

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



1097th
PLENARY MEETING

Thursday, 25 January 1962,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 27: <i>The situation in Angola: report of the Sub-Committee established by General Assembly resolution 1603 (XV) (continued)</i>	1279

President: Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia).

AGENDA ITEM 27

The situation in Angola: report of the Sub-Committee established by General Assembly resolution 1603 (XV) (continued)

1. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Before calling on the first speaker on my list, I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Assembly to the statement of the financial implications of the forty-four Power draft resolution [A/L.384/Rev.1].
2. Mr. STEVENSON (United States of America): We have been often reminded during this long debate that it is now nearly a year since Angola became a centre of trouble and of tragedy in Africa, and hence an object of urgent concern both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly.
3. Important events have taken place during that period. All may be quiet now in Angola, but little has happened to avert the danger of further alarming tragedy at some future time. And nothing has happened to lessen the duty of this Assembly to further a just and a peaceful solution in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.
4. What the details of that solution ought to be is not the issue. But the broad character of the solution should be determined by the force of history and by the Charter, which is our common standard. In the view of the United States delegation, three great principles are here involved.
5. The first is the principle of self-determination. In the first meeting on this subject last winter I emphasized the belief of the United States that it was imperative for Portugal to speed up the economic and social advancement of the inhabitants of Angola toward full self-determination. That that is the duty of Portugal and that that is the right of the Angolans remains the unchanged view of my Government.
6. The second and equally vital principle is the duty of the Assembly to propose peaceful means of avoiding further conflict. This duty lies upon the Government of Portugal and upon all Member States of the United Nations.
7. These two principles, self-determination and peaceful settlement, are interconnected, and it is our responsibility to ensure that both are accomplished.

8. Finally, there is a third principle whose fulfilment depends upon the other two, and which is perhaps the highest ideal of the Charter of this Organization: the ideal of peaceful co-operation among equals for the common good. The future is full of possibilities for such peaceful and creative co-operation between Portugal and Angola. But these possibilities cannot be realized unless the present relationship gives way to one based on the full and voluntary acceptance of all those directly concerned.

9. These have long been the views of the United States Government. They rest not on trivial or accidental circumstances but on fundamental and long-range considerations; our national tradition of anti-colonialism; our friendship and alliance with Portugal; and our fidelity to the Charter of the United Nations. These are manifestly not extreme but moderate and progressive views—and we trust that will be counted in their favour. Our most earnest wish is that as Members of the United Nations we should work together to assist in the great inexorable movement toward freedom and self-determination, and also to keep that movement in the creative paths of peace—difficult though those paths often seem. Dedicated together to achieve peaceful change through the processes of the Charter, Members must not individually plunge in haste, or in despair, into the use of force and the abyss of war.

10. Our feelings that peaceful change should take place along these lines are confirmed by the report of the Sub-Committee on the Situation in Angola [A/4978], which was submitted to the Assembly since our last debate. This report amply reflects the wisdom and the diligence of the representatives of Bolivia, Dahomey, the Federation of Malaya, Finland and the Sudan.

11. We have noted with satisfaction and we applaud the repeated expressions of the thanks of the Assembly for a document which is most useful to us in our consideration of this question. The report would be still more useful and still more complete if the Sub-Committee had been enabled to visit Angola. We regret that Portugal decided not to permit this. If there are shortcomings in the report, these certainly arise in part from that hampering circumstance.

12. We were glad to note that the Portuguese Government did receive Mr. Salamanca in Lisbon in his capacity as Chairman of the Sub-Committee, and provided him with information and with an insight into the Portuguese policy in Angola, which is duly reflected in the report. We note also that the Portuguese Government is co-operating in an inquiry into labour conditions in Angola which is now being conducted in Angola by the International Labour Organisation. We believe that, moving forward from these steps, the Portuguese Government would be wise now, in the same spirit of co-operation, to accept a United Nations visit to Angola.

13. In any case, whatever the limitations of the present report, it contains much which deserves the attention

and thought of the Assembly, and it has received much thought and attention during the past ten days of debate. It notes the tragic price which has already been paid: "...the loss of thousands of lives, the flight of nearly 150,000 refugees from the territory and the creation of 'a veritable atmosphere of war'." [A/4978, para. 437.]

14. On the more positive and more hopeful side, the report notes the announced reforms initiated by the Portuguese Government in Angola. Although the Sub-Committee refrained from making any judgement as to the adequacy of these steps, it did note that "they would seem to reflect some awareness by the Government of Portugal of the need to adjust its policies to the realities of the situation and the opinion of the international community" [*ibid.*, para. 451]. And the report adds the view "that rapid measures by the Government of Portugal can still preserve the positive elements of past policies and achievements" [*ibid.*, para. 472].

15. I would conclude this discussion of the report by reading one last brief passage:

"The Sub-Committee believes that the recognition of the personality of Angola, the primacy of interests of the inhabitants of the territory, the acceptance of the principle of self-determination to Angola and the need for immediate steps to prepare Angola for self-government are not antithetical to the vital interests or the historic mission of the Portuguese people. Such steps are, on the other hand, fully consistent with the recognition of racial equality and the proclaimed philosophy of Portugal." [*Ibid.*, para. 469.]

16. With that sentiment the United States is in complete accord. It is worth remembering especially that, whatever other difficulties may exist in this case, we do not have to contend with racial superiority or racial separation. In fact, as the Sub-Committee suggests, there is great potential common ground between the contending forces in this unhappy land.

17. As an old friend and ally of Portugal, the United States is by no means deaf to the complaint of the representative of Portugal that there has been little attempt to assess the positive features of the Portuguese presence in Africa. That may be, although, as I have just noted, the report of the Sub-Committee acknowledges that such positive elements exist and should be preserved. In any case, it is not the elimination of Portuguese relationships with Angola, or with Africa, that should be the goal of the General Assembly. Rather we should strive, it seems to us, to create conditions under which the people of Angola, building on the positive elements of the past, can determine their own destiny for the future, including their future relations with the Portuguese nation.

18. It is in the light of this goal that the world will wish to evaluate the measures of reform announced by Portugal on 8 September 1961. It is noteworthy that Portugal announced this reform programme less than five months after the passage of the first United Nations resolution on the Angolan problem. That resolution [1603 (XV)], adopted on 20 April, 1961, urged Portugal, among other things, "to consider urgently the introduction of measures and reforms in Angola for the purpose of the implementation of General Assembly resolution 314 (XV)".

19. Thus, the present reforms are a forward movement in response to the Assembly's request. If they are carried out and expanded they could contribute to the future peace and freedom in Angola which we all

seek. We hope they are the first step towards self-determination for the Angolan people. We cannot now tell how effective they will prove to be, and we would urge Portugal to keep the United Nations fully and promptly informed about the significance and the meaning of these reforms as they are implemented.

20. Now let me remind the Assembly briefly of the steps which the United States has taken on its own initiative to further the purposes of the United Nations on the question of Angola.

21. First, we are convinced, from our own historical experience, that any relationship among people not based on mutual consent is fundamentally unsound and ultimately doomed to failure. Whatever may have been the justification or whatever may have been the benefits of colonialism in the past, its era is over and it must give way to the superior right of peoples to determine for themselves how they should be governed. We have, therefore, consistently urged Portugal over the past year, not only in the United Nations but also outside it, to advance its policies in Angola at a rate which would make possible a constructive and harmonious solution. We have made clear to the Portuguese Government our view that this solution must embrace full self-determination for the peoples of this territory, and have sought to persuade it to modify its policies and make adjustments to this end.

22. Second, as we informed the Assembly last December [1083rd meeting], the United States has pointed out to the Portuguese Government that the diversion to the fighting in Angola of any NATO military equipment supplied to Portugal by the United States would be inconsistent with our military defence agreement with Portugal. We sought and obtained at that time the assurance of Portugal that no such equipment would be employed there. Moreover, in accordance with the desire of this body to seek a peaceful solution in Angola, we have taken the further step of instituting measures to prevent the commercial export of arms for use by those engaged in conflict.

23. Third, the United States has told Portugal that it is ready to give sympathetic consideration to any request by Portugal for material aid in education, in vocational training and in work rehabilitation in Angola. This offer is designed to encourage progress towards self-determination. It is in harmony with one of the findings of the Sub-Committee, which emphasized "the need for a rapid and massive expansion of educational facilities in order to enhance the economic, social and political advancement of the territory" [A/4978, para. 478].

24. Finally, for those Angolans who have taken refuge in the Congo, we have given and will continue to give material aid through the United Nations. And we are prepared to support the United Nations educational programme for young Angolan refugees.

25. The Assembly now once more faces the problem of determining what its own further role in the events in Angola should be. In so doing, the Assembly and its Member States must constantly keep in mind the repercussions which will be created elsewhere in the future by what it and they do here and now.

