

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE **94th
MEETING**



Tuesday, 21 October 1958,
at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 67:	
Question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid of the Government of the Union of South Africa (continued)	41

Chairman: Mr. Mihai MAGHERU (Romania).

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Menemencioglu (Turkey), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 67

Question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid of the Government of the Union of South Africa (A/3872, A/SPC/L.25 and Add.1 and 2) (continued)

1. Mr. Charles KING (Liberia) was glad to see that a number of countries had modified their former policies favouring "separateness" for peoples of different races or religions, and that the changes in question had meant substantial improvements in their social structure. The Liberian delegation had been particularly glad to hear what the United States representative had to say on apartheid. It was most reassuring for the millions of coloured people in countries where segregation continued to be practised contrary to the principles of the Charter.

2. He quoted a number of passages from a speech made by Mr. Jooste, Secretary for External Affairs in the Union of South Africa, to the South African Academy of Arts and Sciences. Mr. Jooste, speaking of his country's role in international affairs and in Africa, said that since the Union was at once a Western and an African State it could, at the international level, serve as a link between Western Europe and Africa; on the African continent, it must maintain good relations with the other African States in the interest of mutual prosperity. The periodical which published the extracts from Mr. Jooste's speech emphasized the importance of co-operation between the Union and other African States and said that the success of that co-operation depended on several factors including the Union's handling of its racial policy.

3. Since leading officials in the Union of South Africa realized how important a part the Union had to play, in Africa above all, the Liberian delegation had hoped that the Union representative would attend the debate on the question of apartheid, which could thus have been discussed without recriminations, in an atmosphere of calm and dignity. Unfortunately, the Union delegation had once again refused to take part in the discussion of the question.

4. The Liberian delegation was fully aware that the discussion by the United Nations of the national policy of a Member State year after year could provoke an unfortunate reaction on the part of the Government concerned. On the other hand, it believed that the General

Assembly must, in accordance with Article 1 (4) of the Charter, be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of the ends set forth in the Charter, one of which was to promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.

5. Since the Union of South Africa persisted in ignoring world public opinion as well as the General Assembly resolutions calling upon it to conform to democratic principles and to accord all its inhabitants the fundamental rights recognized by the Charter, it would appear that the General Assembly would have to continue to examine the question until the Union Government showed that it intended to comply with world opinion.

6. The Union Government refused to recognize the competence of the United Nations to consider the question of apartheid. Naturally, a Member State was entitled to enact legislation to regulate its internal affairs, but it must also take care that the policy it pursued was in accordance with its obligations under the Charter. The United Nations was therefore competent to remind a Member State of its obligations, and there could be no doubt that the policy of apartheid was contrary to the principles of the Charter. World public opinion condemned discrimination, which it feared might seriously impair human relations. The peoples of Asia and Africa were moved by a strong desire and determination to bring about the situation described in the Charter, a world in which all men would be equal without distinction as to race, colour, sex or belief. The policy of apartheid was a matter of life and death to the non-whites.

7. The Liberian delegation was one of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution before the Committee (A/SPC/L.25 and Add.1 and 2). It was drafted in the mildest of terms and could be supported by all States. It was to be hoped that the Government of the Union of South Africa would not remain indifferent to world opinion and would give effect to the recommendations it contained.

8. The CHAIRMAN declared the general debate closed. He invited representatives who wished to explain their vote on the draft resolution to do so.

9. Mr. BEELEY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation understood and respected the motives which had led a number of delegations to request the inclusion of the question of apartheid in the Assembly's agenda and to submit the draft resolution; however, it was doubtful whether the annual debate on that item really served the cause which those delegations had at heart. In the opinion of the United Kingdom delegation, the General Assembly was not competent to discuss the policy applied by the Union of South Africa to its nationals, let alone to adopt a resolution on the subject. The very fact that the General Assembly was considering the matter was a violation of the Charter.

10. The United Kingdom delegation believed that under Article 2 (7) of the Charter, the question of race conflict in South Africa came essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the Union of South Africa. Attempts had been made to reduce the significance of that Article either by alleging that there was a conflict between various Articles of the Charter and that the Assembly must resolve that conflict, or by invoking Article 55 c and Article 56. Nevertheless, Article 2 (7) was clear and categorical. It stipulated that nothing contained in the Charter authorized the United Nations to intervene in matters which were essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State. Therefore, there could be no conflict between the Articles of the Charter, and other provisions could not be invoked in order to interpret Article 2 (7) since it took precedence over them all. With regard to the Venezuelan representative's statement (88th meeting) that the Committee should not restrict itself to too literal an interpretation of the Charter, he himself had been present at the San Francisco Conference in 1945, and he recalled the care with which the representatives had chosen the words of the Charter, including those of Article 2 (7) to which they had attributed a very specific meaning. Those words meant only one thing and any attempt to interpret them differently would be tantamount to a tacit revision of the Charter.

