

# 969th meeting

Thursday, 30 October 1975, at 3.20 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Roberto MARTINEZ ORDOÑEZ (Honduras).

A/SPC/SR.969

## 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.327-329):

- (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.327-329)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that the meeting would be suspended so that members could enter their names in the list of speakers to explain their votes before or after the vote on the draft resolutions before the Committee.

*The meeting was suspended at 3.25 p.m. and resumed at 3.30 p.m.*

2. The CHAIRMAN announced that Ethiopia had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.327 and that Ethiopia, Jamaica, Liberia, Turkey and Yemen had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.328.

3. Mr. ZERAIA (Algeria), speaking on behalf of the non-aligned countries, appealed to the delegations of Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands to withdraw the amendments (A/SPC/L.329) which they had submitted to draft resolution A/SPC/L.327.

4. The CHAIRMAN, after reading out rule 128 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, invited the Committee to vote on the amendments.

*The amendments contained in document A/SPC/L.329 were rejected by 69 votes to 25, with 11 abstentions.*

5. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.327.

*At the request of the representative of the German Democratic Republic, a recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Ice-

land, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* None.

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

*The draft resolution was adopted by 100 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.*

6. Mr. VROON (Netherlands), speaking on behalf of Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands in explanation of their votes after the vote, said that those delegations deeply regretted having had to abstain on the draft resolution because the Committee had not adopted their proposed amendments. Their Governments rejected the policy of *apartheid* because it constituted a grave and systematic violation of human rights, and they opposed the establishment of "bantustans" which indeed represented a consolidation of that inhuman policy.

7. On the other hand, the three delegations had always opposed the general tendency to equate the position of the black people in South Africa with that of a population living under colonial rule. Of course, colonial history had left its traces in South Africa as in many other countries which were now independent, but it was the task of the United Nations to shape contemporary history to the goals defined by the Charter. That was why the Governments of Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands could not agree that the white population of South Africa, which for the most part had been rooted in South African soil for as long as the black population, should be equated with foreign overlords. That would be a distortion of history and would lead to discrimination against the white natives, many of whom were also bitterly opposed to *apartheid* and were suffering for their convictions. To deny that South African society was a multiracial one could lead the United Nations to actions incompatible with its own standards and ominous for the future of the South African people as a whole.

\* Resumed from the 964th meeting.

8. The three delegations' reservations on the wording of the draft resolution applied in the first place to the third preambular paragraph, because they considered South African society to be a multiracial one in which all races should have the right to live peacefully together on the basis of equality. In their view, the reference to the Charter in operative paragraph 2 was legally unfounded and paragraph 3 should not be interpreted as excluding every type of contact with "bantustan" authorities or institutions, since the barring of such contacts would not contribute to the eradication of *apartheid*. The Governments of Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands rejected the inhuman policy of *apartheid* and the "bantustan" idea but also rejected violence as a means of overcoming that policy.

9. Mr. PIETINEN (Finland), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden, said that those countries were firmly opposed to the system and the methods used by the South African régime to impose its inhuman policy, including the establishment of "bantustans", and had therefore voted for the draft resolution. However, they had reservations regarding the phrase "by all means possible" in the third preambular paragraph, since it could be interpreted as meaning that the use of force was legitimate.

10. Mr. BRIGHTY (United Kingdom) explained that his delegation had had to abstain in the vote despite its agreement with much of the draft resolution because it had a number of problems with the text. First, with regard to the third preambular paragraph, his Government considered that the references to the struggle "by all means possible" should not be regarded as endorsing recourse to armed struggle or violence. The same paragraph also referred to "self-determination", an expression which was suitable for a colonial situation but did not apply in the case of South Africa, which was a sovereign State whose Government the United Kingdom recognized.

11. The difficulties over operative paragraph 2 were basically of a legal nature. His Government's view was that there was nothing in the Charter which required any sovereign State to maintain its territorial integrity or which precluded it from voluntarily giving autonomy to part of its territory. With regard to paragraph 3, the "homelands" and "bantustans" formed an integral part of the Republic of South Africa and his Government was not convinced that it would serve the interests of those living in them to refuse to have any dealings with them.

12. Mr. PETHERBRIDGE (Australia) said that, by voting in favour of the draft resolution, his delegation had confirmed its strong opposition to *apartheid* and the system of "bantustans", but it had certain reservations regarding the third preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights said that "it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law". The United Nations should strive with all its might to avoid recourse to that "last resort"; consequently, it should avoid the use of such expressions as "by all means possible". Moreover, although Australia did not recognize the "bantustan" system, it wondered whether it was desirable to cut off all contact with the broad spectrum of the African

people and leaders of all races and political persuasions and hoped that was not the aim of the draft resolution.

13. Mr. WOLF (Austria) said that he had voted for the draft resolution because Austria fully associated itself with the struggle of the people of South Africa and strongly believed that those people must be given the possibility of exercising all their rights as a matter of urgency. However, his delegation considered that the expression "by all means possible" in the third preambular paragraph referred to all the peaceful means set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, because it could in no way advocate the use of force.