26. The root of the problem in Angola is change—the inevitable, continuous modification of man's relationship with other men. It is such progress that is necessary to a healthy and growing world. The new status of the Angolan people which will inevitably unfold in

that territory, just as it has unfolded or is unfolding in most of the rest of Africa, is an integral part of this process of change.

27. The Charter, the instrument from which the role of the General Assembly derives, provides a way in which we may encourage the realization of such change by peaceful processes. Chapter XI establishes the principle that the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of these territories shall take place by peaceful means. It also imposes obligations on the Administering Authorities, foremost among which is the obligation of promoting to the utmost the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories, and, in this context, the development of self-government.

28. It is precisely the question of to what extent Portugal had lived up to these obligations under the Charter, with respect to the people of Angola, which has given rise to recent events in that territory. Violence of the sort that is reported to have taken place is ugly and abhorrent, and is the very thing which due application of the principle of the Charter, and especially those of Chapter XI, was designed to avoid. Had these principles in fact been applied in Angola as they have been elsewhere—in so many places and with such conspicuous success—it is highly unlikely that we would now be considering the item before us in its present context at all.

29. None can or would wish to contest the right of the people of Angola to maintain their struggles to determine their own political destiny. And it would be futile to expect their desires not to be furthered by other means if the franchise is not made progressively available. But the responsibility the rest of us have to the Angolans and to the Portuguese is to use our influence with them to assure that the processes of peace prevail over the counsels of violence. And the responsibility that we have to ourselves and to each other is to conduct our own individual policies toward the same peaceful, not violent, end. This was the commitment that we made when we signed the Charter, and it is fundamentally upon our adherence to this commitment that the efficacy of this Organization depends.

30. The United Nations stands for peaceful change. We, its individual Members, have a responsibility not to employ force in situations such as prevail in Angola. This responsibility falls upon all of us: on Portugal not to repress with force the just aspirations of the people of Angola under the pretext of its rightful and essential responsibility for the maintenance of law and order; on the rest of us, not to intervene with force to press the changes in Angola. There are not two laws of the Charter on such questions. There is only one, and it is equally binding on all of us. As for itself, the United States will continue to exert its influence toward resolving the issue of Angola within the terms of the Charter, by peaceful means. We earnestly trust that others will take the same attitude. In this process of change, but by peaceful means, lies the responsibility of the United Nations.

31. I am sure that Members of the Assembly will recognize that we are faced here with a problem which goes far beyond the particular one of Angola. For a moment I would like, with the Assembly's indulgence, to depart from the specific problem of Angola to deal with this larger aspect, this major concern of this Organization.

32. A profound dilemma confronts the United Nations in attempting at the same time to facilitate change and to keep the peace. Both of these are imperative responsibilities which the United Nations must not and cannot escape. They are, moreover, mutually dependent and complementary. Without peaceful change, tensions will build up which will eventually explode in the use of force. On the other hand, whenever force is used to effect change, the very foundations of this peace-keeping Organization, on which the security of all of us in whole or in part depends, are dangerously shaken.

33. There unhappily still exist in the world many situations which individual nations or groups of nations consider to be unjust or intolerable. Some of these are vestiges of the colonial system; others are threats to peoples, not long ago free, who no longer control their own destiny or whose freedom is in jeopardy. Still others are concerned with territorial claims of one nation against another, claims of one new nation against another, claims of one new nation against another as well as against the older Powers. In each of these cases, one party, or sometimes both parties, is likely to feel that the present situation is unjust, outrageous, humiliating, and must be changed at all costs. Men and nations always run the risk of thinking that their grievances are unique and that their impatience is justified. If the numerous instruments of peaceful change and peaceful settlement do not provide a solution acceptable to them, there is a great temptation to claim that the possibilities for peaceful settlement have been exhausted, that the situation can no longer be tolerated and that there is "no alternative" to a resort to force. But I submit that in 1962 both the risks and the responsibilities must be pondered with the greatest of care. Even in 1945, before the age of atomic weapons had really begun, men and nations concluded that the holocaust of war was too terrible to be an instrument of policy, and it was for that reason that this Organization was created, with its ways and means for tackling the grievances, the disputes and the injustices which vexed us.

34. The provisions of the Charter are quite clear. Article 2, paragraph 3, states that "All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means". This Organization, over the sixteen years of its life, has built wisely upon related Charter provisions. We have available a wide range of instruments through which peaceful change can be facilitated and peaceful settlement effected.

35. The Secretary-General and his senior staff have given excellent service in the conciliation of dangerous and destructive conflicts. We have established United Nations "presences" in various areas—symbols of the Organization, symbols which have helped dampen down explosive situations and give effect to quiet conciliation. Rapporteurs or special representatives have been appointed for the detailed negotiations necessary in complex disputes. Notable successes have been achieved in apparently intractable cases. The United Nations facilitated the independence of Indonesia in 1948 and 1949. Peace, though uneasy, has been kept in Palestine with the aid of the United Nations Emergency Force and the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization. Aggression was repelled in Korea. An observer corps helped stabilize a situation of tribulation in Lebanon. We are now engaged in a major and increasingly hopeful operation in the Congo which is providing new proof of our peace-keeping capability.

36. Such United Nations machinery for stability, for peace and for change should be used to the maximum, and we may want during the coming months to see whether it can be strengthened and made more quickly responsive to the needs of this dangerous interval in human history when an old order is dying and a new one is struggling to be born.

37. But we shall make little progress, either in improving our machinery or in making effective use of that which we already have, unless we bring to this all-important task a new will, a new determination, to build the work of peaceful settlement and of peaceful change, through this Organization, into the very fabric of our mutual relationships.

38. In a world living under a nuclear sword, even our small quarrels can snowball into general catastrophe. We are dealing with a major question of political will, the will to effect peaceful and orderly change, the will to take action which will strengthen the capacity of this Organization to cope with the heavy responsibilities placed upon it.

39. If anyone in our world feels that his case is special or so unique that international procedures can be ignored and obstacles crushed by military force, let him consider the risks. Can exceptions be made from standards of conduct we have all accepted without risking that they will be followed in other cases? Can anyone believe that the use of force can be prohibited in certain types of national disputes if it is allowed in others? In our inter-dependent world what is done in one place, however remote, reverberates around the globe, and the implications grow as they travel. No longer is it possible to rely on conflicts being localized. If one of us takes the law in his own hands he may force the hand of others who also feel that they have special cause.

40. How can a Government justify to its people not using force to settle its grievances if its neighbours are doing so? Such anarchy in an age of enormous armaments and nuclear weapons is literally impossible. Either the anarchy must be prevented and peaceful procedures employed, or we shall destroy ourselves.

41. National injustices, whether they be remnants of colonialism or disputes among new or among old States, must not be allowed to threaten destruction of our Organization, with its developing but still fragile peace-keeping machinery and the hopes of all mankind for a world of law and order. The use of force in colonial questions is no more justified than in any other question, and any effort to establish a dual standard of conduct with respect to them could not fail seriously to endanger the entire structure of the United Nations. And those who would suffer most from a weakening of the United Nations would be those who need the United Nations most—those small States which do not have strong allies or the physical resources for unilateral self-defence in a modern world. If such States choose to achieve their own ambitions, if they choose to settle their own disputes by force or to condone others in so doing, they risk finding, when they themselves are threatened, that the great international instrument which might have saved them has been paralyzed by their own action or inaction.

42. The Charter provides the most extensive machinery the world has ever seen for the peaceful settlement of disputes and for the adjustment of differences among States. Members of the United Nations are

bound to avail themselves of this machinery and not to resort to the use of armed force when this machinery does not provide a quick or a desired result. In view of the alternative prospect, with the ever-expanding potential of modern arms and armaments, I submit that it is both compulsory and expedient to rely on the principles of the Charter and to use to the full the machinery and the processes of the United Nations for affecting peaceful change. Where States resort to force instead, they can expect vigorous opposition from the United States, whoever they may be.

43. In Angola the broad character of the solution is clear. It does not lie in a fruitless attempt to repress inevitable change. Nor does it lie in the fomenting of violence and extremism. It lies rather in the processes of peaceful progress and peaceful change. And it is not too late to set those processes in motion.

44. The greatest responsibility lies upon Portugal and upon those who contend against it—upon Portugal to accept the goal of self-determination, and upon both to work in good faith towards that goal, abjuring force. A corresponding responsibility lies upon every Member of the United Nations to make every effort to advance this process, to discourage the use of force and to encourage recourse to the extensive machinery of peaceful settlement provided by the Charter.

45. We hope that the General Assembly will adopt a resolution embodying these principles and that Portugal, in its wisdom, will respond—not only to the voice of the community of nations but to its own highest self-interest.

