the vote on a number of other preambular and operative paragraphs. On the other hand, it had not cast a negative vote on the text as a whole because it shared with an overwhelming majority of delegations the view that the main objective of United Nations policy on racial discrimination should be the total elimination of the policy of *apartheid* pursued by the Government of South Africa.

14. Mr. PETHERBRIDGE (Australia) said that his delegation was disappointed that it had not been able to support the draft resolution which had just been adopted, since it had wished to express once again in a major resolution its condemnation of *apartheid* and of South Africa's defiance of United Nations resolutions on South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia.

15. Australia's objective was to ensure that pressure was maintained against the South African Government in order to induce it to change its policies. In the view of his delegation, the most appropriate forms of pressure were those provided under the Charter, which had often in the past brought about changes of a dramatic nature.

16. His delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because a number of its provisions ran counter to Australia's objectives. In particular, his delegation could not agree with the provisions of the draft resolution which prohibited all collaboration with the régime, condoned the use of force and singled out specific countries instead of dealing with South Africa's external policies as a whole. Finally, the affirmation contained in operative paragraph 6 was unacceptable to his delegation.

17. Mr. FREEMAN-GREENE (New Zealand) said that his Government had made its opposition to the intolerable policies of *apartheid* quite clear and had informed the Committee of specific steps it was taking in order to persuade the Government of South Africa to abandon those policies. His delegation therefore regretted that it had not been able to support the draft resolution which had just been adopted because it contained a number of features which did not, in the view of his delegation, advance the efforts of the international community to eradicate *apartheid*.

18. The eighth preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 6 were among the provisions with which his delegation could not agree, and, had separate votes been taken on those paragraphs, his delegation would have voted against them.

19. Mr. WHISTLER (United States of America) said that his Government abhorred the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa and consistently opposed them. However, his delegation had well-known reservations about characterizing the situation in South Africa as a threat to international peace and security and about the call for sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter. Moreover, it disagreed with the condemnation, contained in the draft resolution of those States which maintained normal contacts with South Africa, for it continued to believe that such contacts were essential to a positive evolution of the situation in South Africa.

20. Mr. SAGHIYYAH (Lebanon) said that in accordance with his Government's traditional policy on *apartheid*, his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.331. Had a separate vote been taken on operative paragraph 3, however, his delegation would have abstained.

21. Miss TABATABAI (Iran) said that her Government condemned all forms of racism and racial discrimination and accordingly maintained that the system of *apartheid* must be abolished. Her delegation had abstained in the vote, however, because the draft resolution contained a number of points which did not further the aims of the international community in its struggle against *apartheid*. Had a separate vote been taken on the various paragraphs of the draft resolution, her delegation would have voted against several of them. It had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole, however, in order to indicate its sympathy with the over-all thrust of the text.

22. Mr. TELLMANN (Norway) said that his Government was and always had been strongly opposed to *apartheid* in all its manifestations and that its attitude had been demonstrated time and again by its consistent support of all constructive efforts by the United Nations to bring about a peaceful change in South Africa towards a multiracial society based on equal rights for all, irrespective of race, creed or colour.

23. The draft resolution, and more particularly the fourth and eighth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs 4 and 6, contained certain elements which his Government could not support. In its view, the draft resolution might give rise to doubts concerning South Africa's right to participate in the work of the United Nations. Norway had on many occasions and in various forums made its position quite clear on the question of the expulsion or suspension of a Member State from the United Nations. It had always upheld the principle of universality of the membership of the United Nations and would continue to do so. For that reason, his delegation had been compelled to vote against the draft resolution.

24. Mr. DUCLOS (Canada) recalled that his delegation had been a sponsor of the draft resolution on solidarity with the South African Political Prisoners (A/SPC/L.325) and had voted in favour of all the other draft resolutions under agenda item 53 already adopted by the Committee. It had done so in order to demonstrate its opposition to *apartheid* and its desire to promote an early and peaceful change in the situation in South Africa, even though it had found it necessary to place on record its interpretation of the specific language used in a number of those draft reso-

lutions. In the case of draft resolution A/SPC/L.331, his delegation disagreed with, or had reservations concerning, five preambular and nine operative paragraphs. Both in tone and in content, the draft resolution was contrary to the approach adopted by the Canadian Government, and his delegation had therefore been compelled to vote against it. He drew the attention of the Committee to the full account of the Government's policy on *apartheid* contained in the earlier statement by his delegation during the general debate on agenda item 53 (963rd meeting).

25. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic had requested him to announce that the Syrian delegation would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.331 had it been present at the time of the vote.

26. Mr. BUX (Bangladesh) said that his delegation, too, would have voted for the draft resolution had it been present.

27. The CHAIRMAN invited the representative of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) to address the Committee.

28. Mr. SIBEKO (Observer, Pan Africanist Congress of Azania), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, expressed the gratitude of PAC and the people of Azania to those countries which had voted in favour of the very crucial draft resolution on the situation in South Africa which had just been adopted. He regretted that a number of countries which had until now been closely identified with the struggle against *apartheid* had not voted in favour of the draft resolution. He regarded as fallacious the arguments which they advanced to justify their position. To those who invoked the principle of universality, he pointed out that

universality would best be served by putting an end to the illegal rule of the white minority in South Africa. The argument that contacts should be maintained with South Africa in order to promote peaceful change was hopelessly idealistic. The enactment, year after year, of ever more repressive legislation by the South African Fascist régime led to the conclusion that contacts merely served to embolden the régime. That conclusion was also borne out by the statements of the South African Prime Minister to the effect that South Africa was far too important to the Western countries for them ever to support any punitive action against it.

29. As to the argument that the situation in South Africa did not constitute a threat to international peace and security, he pointed out that South African troops were at present deployed in Zimbabwe and were occupying parts of Angola under the pretext that South Africa had the right to pursue African freedom fighters across the border into neighbouring countries. Should the Government of Angola, after independence was attained, attempt to expel the South African troops from its territory, war would inevitably ensue. The battle lines were drawn in southern Africa, and support had been pledged to the African liberation movements from many quarters. He therefore appealed to those delegations which had not voted in favour of the draft resolution to reconsider their positions and to recognize that the time had come to take exceptionally firm action against the South African régime.

30. The CHAIRMAN announced that the delegations of Cuba, Mauritania, Morocco and Oman had become sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.332.

The meeting rose at 4.20 p.m.

973rd meeting

Thursday, 6 November 1975, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Roberto MARTINEZ ORDOÑEZ (Honduras).

A/SPC/SR.973

AGENDA ITEM 53

Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa (concluded) (A/10050-S/11638, A/10052-S/11641, A/10103-S/11708, A/SPC/174, A/SPC/L.332, A/SPC/L.333):

- (a) Report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* (A/10022);
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General (A/10281)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (concluded) (A/SPC/L.332, A/SPC/L.333)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that the delegations of Egypt, Iraq, Mauritius, Qatar and Tunisia had become sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.332; he drew the

attention of the Committee to the note by the Secretary-General (A/SPC/L.333), which set out the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution.

2. Mr. VALDERRAMA (Philippines) expressed the gratitude of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* to the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania for his kind words in introducing the draft resolution on its programme of work at the preceding meeting of the Committee. He also thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution and the many delegations which had commended the work of the Special Committee. He then read out the text of a telegram addressed to the Secretary-General by Mr. Oliver Tambo, Acting President-General of the African National Congress of South Africa, which stated that the victims and genuine opponents of South Africa's inhuman