11. Frequent references had been made to Article 55 c which stated that the United Nations should promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion. In that matter, the Government of the Union of South Africa was not the only one open to criticism. There were many situations in which the domestic policy of a State was not to the taste of other Member States. To give Article 55 c precedence over Article 2 (7) in regard to the Union of South Africa would be creating a dangerous precedent.

12. In regard to Article 56, he recalled that the United Kingdom had always fulfilled its obligations under the Charter in all the Territories under its administration. However, it interpreted that Article as an undertaking on the part of the United Kingdom to co-operate with other Member States in securing the implementation of fundamental human rights, and not as justifying investigations or attempts to reform the relations between other Governments and their peoples.

13. The United Kingdom delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution. In so doing, it was not expressing any opinion on the internal policies of the Union of South Africa. The sole purpose of the vote was to defend the Charter of the United Nations.

14. Mr. DE VAUELLES (France) said that his delegation appreciated the moderation shown by the sponsors of the draft resolution. As a matter of principle, however, it was unable to support it. His delegation considered that under Article 2 (7) of the Charter the domestic legislation of a State, whether open to criticism or not, could not be discussed in the United Nations. Such interference in the domestic affairs of a Member State constituted a precedent that was extremely dangerous for the future and for the very existence of the Organization.

15. Delegations which had given Articles 55 and 56 of the Charter precedence over Article 2 (7) might in future find it difficult to object to the inclusion in the

agenda of such items as the non-application in certain countries of the principle of equality between the sexes, not only from a political standpoint but also in regard to remuneration for work. As the representative of the Philippines had pointed out (86th meeting), no country could claim to act in complete conformity with the principles of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It was therefore disquieting to hear some Members—the representative of Albania, for example (91st meeting) uttering thinly veiled warnings to other Member States as having a lesson to learn from the debate. Such statements gave a hint of future recriminations which would threaten the very existence of the United Nations. According to the interpretation given by the representative of Colombia to the main Articles of the Charter (92nd meeting), the United Nations would eventually become a sort of supreme court authorized to supervise the legislation of Member States. Such a metamorphosis of the Organization might be desirable, but it was very doubtful whether Members would be willing, at that stage, to subject the activities of their elected assemblies to judgements of that kind.

16. The French delegation's vote would by no means signify that it approved of the policy of segregation practised by the Government of the Union of South Africa, a policy entirely alien to French tradition and philosophy. France had always practised the principle that all persons were equal before the law. Thus, the second-ranking person in France, the one who would provisionally assume the conduct of public affairs in the event of the death of the President of the Republic, was a coloured man who had represented a metropolitan department in the Council of the Republic for fifteen years. That one example provided an eloquent answer to those who maintained that colonialism and racialism always went hand in hand. It was, incidentally, surprising to see that among the delegations which condemned the Union Government for its policy of apartheid there were some which criticized other countries, such as France, for practising the very opposite policy and making their overseas compatriots fully-fledged citizens.

17. Mr. MESSINA (Dominican Republic) said that, as at past sessions of the Assembly, his delegation had not participated in the debate on the question of the race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid of the Government of the Union of South Africa, because it doubted whether the United Nations was competent to deal with the matter. Under Article 2 (7), nothing in the Charter authorized the United Nations to intervene in matters which were essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State.

18. Moreover the principle of non-intervention in the domestic or foreign affairs of another State was upheld by the Constitution of the Dominican Republic and was an integral part of the country's foreign policy. Article 8 of the Constitution expressly guaranteed the protection of human rights.

19. The Constitution of the Dominican Republic protected the rights pertaining to the human person without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion, in conformity with Article 1 (3) of the Charter and with the social, political and juridical traditions of the Dominican Republic. Thus no group of persons could be set up which had privileges not enjoyed by other groups, nor could any racial or religious problem arise.

20. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) said that his delegation had not participated in the general debate on the question of the race conflict in South Africa because it considered that the inclusion of the item on the Assembly's agenda and a discussion of it constituted interference in the domestic affairs of South Africa and thus violated the provisions of Article 2 (7) of the Charter. While it considered itself bound by its pledge under Article 56, Australia held that the provisions of Article 2 (7) took precedence over those of Article 56. Some representatives had expressed the view that the Australian delegation's interpretation of Article 2 (7) might be prejudicial to the aims stated in the Charter, in Article 55 for example. That might be so in certain cases, but the fact remained that under Article 2 (7) the United Nations had specifically undertaken not to intervene in matters which were essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of a Member State, and many States had accepted the obligations laid down in the Charter on the basis of that very safeguard. The mere fact that the Assembly had on six previous occasions stated that it was competent to consider the question of race conflict in South Africa did not mean that it was competent to do so. The repetition of an error did not make it a truth.