46. Thus both the United Nations and Portugal will have contributed a bright page to the history of the growth of human freedom.

47. Mr. KOIRALA (Nepal): The situation prevailing in Angola has been discussed repeatedly in the various organs of the United Nations, but owing to the defiant posture Portugal has assumed, and its disregard for the opinions expressed by this body, no positive results have been achieved. Yet the evidence at our disposal clearly indicates that some concrete changes must be made in order to avert a tragedy.

48. It is not necessary to repeat at this time the substance of resolutions 1514 (XV), 1541 (XV), 1542 (XV), and 1603 (XV) adopted by the General Assembly at its fifteenth session, or that of the resolution^{1/} on this subject adopted by the Security Council. The meaning and purpose of these resolutions are crystal-clear to all of us, save to those who choose not to comprehend or abide by them.

49. We are very grateful to the Chairman and members of the Sub-Committee on the Situation in Angola for their comprehensive and impartial report [A/4978]. This report, compiled despite the unco-operative attitude of Portugal, has further confirmed our views regarding the situation existing in Angola, and forthrightly reveals the reasons for our stand. It is the opinion of the Nepalese delegation that the fundamental issue now before this Assembly is how best to remedy the situation in order to achieve a just solution to the problem and to preserve international peace and security. In the resolutions which have been adopted previously, the co-operation of Portugal has always been sought. Unfortunately, Portugal has been obdurate and has refused thus far to heed world opinion despite

^{1/} Official Records of the Security Council, Sixteenth Session Supplement for April, May and June 1961, document S/4835.

the fact that resolution 1699 (XVI), adopted by this Assembly on 19 December 1961 by a vote of 98 in favour to 3 against with 2 abstentions, condemned Portugal's actions.

50. It has been argued that "of a field which is prematurely reaped even the straw is good for nothing". This has long been used as an excuse by the colonial Powers for refusing to grant the right of self-determination to peoples under their rule. But we, as Members of the United Nations, have endorsed the principle of self-determination and are bound to uphold it. It is clearly stated in paragraph 3 of the General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) that:

"Inadequacy of political, economic, social or educational preparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence."

51. It is most unfortunate that Portugal has been derelict in preparing the people of Angola for self rule. The evidence contained in the report of the Sub-Committee bears witness to this. We are all well aware that for any State to operate autonomously, whatever form its political institutions may assume, it is necessary that certain fundamental prerequisites be fulfilled. It is a grave pity that Portugal has not equipped the Angolan people with the skills necessary for self-government. This situation must be remedied as quickly as possible. This is the real issue with which we should concern ourselves.

52. It is quite evident that Angola must ultimately pursue an existence independent of that of Portugal. The truth is its own best spokesman, as we all know that there are vast cultural, racial, ethnic, and social differences dividing the Angolan and Portuguese peoples. Thus they are not one nation. General Assembly resolution 1542 (XV), adopted on 15 December 1960, took cognizance of this fact by declaring Angola, among others, a Non-Self-Governing Territory within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter. This truth must be universally acknowledged, and we should direct our attention to the basic question: how can Angola best be prepared for independence?

53. It is inevitable that Portuguese hegemony should be ended. This can be accomplished peacefully and gradually, or with bloodshed, hatred and bitterness. It is up to Portugal as to how this transition will be accomplished. If Portugal refuses to see the writing on the wall and insists on pursuing a short-sighted unjust course of action, when the Angolan people do wrest themselves from Portuguese rule, they will be that country's bitter enemies. The peaceful transfer of power to the Angolan people, brought about with goodwill, will be in the mutual interest of both Portugal and Angola.

54. Although Nepal itself has never been subjected to colonial rule, for centuries it has been surrounded by countries suffering this fate, and consequently knows full well the hardships and the social, economic and political injustices that accrue to such a system. We ourselves have experienced indirectly many of the dire consequences borne by peoples subjected to colonial rule. Perhaps those countries which have been fortunate enough to extricate themselves from the clutches of foreign domination centuries ago, and those nations who have never experienced this fate, are unaware of the agonies, humiliations and frustrations now being felt by our Angolan brethren and the other peoples under Portuguese rule. It has been their tragic plight

to be suppressed and exploited for centuries by those who consider themselves to be more civilized.

55. For nearly five centuries they have borne the yoke of slavery very patiently. They have been accused now of not being capable of self-government. Is it not those who claim to be more civilized who are seeing to it that the indigenous sons of the soil are unable to grow spiritually, economically, socially and politically? The very ones who do not provide them with the opportunity to develop now accuse these subjugated peoples of not being prepared for responsibility. Who is really responsible for this? Is it not these self-imposed guardian-masters of civilization? Those who are subject to colonization, when their patience is exhausted and they are thoroughly exasperated, indulge in violence. It is these very master-guardians which have inflicted so much suffering, who become hoarse from crying out concerning barbarism and cruelty, and start predicting the end of the world. They try to equate these incidents with the Hitlerian "blitzkrieg" and the mass killings of innocent civilian populations. If our blood boils when blood of our blood and flesh of our flesh are butchered and massacred, all in the name of civilization, are we to blame? Is it we who should feel ashamed?

56. My delegation is firmly opposed to the policy of "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth", and we do not believe that violence should be met with violence. The loss of human life is a tragedy and should be averted at all costs. For this reason, it is the obligation of every Member of this world Organization to see that a peaceful solution is reached. We still have faith that the Portuguese people and their Government will realize the folly of refusing to compromise and that they will cease to scorn the decisions reached by this Assembly. The truth is not eradicated by refusing to listen to it. In absenting itself from these deliberations, Portugal is not strengthening its control over Angola. Portugal is merely perpetuating a tragic state of affairs and is weakening the one body capable of arriving at a better arrangement. In the long run, we shall all suffer from such an assault on the United Nations.

57. Considerable criticism has been directed at the smaller nations which are Members of this Organization. They have been accused of introducing resolutions based on emotions and sentiments which are lacking in reality and practicality. Actually, it is mostly those who speak in the name of civilization and realism and responsibility who have defied and ignored the decisions we have reached and who have acted contrary to the spirit and letter of the Charter.

58. In all humility and good faith, my delegation appeals to the major Western Powers to prevail upon their friends not to undermine the prestige of the United Nations by refusing to co-operate. The solution of the problems confronting us depends upon the existence of an international organization capable of dealing with them; hence the prestige and power of the United Nations should be enhanced, not weakened. Only recently the President of the United States aptly emphasized this in his address to the United States Congress,^{2/} and this address has already been quoted before the Assembly [1091st meeting] by Mr. Malalasekera, the representative of Ceylon.

59. My delegation adheres to the position it has consistently held with respect to this issue and has the

^{2/} President Kennedy's State of the Union message to Congress on 11 January 1962.

honour to sponsor the draft resolution contained in document A/L.384/Rev.1. This draft resolution takes into account the realities of the situation and is conciliatory in spirit in that it appeals to Portugal rather than advocating the outright use of sanctions and seeks peacefully to remedy the situation. It is our sincere hope that the draft resolution will receive unanimous endorsement by the Members of the Assembly.

60. Regarding the other draft resolution, contained in document A/L.383, my delegation reserves its right to speak at a later date should it be deemed necessary.

61. Mr. BUDO (Albania) (translated from French): The question of Angola is among those colonial questions which have been of particular concern to the United Nations. The Organization has been dealing with this problem for six years. Last year, the General Assembly, on two occasions, and the Security Council considered the dangerous situation prevailing in Angola and adopted important resolutions with a view to ending the atrocities perpetrated by the Government of Portugal in that African land and enabling the Angolan people to enjoy their right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with the United Nations Charter and the historic General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) on the liquidation of colonialism and the accession of colonial countries and peoples to independence. Owing, however, to the extremely negative attitude, contrary to the Charter, to which the Portuguese Government stubbornly adheres, the efforts made by the United Nations have hitherto met with no success and the colonial war in Angola continues to cost the blood of this martyred people who are fighting for freedom and national independence.

62. On 20 April 1961, at its fifteenth session, the General Assembly, by an overwhelming majority, adopted resolution 1603 (XV), which was reaffirmed by the Security Council on 9 June 1961^{3/} and in which it called upon Portugal to consider urgently the introduction of the necessary measures in Angola for the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV). By that same resolution 1603 (XV) the General Assembly set up the Sub-Committee of five members which investigated the situation in Angola and submitted its report to us [A/4978].

63. Subsequent events and the statement made at the very beginning of this debate by the representative of Portugal [1088th meeting] have shown us that the Government of that country, consistent with its out-and-out colonialist policy, is continuing to disregard the resolutions of the United Nations and is still trying to defend its position by every possible means—from the most ridiculous fictions, such as that of the alleged "overseas provinces", to the use of armed force. As is mentioned in the Sub-Committee's report, Prime Minister Salazar stated on 30 June 1961 that "the invitation to the Portuguese authorities to cease at once the measures of repression in Angola" was "theatrical" and could not have "the least hope of being accepted" [A/4978, para. 135].