14. Mr. ESCOBAR (Colombia) said that his delegation repudiated and condemned not only the treatment of political prisoners but also and especially the inhuman policy of *apartheid*. It had voted for the amendments (A/SPC/L.329) to the draft resolution because it felt that it would be better not to include the words "by all means possible" in the preamble. Although it had voted for the draft resolution, his delegation did not wish its vote to be interpreted as accepting terrorism and violence as a method which could be adopted, since it considered them just as repugnant as the *apartheid* system itself.

15. Miss MORALES (Costa Rica) said that her delegation had voted for the draft resolution, as it had done for all the resolutions aimed at the elimination of *apartheid*. She reiterated her support for the liberation movements but had reservations with regard to the phrase "by all means possible" in the third preambular paragraph, because its scope was so wide that it could be interpreted as giving support to acts of violence and terrorism of every kind. Costa Rica's peace-loving policy precluded it from encouraging such acts.

16. Mr. MATSUMOTO (Japan) said that his delegation, which was firmly opposed to the policies of *apartheid*, had voted for the draft resolution in spite of the difficulties it had with the wording of the third preambular paragraph and of operative paragraph 3. As his delegation understood it, the phrase "by all means possible" did not imply the use of force and a solution must be found by peaceful means. Japan understood paragraph 3 as appealing to States not to take action which might lead to the recognition of the South African Government's "bantustan" policy but as not prohibiting contacts and talks with the leaders of "bantustans" with the aim of solving the problem of *apartheid*.

17. Mr. DUCLOS (Canada) said that he had voted for the draft resolution because he was opposed to the policies of "separate development". Nevertheless, he thought that the language of paragraph 3 was somewhat too rigid. There were millions of South Africans bound up, without their consent, in the "bantustan" system. Countries both in Africa and elsewhere would inevitably have to have certain contacts with those people and their leaders. His delegation felt that such contacts might assist in undermining the very structures of *apartheid*. With regard to the third preambular paragraph, Canada could not accept the endorsement of the use of force to bring about a solution to the difficult racial problems of South Africa.

18. Mr. CRAIG (Ireland) said that he had supported the amendments contained in document A/SPC/L.329 because

he thought that they would have improved the draft resolution. His vote in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.327 reflected Ireland's categorical opposition to the policies of *apartheid* and the "bantustans". However, that did not imply that Ireland's position had changed; it maintained that in a United Nations resolution the phrase "by all means possible" referred only to such peaceful means as were compatible with the Charter.

19. Mr. WHISTLER (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had reservations about paragraph 3 in view of its policy of keeping open channels of communication to all elements of the South African population, regardless of race.

20. Mr. VON UTHMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) said his delegation regretted that it had been unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution. Although the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany did not regard the "bantustan" policy as an appropriate way to solve the *apartheid* problem, it did not agree that all contact with the "bantustan" leaders should be avoided, as called for in paragraph 3. In his Government's opinion, it was necessary to seek contact with all parties involved in a conflict. His delegation also had reservations with regard to paragraph 2, since it felt that a Government which divided its own territory could not be held to have violated the principles of the Charter.

21. His Government's position regarding the phrase "struggle . . . by all means possible" was well known. The Federal Republic of Germany had renounced the use of force as a means of safeguarding its own interests, and it could not concede to others what it denied itself.

22. It was unfortunate that the amendments submitted in document A/SPC/L.329 had not been accepted. It would be desirable next year for the African group to get in touch with the Western countries as well in order to work out a generally acceptable wording.

23. Mr. SCARANTINO (Italy) said that Italy had always opposed the "bantustan" policy, which was a deceptive action aimed at perpetuating discrimination, dividing the black population of South Africa and splitting the nation in order to consolidate the system of *apartheid*. At the twenty-sixth session, his delegation had supported General Assembly resolution 2775 E (XXVI) on the policies of *apartheid*. Nevertheless, it had had to abstain in the vote on the current draft resolution on "bantustans", not because its position had changed but because the wording had been altered. Once again, in speaking of the leadership of the national liberation movements and the right to self-determination, the language of decolonization had been used in the context of *apartheid*. His delegation also found it difficult to accept the expression "struggle . . . by all means possible", which sounded like an encouragement to the use of violence. It also had reservations about the assertion in paragraph 2 that the establishment of "bantustans" represented a violation of the principles enshrined in the Charter. If the amendments proposed by the delegations of Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands had been accepted, the text of the draft would have been improved and his delegation would have been able to vote for it.

24. Mr. MATHABA (Lesotho) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution which had just been adopted even though its language was not fully acceptable.

25. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Liberian delegation had informed him that if it had been present during the vote, it would have voted for draft resolution A/SPC/L.327.

26. Mr. RAO (India), speaking on a point of order, said that from the statements which had been made and from the measures adopted by Governments it was clear that there was total opposition to the policy of *apartheid* in sports; he therefore proposed that draft resolution A/SPC/L.328 should be adopted by acclamation.

27. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to adopt draft resolution A/SPC/L.328 by acclamation.