64. This statement requires no comment and testifies to the complete lack of respect shown by the Portuguese authorities for the United Nations, of which Portugal is a Member. Furthermore, Portugal, like all the colonial Powers, complains of the injustice done to it by the Organization. It accuses the United Nations of

violating the Charter because it has not supported Portugal's policy of perpetuating the colonial subjugation of the peoples still under Portuguese domination and because it has not given its assent to Portugal's short-sighted mediaeval policy and savage acts of repression in Angola. The Salazar Government does not hesitate to threaten to leave the United Nations if the latter persists in condemning the colonial system.

65. The absurd pretensions of the Portuguese Government regarding the so-called "overseas provinces" and its stubbornness in defending an untenable and dangerous position have been widely discussed and denounced by the Member States and condemned by United Nations resolutions.

66. The Albanian delegation does not therefore think that there is any need to repeat this discussion. Nevertheless we feel obliged to draw attention to the serious danger which such an attitude on the part of Portugal presents to the legitimate rights of the Angolan people to their existence, their liberty and their independence.

67. A savage colonial war is still being waged in Angola. The blood of the Angolan people, who are fighting for freedom and independence, is still being shed. The figure of 50,000 Angolans killed during only the first four months of the war has been given. Portuguese colonial troops, more than 20,000 strong and equipped with arms by the aggressive NATO bloc, are continuing a war of extermination in this African country. Yet, in spite of the efforts of the Salazar Government to convince us that it has completely crushed the Angolan people's struggle for national independence, that struggle, as might have been expected, is constantly spreading and increasing in strength. The Angolan forces of national liberation, who have organized themselves into guerilla units, are operating primarily in the northern parts of the country, but the struggle of the Angolan people extends over the entire national territory.

68. In its report, the Sub-Committee gives us a description of this war—as far as it is able to do so in view of the refusal of the Portuguese Government to allow it to enter Angolan territory—covering the period from January to October 1961. It appears from this report that the Angolan fighters control large areas in the northern part of the country, where the authority of the Portuguese Government is limited to the large centres, and strategic positions.

69. The situation in Angola is serious and fraught with the direct consequences. The blackest pictures have been painted for us here. We have been told of massacres, of the devastation of entire areas, of murders and of an entire innocent people—men, women and children—indiscriminately massacred. This butchery has rightly been described as genocide. The most barbarous methods have been used to this end. Over and above the shelling of the defenceless civilian population and the napalm bombs dropped on them, the burning of towns, villages and entire areas, the mass arrests and the deportation of prisoners to concentration camps, frightful methods of extermination have become the order of the day, such as mass murders and executions of the indigenous population by Portuguese colonists armed by the colonial Administration and hundreds of Angolan patriots hanged or thrown into the sea bound hand and foot, or burned alive in petrol drums.

70. In the face of the repressive measures carried out by the Portuguese authorities, a great number of

^{3/} See Official Records of the Security Council, Sixteenth Year Supplement for April, May and June 1961, document S/4835.

Angolans have been compelled to flee their country and seek refuge in neighbouring countries, such as the Republics of the Congo (Brazzaville) and the Congo (Leopoldville). The number of refugees in these two countries has already exceeded 150,000, most of them women and children.

71. In speaking of the atrocities committed by the Portuguese in Angola, the Sub-Committee has told us the following:

"...the bombing of villages and areas suspected to contain concentrations of rebels, including the use of napalm bombs, resulted in the wounding and killing of innocent persons, including persons attempting to flee to safety across the border, and the destruction of the property of the indigenous population. Many refugees arrived in the Congo with bullet and bayonet wounds and burns." [*Ibid.*, para. 126.]

"Many of the complaints received by the Sub-Committee concern the indiscriminate violence attributed to Portuguese civilians armed and recruited into the militia. Civilians, driven by panic and a spirit of revenge, were said to have resorted to attacks on unarmed and defenceless Angolans with little or no provocation and to have engaged in acts of vengeance." [*Ibid.*, para. 127.]

"The Sub-Committee was also told of indiscriminate arrests, imprisonment without trial, ill-treatment of prisoners, and the disappearance or execution of prisoners without the normal processes of law." [*Ibid.*, para. 128.]

72. Despite the measures taken by Portugal and despite its refusal to supply the information required under the Charter, the United Nations is well informed about the colonial régime in Angola and the grim consequences of this régime for the Angolan people—consequences which are inherent in any colonial system. Poverty and hunger now prevail in Angola as in all the other Portuguese colonies. The most shameless discrimination, the division of the indigenous inhabitants into "civilized" and "uncivilized", the most brutal exploitation based on forced labour and the selling of Angolans as cheap labour, lawlessness, the denial of any rights to the African population, the most cruel reign of terror based on mass executions, imprisonments, torture and corporal punishment: such are the characteristic features of this system of slavery.

73. The mortality rate in Angola is extremely high, particularly among children. Ninety-nine per cent of the population is illiterate. The indigenous inhabitants are completely excluded from the administration of the country. Many representatives who have preceded me and who have spoken on behalf of African and other countries have provided details about the backwardness, poverty and mediaeval terror which at present prevail in Angola. The Sub-Committee's report also gives us a detailed description of this situation.

74. It is obvious—as nobody could doubt—that the reason Portugal is still able to maintain its colonial domination in Angola, Mozambique and elsewhere is that it enjoys the support of the other colonial Powers and is provided with arms by its allies of the aggressive NATO bloc, above all the United States. Left to itself, the Salazar Government could not withstand the surging national liberation movement of the African peoples. Despite the declarations of sympathy and friendship which the Western Powers and their repre-

sentatives in this Assembly are constantly showering upon the peoples and States of Africa, these Powers not only do nothing to restrain the criminal hands of the Portuguese murderers in Angola but even help them to keep the peoples of Africa under a system of slavery and to continue the inhuman and intolerable work which Portugal has undertaken.

75. These Powers therefore bear a heavy responsibility in this matter. In particular, they are accomplices in the merciless extermination of the Angolan population which Portugal has begun. This is naturally of no surprise to anyone. Everybody understands that by helping Portugal to maintain its system of colonialist slavery in Africa the imperialist Powers, linked to each other by a community of selfish interests based on the exploitation of other peoples, are defending the rapacious interests of their own monopolies. It is indeed common knowledge and many representatives here have mentioned it, that the monopolies of the United States, the United Kingdom, Western Germany and other countries are reaping enormous profits from the wealth of Angola.

76. A war of atrocious repression and extermination is still going on in Angola. Every day which goes by brings heavy losses to the people of that country and threatens their very existence. The peoples of Africa and the whole world are seething with indignation about this. At the same time, the situation created in Angola constitutes a source of tension and serious threat to the maintenance of world peace and security. In the face of this situation, the United Nations must resolutely assume its responsibilities under the Charter and take the necessary steps. It can no longer be content to adopt resolutions which are systematically ignored and trampled under foot by the Salazar régime. It must take prompt and effective action.

77. The Angolan people's right to self-determination and independence is indisputable. A very large majority of the Member States are convinced of this and in complete agreement about it, as has been confirmed by numerous resolutions adopted by the United Nations. This applies in particular to General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The steps the United Nations has taken so far, however, with regard to Angola have proved ineffective because of the negative position, contrary to the Charter, stubbornly taken by Portugal. In the circumstances, therefore, it behoves us to find and adopt suitable ways and means for the effective achievement of our goal. To condemn the colonial war in Angola and to put a stop to this inhuman slaughter at once, to bring all measures of repression and oppression in Angola to an end and to enable the people of this country to realize fully, and without further delay, their right to self-determination and independence: such are the objectives the United Nations should set itself. As the methods followed up to now for this purpose have proved ineffective, other means must be used to achieve it.

78. Since Portugal has defied all appeals and all decisions of the United Nations, the latter must take steps to compel Portugal to comply with them. Among these measures there are some which must be adopted forthwith and are fully justified. For instance, all States should refrain from furnishing any kind of assistance to Portugal; they should, in particular, refuse to supply it with arms and war materials, and the Security Council should adopt sanctions, in conformity with Articles 41 and 42 of the Charter. The

delegation of the People's Republic of Albania will support all measures by the United Nations which are calculated to contribute effectively to the attainment of the aims set forth above.

79. With respect to the draft resolution [A/L.383] submitted by Bulgaria and Poland, my delegation considers that it answers the purpose we have set ourselves and provides suitable means for achieving it. For this reason, we shall give it full support and shall vote in favour of it.

80. The Albanian people and their Government have always followed with great interest the movement of peoples towards national liberation; they have constantly supported, to the extent of their ability, the heroic struggle of those peoples. The Albanian people who are today building a new life in liberty and independence express their deep sympathy and complete solidarity with the peoples who are carrying on the struggle against imperialism and colonialism in all forms and manifestations.

81. We feel that the liberation of the colonial peoples is not only the realization of their most sacred inalienable right; it is also an indispensable condition for the maintenance and strengthening of world peace. It does much to promote the progress of human society and the establishment among nations of relations based on sound foundations and in keeping with the dignity of man. The liquidation of colonialism, the complete elimination of this shameful survival of the past in our human society is inevitable, despite the desperate efforts of imperialism to maintain its régime of slavery. The struggle for national liberation by peoples who, like the Angolan people, are still suffering under the colonial yoke in spite of the support of all the anti-colonial forces, is bound to triumph.

82. The lofty principles on which the United Nations is based require the latter to act speedily and in accordance with those principles and to make its great contribution to the sacred cause of the Angolan people. My delegation hopes that the United Nations will successfully meet this test which directly concerns its authority and effectiveness, as also the trust the peoples of the world place in it.

Mr. Padilla Nervo (Mexico), Vice-President, took the Chair.

83. Mr. COLLIER (Sierra Leone): I hope the President will allow me to take this opportunity of expressing the gratitude of my delegation to the Sub-Committee on the Situation in Angola, whose diligent and efficient services to this Organization have made it possible for us to debate the question of Angola in this atmosphere, assisted by the comprehensive report [A/4978] which it has so ably presented concerning the work assigned it by the United Nations.

84. This report is of particular significance in view of the difficult circumstances under which the members of the Sub-Committee were obliged to work. It is a matter for regret that the Portuguese authorities refused to allow the Sub-Committee to enter the territory of Angola to obtain first-hand knowledge and information regarding conditions prevailing there. Yet we heard the representative of Portugal say from this rostrum with characteristic cynicism that the Sub-Committee had made use of "hearsay information".

85. At the beginning of this debate, when the representative of Portugal took the floor in this Assembly [1088th meeting], my delegation hoped that Portugal

had a real intention of discharging a basic duty as a Member State of this Organization and of giving the necessary co-operation towards ensuring the peaceful solution of a situation which, on his own admission, is clearly explosive. Even if we were for a moment to accept his description of the events in Angola as "terrorist activities" and his admission that, in the first three or four weeks of these so-called "terrorist activities", more than 5,000 lives were lost, an Organization such as ours could not afford to ignore the grave potential for an international crisis which such a situation undoubtedly created, particularly when we recalled that these so-called "terrorists" belonged to the indigenous race of a territory which is subjugated by people belonging to another race from another continent. The Portuguese Government, it is true, did give some measure of co-operation by putting at the disposal of the Sub-Committee certain official documents. Even if one were to accept the evidence derived from such documents alone as pertinent to the question of Angola, one would still be bound to come to the conclusion that a country where the vast majority of people are not permitted to enjoy a large measure of fundamental human rights and have a "special status", mainly due to this situation, will provide a vital breeding ground for tensions and conflicts in these days when a new wind of change has been blowing over other parts of the continent of Africa.

86. The spectacle of Portugal thus arraigned before this world assembly is a sorry one indeed, particularly when one recalls the past pioneering glories of that country. My delegation represents a country whose modern history began with the exploits of a distinguished Portuguese adventurer, Pedro da Cintra, who, in an era when men were afraid to traverse the oceans of the world, braved the odds and sailed down the West African coast to discover and to name Sierra Leone, among his other exploits. But it seems that the days of daring adventure in the annals of Portuguese history are no more. Today, Portugal seems afraid to meet the challenge of our times and to brave the rough seas of nationalism and self-determination, which are important elements of our age.

87. Portugal seems to be living in the glories of the past that had better be forgotten, when other nations like the British and French have caught the spirit of the age and are adjusting their colonial policy accordingly. They had their moments of greatness in the past but, indeed, the future historian may well record that the most glittering period in the history of these countries was the period when they agreed to give a hand of partnership to their former colonial territories and help them to take their place as full members of the world community.

88. Portugal ought to know that the position it holds in Angola is untenable and utterly revolting to all decent-minded people. It may be a question of time, but the people of Angola will certainly throw off the Portuguese yoke and establish their right to self-determination. That again will be a sorry day for Portugal if it allows this to be accomplished in an atmosphere of bitterness and strife. This is why my delegation appeals to the Government of Portugal to take this opportunity to preserve a worthy place for itself in the history books of Africa.

89. The Portuguese are fond of making references to their historic contribution to the culture of the peoples of the world and would prefer us to think of them as a nation with "a civilizing mission". The people of Africa

waged by Portugal against this people, which it wants to go on exploiting and oppressing under the most barbarous and degrading conditions, and the refusal of the Portuguese Government to carry out the various resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly are, in the eyes of my delegation, facts that no one—not even those who most stubbornly defend Mr. Salazar's régime—can any longer deny.

68. That being so, does it not logically follow that there should be a request to apply the provisions of Articles 40 and 41 of the Charter against Portugal? What, after all, is the point in having a code—which in this case is the Charter—and providing for sanctions, if there is no way of condemning the culprits and if the United Nations cannot play its part as the supreme arbiter and the guardian of peace, justice and freedom?

69. I fully agree with the Tunisian representative, who said here a few days ago [1099th meeting] that the United Nations must not continue to play the part of an archivist or registrar. It must take vigorous action now to ensure that its prestige, particularly in Africa, is maintained. My delegation accordingly agrees with those who consider that Portugal deserves much stricter sanctions than those provided for in draft resolution A/L.383. It is therefore understandable that my delegation will find it quite easy to vote in favour of this draft.

70. If Mr. Salazar persists in a policy which is tantamount to defiance of the international conscience, Senegal will be prepared, at the next or a later session of the General Assembly, to sponsor and vote for any draft resolution that is designed simply to expel Portugal from the United Nations in accordance with Article 6 of the Charter. This attitude has been adopted after mature reflection, and it will not be changed one iota if Portugal, which regards itself as a member of the so-called free world—and what an aberration that is, in our opinion!—continues on the one hand to massacre our Angolan brothers and, on the other hand, to flout the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948, the United Nations Charter and the various resolutions of the General Assembly.

71. Indeed, we would be very pleased if Portugal's expressed intention to withdraw from the United Nations was actually carried out. Could Mr. Salazar then hope, by a simple declaration, after the crushing defeat suffered in Goa, to remind his allies that he was still one of them? And what can we say of those who choose to ally themselves with a country that is poor and threatened by an intellectual crisis, while they remain silent or even indifferent before the friendship offered them by over 200 million Africans imbued by the spirit of freedom, justice and peace? In any case, that is something which Senegal cannot understand and which Senegal cannot countenance.

72. In July 1961, on the 25th to be exact, our Government decided to break off its relations with Lisbon. How can an independent African State of our times continue to maintain diplomatic relations with Portugal? To us this makes no sense, as the essence of these relations is to promote friendly relations between States. These are the real reasons which caused Senegal to sever its relations with Portugal.

73. It will thus be readily understood that the assertions made by the Portuguese delegation in its "comments on the report of the Sub-Committee on the Situation in Angola" are far from the truth. For ex-

ample, the Portuguese delegation made the following statement:

"The break-off in the diplomatic relations with Portugal on the part of Senegal was not caused by the developments in Angola but by its ambitions of territorial annexation in respect of the Portuguese province of Guinea." [A/5082, para. 72.]

74. If the Portuguese representative has a short memory—I was going to say "if he has lost the north", and I do not only mean the north of Angola, where Portugal no longer has any authority, but his bearings in general—we, for our part, are still clear in mind and conscience and are consistent in our ideas. How could we have defended the principle of *uti possidetis juris* here during the debate on the Mauritanian question, and today have any annexationist views on another African territory? In any case, this allegation by the Portuguese representative is gratuitous, since it is based neither on fact nor on law.

75. In this matter, Senegal has chosen the camp of justice and freedom, and has promised to grant asylum to the nationalists who are prevented by bloody repression in their own country from using the normal democratic weapons in their fight to attain independence and regain their human dignity. I declare this in public, before this international forum, and in so doing I confirm what the Portuguese representative said in his statement of 15 January 1962 before the General Assembly ...

76. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I should like to remind the representative of Senegal that this is an explanation of vote, and not the general debate. I should be grateful if he would take this into account.

77. Mr. KANE (Senegal) (translated from French): I thank the President. My delegation has taken all these considerations into account in determining the vote it will cast on the draft resolutions before the Assembly. I should like to say only a few more words, with the President's permission.