*The draft resolution was adopted by acclamation.*

28. Mr. LAI Ya-li (China), speaking in explanation of vote, said that the Government and people of the People's Republic of China had consistently supported the struggle of the Azanian people against the South African colonialist authorities and white racists. His delegation had therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution. However, the Olympic principle of non-discrimination was mentioned in the text, and his delegation deemed it necessary to explain its position regarding the International Olympic Committee. Although Taiwan was an inalienable part of the territory of the People's Republic of China, a handful of reactionaries on the International Olympic Committee continued to deprive the legitimate representatives of the People's Republic of their rights; they had not expelled the Chiang clique and stubbornly pursued the policy of "two Chinas". That situation was abnormal and intolerable and was doomed to failure.

29. Mr. TELLMANN (Norway) said that freedom of expression and organization were principles enshrined in the Norwegian Constitution; his Government therefore had limited power to exert influence over private organizations. Nevertheless, the text of the draft resolution which had just been adopted would be communicated to sports organizations for their information so that they might take whatever measures they deemed appropriate.

30. Mr. SERUP (Denmark) said that his Government had always been opposed to *apartheid* in sports but, for constitutional reasons, it had no way of prevailing upon sports organizations or other private organizations to refrain from contact with South African teams.

31. Mr. VROON (Netherlands) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution but that the Netherlands Government had no legal means of intervening in the affairs of sports organizations, which were private and independent entities.

32. Mr. BERG (Sweden) said that in his country sports organizations were private entities and that the influence which the authorities could exert on them was therefore very limited.

33. Mr. DE LATAILLADE (France) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution because it was

opposed to *apartheid* in sports as to all other manifestations of racial discrimination. Nevertheless, although his Government did not encourage matches between French and South African teams, it had very limited power to forbid such matches.

34. Mr. BUTLER (Bahamas) said that if his delegation had been present it would have voted in favour of draft resolutions A/SPC/L.327 and A/SPC/L.328.

*The meeting rose at 4.25 p.m.*

## 970th meeting

Friday, 31 October 1975, at 3.20 p.m.

*Chairman:* Mr. Roberto MARTINEZ ORDOÑEZ (Honduras).

A/SPC/SR.970

### AGENDA ITEM 50

#### Effects of atomic radiation: report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation (A/10267, A/SPC/L.330)

1. Mr. PETHERBRIDGE (Australia) introduced the draft resolution contained in document A/SPC/L.330.

2. The report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation for the current year (A/10267) was very brief, being essentially a progress report pending submission of the next comprehensive report to the General Assembly at its thirty-second session. Consequently, draft resolution A/SPC/L.330 was in general terms and followed the lines of previous resolutions on the question. Although it was not explicitly mentioned in the draft resolution, his delegation would like to see increased co-operation between the Scientific Committee and UNEP, and it had referred to that at the 1675th meeting of the Second Committee on 22 October 1975.

3. His delegation attached great importance to the work of the Scientific Committee, which had made and would continue to make important contributions to the welfare of mankind. It therefore hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

4. Mr. FREEMAN-GREENE (New Zealand) said that his delegation's sponsorship of draft resolution A/SPC/L.330 demonstrated the importance his Government attached to the work of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation. His delegation noted that the Scientific Committee had made decisions regarding the treatment of a number of subjects, including the genetic and somatic effects of atomic radiation, and it looked forward to receiving the next comprehensive report. For its part, New Zealand would continue to forward data from its monitoring system to the Scientific Committee.

5. His delegation would like to see greater co-operation between UNEP and the Scientific Committee, and regretted that nowhere in the report of the Governing Council of UNEP,<sup>1</sup> or in the introductory statement of its Executive

Director at the 1672nd meeting of the Second Committee on 20 October 1975 was there any indication that the Scientific Committee had been invited to contribute to the work of the Programme. He therefore hoped that it would be asked to participate in UNEP activities at an early date.

6. In previous years, his delegation had expressed concern in the Special Political Committee about the increased levels of atomic radiation from nuclear tests. It was encouraging now to learn that during 1974 the average deposition of strontium 90 on New Zealand and its Pacific neighbours had been the lowest since measurements had begun in 1960. His delegation was confident that the Scientific Committee would continue to carry out its task as effectively as it had done thus far, and hoped that the draft resolution would receive unanimous support.

### 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/L.174):

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

#### CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (continued)

7. The CHAIRMAN announced that the delegation of Turkey had requested him to inform the Committee that it had been absent from the 964th meeting for very pressing reasons but wished to place on record that it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.326.

8. Mr. SAHAD (Libyan Arab Republic) introduced a draft resolution entitled "Situation in South Africa",<sup>2</sup> sponsored by 51 countries. The statements made in the Committee reflected the deep concern of the international community over the sufferings of the oppressed people of South Africa and the threat to world peace and security arising from the policies and practices of the racist Pretoria régime. *Apartheid* was a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and was contrary to standards of human ethics and morality.

<sup>1</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirtieth Session, Supplement No. 25.

<sup>2</sup> Subsequently circulated as document A/SPC/L.331.