78. I therefore confirm what the Portuguese representative said in his statement of 15 January 1962 before the General Assembly [see para. 41 of the 1088th meeting]. If that is the charge which the Portuguese representative thinks he is levelling against us—he accuses us of giving material and financial aid to those who are fighting for their freedom—then we are extremely grateful to him, for he has thus acknowledged our part in the struggle for the decolonization of Africa.

79. These are the considerations which have induced my delegation to support the draft resolution submitted by Poland and Bulgaria and which I wished to explain before the vote was taken.

80. Mr. ARRAIZ (Venezuela) (translated from Spanish): The Venezuelan delegation is of the opinion that the two draft resolutions about to be voted upon, namely, that submitted by Bulgaria and Poland [A/L.383] and that sponsored by forty-five African and Asian Member States [A/L.384/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1], are practically identical. The only difference is in emphasis, but the object is the same. As it would be superfluous to approve both, we feel that a choice is imperative.

81. After examining the two drafts carefully my delegation tends to favour that submitted by the forty-

five Powers. On the one hand, the large number of Member States that are sponsoring it gives it moral weight; many of them have geographical and ethnic ties which make them more closely interested in the problem and better informed concerning it.

82. On the other hand, in the Bulgarian and Polish draft no mention is made of the brilliant work done under the chairmanship of an outstanding South American by the Sub-Committee appointed to examine the situation in Angola in virtue of General Assembly resolution 1603 (XV) or of the report submitted by the Sub-Committee [A/4978], which is perhaps the most important document that has been submitted for our consideration in connexion with this item. We are unable to understand this twofold omission.

83. For these various reasons my delegation does not feel prepared to vote for the draft submitted by Bulgaria and Poland. It could abstain because, in principle, it agrees with the object of that draft resolution, which is, I repeat, the same as that of the forty-five-Power draft apart from the fact that it is expressed more forcefully. An abstention in this case, however, might mean the adoption by the General Assembly of the draft we do not favour. In addition, we sincerely believe that a definite choice is always more forthright.

84. The delegation of Venezuela will therefore vote against draft resolution A/L.383 and is prepared to vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.384/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1.

85. Mr. MELO FRANCO (Brazil) (translated from French): At the outset of the debate on the question before us, the Brazilian delegation clearly and firmly explained its position on the problem of Angola [1088th meeting].

86. Our statement was based on two fundamental factors: first, the special sentimental, cultural and historical ties which bind us to the Portuguese people and which we should like to emphasize once again; and, secondly, Brazil's anti-colonial policy and its loyalty to the United Nations Charter and the resolutions of the General Assembly.

87. A number of representatives with different political backgrounds and from all the regions of the world have referred to the Brazilian statement, showing most encouragingly that they had understood not only the special ties which bind us to Portugal, but also the impartiality of our anti-colonialist position. On behalf of the Brazilian delegation, I should like to tender these delegations my sincerest thanks.

88. Draft resolution A/L.384/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1 has been sponsored by forty-five delegations. This document, which must have been very difficult to prepare, represents a compromise between different trends of thought. I am fully aware of the difficulty of introducing amendments to it, and I shall therefore limit myself to making a few remarks.

89. I shall refer first of all to paragraph 1, the wording of which we do not find quite satisfactory. The Sub-Committee on the Situation in Angola is presumed to transmit its observations, findings and conclusions direct to the General Assembly. As the Assembly approved these observations, findings and conclusions almost unanimously, we think that it would be more logical to inform Portugal of the conclusions of the General Assembly itself.

90. My second remark relates to paragraph 6 (b), in which the Sub-Committee is requested:

"To study ways and means to secure the implementation of the present resolution and to report thereon to the Security Council and to the General Assembly through the Special Committee of seventeen members established under resolution 1654 (XVI)".

91. In the opinion of the Brazilian delegation, the Sub-Committee should report directly to the Security Council and to the General Assembly, of which it is an immediate subsidiary organ. Under the resolution [1603 (XV)] setting up the Sub-Committee, that body has specific terms of reference with which it must comply as soon as possible in view of the extreme seriousness of the situation in Angola. The terms of reference given by the General Assembly to the Special Committee of seventeen members are much broader and relate to the implementation of the resolution on the elimination of colonialism [1514 (XV)]. The Special Committee itself has yet to determine the methods and procedures for carrying out its task. Accordingly, if a separate vote is taken, we shall abstain from voting on this sub-paragraph.

92. Turning to paragraph 7, a comparison with paragraph 2 reveals that the word "self-determination" does not appear in paragraph 7. In our opinion, the omission of the word "self-determination" impairs the text by removing it further from the spirit and letter of the United Nations Charter.

93. In my original statement, I brought out the need for administrative, social and economic reforms in Angola so as to prepare the country for self-determination, in accordance with Article 73 b of the Charter.

94. The Brazilian delegation will, for these various reasons, abstain from voting if a separate vote is taken on paragraph 7.

95. Subject to the reservation concerning the omission of the word "self-determination" from paragraph 7 and to the other remarks I have made, the Brazilian delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole. The Brazilian Government is fully convinced that it will in this way be contributing to a peaceful solution of the problem of Angola.

96. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): As I have come to the end of my list of speakers, I shall sum up the situation. The Assembly has before it two draft resolutions. The first [A/L.383] was submitted on 15 January 1962 by Bulgaria and Poland. The second [A/L.384/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1] was submitted on 25 January by forty-five Member States. In connexion with the second draft resolution, I should like to remind you that the United States representative has asked for a separate vote on the following phrase in paragraph 6 (b): "through the Special Committee of seventeen members established under resolution 1654 (XV)", and also on paragraph 7. The delegation of Senegal, a sponsor of the draft, has objected to that request.

97. Before we proceed to the vote, I shall give the floor to the representative of Iraq on a point of order.

98. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq): I have been asked by a majority of the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.384/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1 to state the following. While we do not oppose a separate vote on paragraph 6 (b),

which was requested by the representative of the United States, we do oppose a separate vote on paragraph 7, which we feel must be maintained in the draft resolution. It will be recalled that in General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVI), the Special Committee of seventeen members was given special responsibilities on all colonial questions and therefore in our view, nothing should be done to affect or minimize this over-all responsibility of the Special Committee of seventeen members on colonial questions.

99. I would merely recall paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 1354 (XVI) which reads as follows:

"Requests the Special Committee to examine the application of the Declaration"—namely the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples—"to make suggestions and recommendations on the progress and extent of the implementation of the Declaration, and to report to the General Assembly at its seventeenth session;".

100. That is why a special paragraph was included in the draft resolution of the forty-five Powers, asking the Special Committee of seventeen members to give its urgent consideration to the question of Angola—which, I think everyone agrees, is one of the foremost colonial questions of the day. Therefore it would seem to be normal that the Special Committee of seventeen members should not be excluded from giving some consideration to the question of Angola, in view of its very explicit and clear terms of reference laid down by the General Assembly at the end of the first part of the sixteenth session.

101. For this reason we appeal to the representative of the United States to amend his proposal, so that the request for a separate vote would apply only to the last part of paragraph 6 (b), and not to insist on a separate vote on paragraph 7. However, if he does insist on a separate vote on paragraph 7, we shall be compelled to vote against that second part of his proposal.

102. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The request for a vote by division on draft resolution A/L.384/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1, made by the representative of the United States, has been opposed by the representative of Senegal, who is now supported by the representative of Iraq. Before proceeding to a vote by division, I shall have to submit the request for division to the Assembly. In accordance with rule 91 of the rules of procedure, I can give the floor to two speakers in favour of the motion for division and two against.

103. I give the floor to the representative of Poland on a point of order.

104. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland): I shall not speak on the point raised by the representative of Iraq because I submit that, before any procedural problem connected with the draft resolution of the forty-five Powers [A/L.384/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1] is settled, the draft resolution presented by the delegations of Bulgaria and Poland [A/L.383] should be voted upon first because it has priority. I submit that many delegations, including my own, might be influenced by the result of a vote on the draft resolution of Bulgaria and Poland when they come to vote on the draft resolution of the forty-five Powers. Therefore, I would propose that the President should put to the

Assembly the draft resolution presented by Bulgaria and Poland as having priority.

105. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): As no one has asked for priority to be given to draft resolution A/L.384/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1, I will put draft resolution A/L.383 to the vote first, and then ask the Assembly to decide on draft resolution A/L.384/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1. I think this is the best procedure, and shall therefore adhere to it.

106. I now put to the vote draft resolution A/L.383, submitted by Bulgaria and Poland. There has been a request for a roll-call vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Nigeria, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Poland, Romania, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Tanganyika, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco.

Against: Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua.

Abstaining: Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Upper Volta, Yemen, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Burma, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cyprus, Dahomey, Federation of Malaya, Gabon, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Nepal.

The draft resolution was rejected by 43 votes to 26, with 32 abstentions.

107. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We shall now vote on the forty-five-Power draft resolution [A/L.384/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1].

108. I give the floor to the representative of the United States on a point of order.

109. Mr. STEVENSON (United States of America): In response to the plea of the representative of Iraq, and in the interest of unanimity and, I hope, of celerity, the United States delegation is prepared to withdraw its request for a separate vote on paragraph 7 if an amendment inserting the words "self-determination and" before the word "independence" could be adopted by the Assembly. I think that this, as I understand it, would be acceptable to the majority of the sponsors of the draft resolution; that being the case, I suspect it might be acceptable to the Assembly and we could proceed promptly to the disposition of this draft resolution.

110. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): As I understand it, the representative of the United States is proposing an amendment to paragraph 7 whereby the words "self-determination and" would be inserted between the words "speedy achievement of" and the word "independence".

111. We therefore now have before us a request for a separate vote and a proposed amendment to paragraph 7.

112. I give the floor to the representative of Afghanistan on a point of order.

113. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan): I am very sorry to have asked for the floor when the Assembly is proceeding to a vote on the draft resolution, but I felt compelled to do this in the light of the new suggestion made by the representative of the United States.

114. As far as this amendment is concerned, my delegation has no objection to the mention of the word "self-determination" in this paragraph, as such mention has been made in the previous paragraphs, and we also think that it might add some consistency. But, in the wording suggested by the representative of the United States, my delegation would not find this amendment acceptable.

115. As I understand it, the amendment would make the paragraph read: "to the speedy achievement of self-determination and independence ...". With this we cannot agree.

116. But we could agree if the representative of the United States would give consideration to our point of view and accept a modification. This modification would make the paragraph read as follows:

"Requests the Special Committee of seventeen members established under its resolution 1654 (XVI) to give its most urgent consideration to the question of Angola with a view to the speedy achievement of independence by the people of Angola on the basis of self-determination".

117. We do hope that this will be given consideration by the representative of the United States, for only in that case will my delegation be in a position to vote for that amendment.

118. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Does any representative wish to speak on the statements just made by the representatives of the United States and Afghanistan?

119. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): My delegation is one of the sponsors of this draft resolution. We have drafted a resolution for the purpose of getting as far as possible unanimity in this Assembly on a matter which is of general concern, and to see the question of Angola settled in a peaceful way; I believe we have gone a long way in that direction. There is now a small difficulty which we must overcome in that spirit of unanimity. The representative of the United States has proposed the addition of the words "achievement of self-determination and independence by the people of Angola". We can see no objection to that addition, considering that it is the same phrase which appears in the preamble, and I refer to the full phrase:

"Convinced that the continued refusal of Portugal to recognize the legitimate aspirations of the Angolan people to self-determination and independence ..."

Therefore, we state here that the legitimate aspirations of the Angolan people are self-determination and independence. In operative paragraph 2, we solemnly reaffirm the inalienable right of the Angolan people to self-determination and independence.

120. Therefore, we have in our draft resolution that it is the legitimate aspiration of the people of Angola to have self-determination, and we, ourselves, again

say that it is their alienable right. Therefore, it would be contrary to logic if we do not ask for the same thing, which is their aspiration and their right.

121. Therefore, I would support this amendment, which not only does not interfere with the essence of the draft resolution but makes one part consistent with the other. I might remind the Assembly that the Declaration on colonialism [resolution 1514 (XV)], mentions clearly the right of people to self-determination. Therefore, from every point of view the addition of this word would not in any way impair, but would improve, the resolution.

122. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) (translated from French): Many appeals have been made since the opening of this afternoon's meeting, and I too have come to the rostrum to make an appeal. This appeal will be brief and will be addressed to the representative of the United States.

123. We have no objection—indeed, quite the contrary—to mentioning the inalienable right of the African peoples to self-determination, but in the view of my delegation the problem here is a different one. So it may not be out of place to state and repeat to the Assembly that this point was not only discussed in the small drafting committee of the African-Asian group, but was brought up at the plenary meeting of our African-Asian group on several occasions and on the most recent of these by the representative of Cyprus. This question has been very seriously studied and deeply pondered by us, and it is not without good reason that we adopted the present text after very lengthy discussions.

124. Why therefore did we not mention self-determination in this instance? The answer is that paragraph 7 deals with the application of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)]. That is the name of this Declaration. It is not a declaration on the granting of self-determination but on the granting of independence, and to make this quite clear, the best thing I can do is to read out paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), which is as follows:

"Immediate steps shall be taken, in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories or all other territories which have not yet attained independence, to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories, without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire, without any distinction as to race, creed or colour,"—and here is the most important part—"in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom."

There is no reference to self-determination. I think that is quite clear.

125. It is true that at the time—and this cannot be laid at the door of those who are now on the United States delegation—the United States delegation to the fifteenth session did not vote for this resolution. We were, however, glad when, in accordance with that resolution, the United States delegation to the sixteenth session voted for resolution 1654 (XVI) concerning the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

126. In the light of all these considerations and after a great deal of hard work, we achieved a delicate balance of agreement on a text which, as can be seen,

cannot satisfy everyone. The least change in it is apt to upset the balance which we achieved with such difficulty. Like many others, my delegation made considerable sacrifices and concessions for the sake of African-Asian solidarity, but there are limits beyond which I feel we cannot go.

127. In view of everything that has been said here and of the almost universal judgement that the text is moderate in tone, I would urge the United States representative not to press his amendment in order that our draft resolution might be adopted unanimously.

128. In response to the United States amendment, the representative of Afghanistan proposed a sub-amendment that is self-explanatory. The people of Angola, like all the people of Africa and all the people of the world, will achieve independence on the basis of self-determination. We likewise discussed this point, and we have no objection regarding it. We arrived at a balance of agreement which was difficult to achieve but which has been embodied in a text that was unanimously approved by the African-Asian delegations. Indeed—there is no harm in repeating this—although some Asian and African delegations do not appear among the sponsors of the draft resolution, not a single delegation opposed it, and the reluctance of the members of the Sub-Committee on the Situation in Angola to become co-sponsors was due to a readily understandable conscientiousness and sense of propriety. Our text, let me repeat, had everyone's agreement.

129. Hence, in the light of these considerations, my delegation would like to make a last appeal to the United States representative not to press his amendment, for the text before us really expresses our intentions and is the minimum required by the interests of the people of Angola.

130. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I should now like to ask the United States representative what his final position is with regard to the Afghan representative's proposal and the Guinean representative's appeal.

131. Mr. STEVENSON (United States of America): I have attempted to respond to one appeal. I am afraid that is all the responses I have. I will repeat my proposal: to amend paragraph 7 by inserting the words "self-determination and" after the words "achievement of". If that amendment is carried, we will withdraw our request for a separate vote on paragraph 7.

132. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We have before us a number of proposals regarding the voting. We have had proposals for a vote by division, on which various speakers have spoken. In addition, the United States representative is pressing his amendment to paragraph 7 of the draft resolution. That is the situation at present.

133. I give the floor to the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

134. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): This discussion on voting procedure is causing my delegation to entertain certain doubts with regard to the stand just taken by the United States delegation, because the question is actually being put to us as follows: "If you accept our amendment, we shall withdraw our request for a separate vote". To talk like this is to engage in a kind of bargaining, but bargaining, to my mind, is unworthy of the General Assembly. In the United States it is, of course, possible to bargain, to buy

and to sell, but in the General Assembly, to my mind, bargaining is out of order.

135. The question therefore presents itself as follows. Let the United States put forward an amendment, and we shall then vote on it. It is entitled like any other delegation to put forward an amendment, and we understand its reasons for submitting this amendment. Then we shall vote.

136. The second question concerns the voting procedure. Does the United States delegation propose that a separate vote be taken on the relevant paragraphs—paragraph 6 (b) and paragraph 7 as a whole—or does it not? This is a different question, a question concerning voting procedure, and it too must be decided. In this case, the second question must be decided before the first according to the rules of procedure. The first question to be decided is the manner in which the resolution as a whole is to be voted on. Is a separate vote requested or not? If so, on which paragraphs? After that is settled, a vote will be taken on the paragraphs for which a separate vote is requested, and if these are adopted by a majority of the votes, then the amendments proposed to the various paragraphs will be voted upon. Finally a vote will be taken on the resolution as a whole. That is the normal procedure.

137. It is proposed, however, that we first decide the question of amendments and then the question of voting procedure; that is, that we put the cart before the horse. This, I feel, would be out of order.

138. I therefore propose that we follow the procedure normally observed in the General Assembly, namely, that we now decide the question of voting procedure. If a request is made for a separate vote on any parts of the resolution, then let a vote be taken on this. Is a separate vote requested or not? Does the Assembly agree to this or not? After that, the relevant amendments can be taken up. If there is an amendment, we shall vote upon it; if there is not an amendment, then we shall vote only on the text proposed. In other words, if the Assembly decides that a separate vote is not necessary, we shall vote on the resolution as a whole; if it decides that a separate vote is to be taken on certain paragraphs, we shall first vote on those paragraphs. That is the normal procedure, but in my opinion this is not the place for making deals.

139. Alhaji NGILERUMA (Nigeria): I wish to join the delegation of Guinea and other delegations which appealed to the representative of the United States not to insist on his amendment to paragraph 7. The sponsors have already agreed to compromise with the representative of the United States by consenting to a separate vote on the last part of paragraph 6 (b). For the sake of harmony and the expeditious implementation of our work, I wish to appeal to the representative of the United States not to insist on this amendment.

140. I appeal very strongly also that paragraph 7 should stand as it is. This is because in paragraph 2 and also in the preamble a mention has already been made of self-determination; therefore, I see no useful purpose in submitting an amendment to paragraph 7. I appeal very strongly to the representative of the United States to co-operate with the sponsors and let paragraph 7 stand as it is.

141. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): After this exchange of views, I should like to take the sense of the Assembly on a number of points.

142. First of all, regarding the United States representative's initial proposal for a vote by division, which falls into two parts, I should like to ask whether anyone is opposed to a separate vote on the phrase "through the Special Committee of seventeen members established under resolution 1654 (XVI)" in paragraph 6 (b). As no one objects to a vote by division on this phrase, I shall put it to a separate vote.

143. The United States representative also proposed a separate vote on paragraph 7, and this proposal was opposed by some representatives and supported by others. In accordance with rule 91 of the rules of procedure, I shall now give the floor only to those who wish to speak on points of order concerning the voting procedure.

144. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq): My understanding is that the representative of the United States has indicated that he does not insist on a separate vote on paragraph 7. He said that he is going to present an amendment, and he did indeed present an amendment to paragraph 7. But I submit that there is no connexion between the two. I think that the representative of the United States has said very clearly that he does not insist on a separate vote on paragraph 7, and he said that he was doing that in response to the appeal made by the representative of Iraq. So I do not know really whether his proposal to have a separate vote on paragraph 7 still stands. I was under the impression that he had withdrawn this proposal.

145. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): In order to clarify the situation, I should like to ask the representative of the United States whether or not he has withdrawn his proposal for a separate vote on paragraph 7.

146. Mr. STEVENSON (United States of America): In an effort to accommodate at least some of the sponsors of this draft resolution, I proposed an amendment to paragraph 7 thereof. If the sponsors object to this amendment, then I must renew my request for a separate vote on the paragraph. I regret that I cannot accommodate all of the appeals—from Nigeria, from Guinea, from Afghanistan and from those who would like to see the paragraph adopted as it is. I am sure they appreciate my concern as much as, I hope, I appreciate theirs.

147. Therefore, I repeat my position, that if the amendment I have suggested is satisfactory, then of course I will withdraw my request for a separate vote on paragraph 7; but if this amendment which I understood to be satisfactory is not satisfactory, then I must request a separate vote on paragraph 7.

148. This is the first time, to my knowledge, that an effort to comply with an appeal from fellow Members has been called "trading" or "buying" or "selling".

149. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): It seems that it is now for the sponsors of the draft resolution to state their position. The United States representative will not insist on a separate vote on paragraph 7 if the sponsors accept his amendment. If they do not accept the amendment, he will press his request for a separate vote. I think I have stated the situation correctly.

150. Mr. BINDZI (Cameroon) (translated from French): I think that rule 92 of the rules of procedure gives us all the guidance we need. It states: "When an amendment is moved to a proposal, the amendment shall be voted on first". As the United States repre-

sentative has proposed an amendment, to which certain conditions are attached, I feel that this amendment—namely, the addition it proposes—should be voted on first. If the amendment is not adopted, the United States representative is free to ask for separate vote on the paragraph as a whole.

151. Mr. USHER (Ivory Coast) (translated from French): It is a pity that we cannot make a further appeal to the United States representative, for I would have liked him to heed us. We discussed these problems at length when the draft was being drawn up, and the delegation of the Ivory Coast has no intention of changing its position. Reference is made in the preamble to self-determination and independence, but in the passage under discussion, the important thing is the goal to be achieved. The delegation of the Ivory Coast considers that self-determination is not a goal, but a means of attaining the goal. It would therefore be illogical to mention self-determination in the passage in which the goal is defined. If the parties to the dispute mutually agreed that there should be self-determination, we could only approve their decision, but we cannot in this Assembly decide to impose on the parties such a goal as self-determination.

152. Self-determination is not mentioned on its own anywhere in the Charter. The reference there is to self-determination of peoples in so far as friendly relations among nations are concerned. What is meant by the expression "self-determination of peoples" is that all peoples shall be given the opportunity to choose their own political system, provided that it does not interfere with good relations among nations. That is what my delegation understands by the expression "self-determination of peoples" in Article 1 of the Charter, where the reference is to relations among nations.

153. The present case comes rather under Chapter XI (Declaration Regarding Non-Self-Governing Territories). There is no question here of self-determination alone, or of the self-determination of peoples, but of self-government and of a goal, which is independence. That is why I feel that the addition of the sentence proposed by the representative of Afghanistan is more in harmony with the objectives of the Charter than the insertion of the word "self-determination" at the point proposed. If the word "self-determination" is inserted at that point, the text diverges from the Charter. That is why my delegation, to its regret, cannot support the proposed amendment.

154. Mr. TCHOBANOV (Bulgaria) (translated from French): After the representative of Iraq spoke, the President asked the United States representative whether or not he wished to press his request for a vote by division. The reply was conditional, as the United States representative said that he would withdraw his request for a vote by division if the sponsors of the African-Asian draft resolution accepted his amendment. Instead of clarifying the situation, that reply appears to have complicated it even further. There are forty-five sponsors to the draft resolution. Are we going to hold a referendum and hear statements by every one of the forty-five sponsors? That does not seem possible. Several of them have already said that they could not accept the United States amendment. I feel that that is good enough reason for considering that the amendment has not been accepted and for proceeding to a vote on the request for a vote by division.

155. Mr. STEVENSON (United States of America): I assure the Assembly that this will be my last appearance in this discussion. As there are apparently so many objections to the amendment which I proposed and in an effort to accommodate the requests of several members, I think it will both save time and avoid confusion if I withdraw my amendment and renew my request for a separate vote on paragraph 7. In saying this, I am glad to agree with the representative of Bulgaria—an exercise that I hope I can engage in more frequently in the future.

156. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The situation now seems clear. The representative of the United States is maintaining his proposal for a separate vote on paragraph 7. Two representatives have spoken in favour of this proposal and two others have announced their opposition. Therefore, in accordance with rule 91 of the rules of procedure, I must put the request made by the representative of the United States for a separate vote on paragraph 7 to the vote. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Iraq, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iran.

Against: Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syria, Tanganyika, Togo, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia.

Abstaining: Liberia, Madagascar, Thailand, Tunisia, Afghanistan, Central African Republic, Cyprus, Dahomey.

The proposal was adopted by 47 votes to 45, with 8 abstentions.

157. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now put to the vote separately the following phrase in paragraph 6 (b): "through the Special Committee of seventeen Members established under resolution 1654 (XVI)". A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Cyprus, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Libya, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Syria, Tanganyika, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian

Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cuba.

Against: Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China.

Abstaining: France, Iran, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Madagascar, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Togo, Tunisia, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Colombia.

The phrase was rejected by 44 votes to 37, with 20 abstentions.

158. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now invite the General Assembly to vote on paragraph 7. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Portugal, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syria, Tanganyika, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland.

Against: South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines.

Abstaining: Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uruguay, Venezuela, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Colombia, Cyprus, Dahomey, Ecuador, Federation of Malaya, France, Haiti, Israel, Ivory Coast, Japan, Laos, Liberia, Madagascar, Mexico, Niger.

The result of the vote was 44 in favour and 32 against, with 26 abstentions.

Paragraph 7 was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

159. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now put to the vote the draft resolution, as amended, that is, without the phrase "through the Special Committee of seventeen members established under resolution 1654 (XVI)" and without paragraph 7, neither of which has been adopted by the General Assembly. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Brazil, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tanganyika, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of

America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia.

Against: South Africa, Spain.

Abstaining: France.

The draft resolution was adopted by 99 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

160. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We have concluded the debate on the item entitled "The situation in Angola". Before adjourning this meeting I should like to make an announcement on behalf of the Chairman of the First Committee, who has informed me that, having regard to the wishes of certain delegations directly concerned and after consultation, it has been decided that the First Committee will meet on Monday, 5 February, at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.