21. It had been argued that an issue arising out of a treaty obligation could not be regarded as a matter of domestic jurisdiction of a State and that the same applied to the obligations undertaken by Member States under the Charter. Such an argument was untenable in view of the explicit nature of the provisions of Article 2 (7) which stated that "nothing contained in the Charter"—and that applied as much to Article 56 as to any other Article—"shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State". Some representatives had maintained that Member States were required to bring their domestic legislation into line with their international commitments. The Australian delegation did not dispute that; but it could not agree that the General Assembly thereby had the right to discuss to what extent the Union of South Africa had or had not complied with its obligations under the Charter.

22. Needless to say, the position of the Australian delegation did not imply its approval of the policy of apartheid. Australia was opposed to any form of discrimination and had always stood by its pledge concerning respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

23. For those reasons the Australian delegation would vote against the draft resolution as a whole. It would have been prepared to support paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 if they had not been embodied in a resolution which had no place in the Assembly; and it would therefore abstain from the vote on those paragraphs.

24. Mr. Albano NOGUEIRA (Portugal) recalled that Portugal had been one of the pioneers of multiracial integration and that the principle of co-operation between races was enshrined in its legislation and traditions. The Portuguese delegation found any discrimination based on race unacceptable and entirely shared the ideals underlying the draft resolution. While commending the moderation of the text, however, the Portuguese delegation considered that moderation alone was not enough in the present case. The principle of non-interference in the domestic affairs of a State, as laid down in Article 2 (7) of the Charter, was

of primary importance to the life and work of the United Nations and should therefore be respected absolutely. It was in the light of those considerations that his delegation would vote in the matter.

25. Mr. DIMECHKIE (Lebanon) considered that the United Nations was competent to discuss the question of race conflict in the Union of South Africa. While it was true that human rights were not always respected and that racial prejudice still existed in some countries, the situation in the Union of South Africa was particularly serious since the Government had built up a system of racial discrimination sanctioned by law. In doing so it violated the very principles of the Charter. It was for that reason that the delegation of Lebanon was co-sponsoring the draft resolution.

26. Mr. ULLOA (Peru) said that he would vote in favour of the draft resolution. His position was consistent with the tradition of his country which, ever since it had achieved independence 137 years earlier, had maintained equality between the two groups making up its population, the indigenous Peruvians and the descendants of the colonizers. That attitude was dictated by moral, philosophical and juridical considerations. The Peruvian delegation considered that by their very nature the general principles of the Charter prevailed over the narrow concept of national competence. Human rights were clearly an international matter since man was no longer, as in the past, indirectly subject to international law but had become its primary concern.

27. Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) said that, for the reasons set forth by his delegation at the 88th meeting, he would be compelled to vote against the draft resolution. He wished to make it clear once again that Belgium's position should not be construed as approval, even tacit approval, of the policy of apartheid. It was merely based on respect for the fundamental principle of the Charter laid down in Article 2 (7). Since it believed that the United Nations was not competent to consider the matter, the Belgian delegation would not comment on the substance of the various provisions of the draft resolution. It would be unable to vote in favor of any of the paragraphs—even those which, like paragraph 1, appeared to state truisms.

28. Mr. PATHAK (India) requested a roll-call vote on the separate parts of the draft resolution. The Committee would vote first on the preamble, then on operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 as a whole, and lastly on operative paragraph 4.

29. Mr. DE VAUCELLES (France) asked for a separate vote on operative paragraph 1. The French delegation would vote in favour of that paragraph, which represented France's concept of a unified community.

30. The CHAIRMAN said that a separate roll-call vote would be taken on the preamble, on each operative paragraph, and on the draft resolution as a whole (A/SPC/L.25 and Add.1 and 2).

31. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the preamble of the draft resolution.

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

In favour: Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Ar-

gentina, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Belgium, France, Portugal.

Abstaining: Canada, Dominican Republic, Finland, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, Spain.

The preamble of the draft resolution was adopted by 65 votes to 5, with 7 abstentions.

32. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 1.

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

In favour: New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands.

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Belgium, Dominican Republic.

Operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 73 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

33. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 2.

The United Arab Republic, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: United Arab Republic, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: Belgium, France, Portugal.

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Dominican Republic, Spain.

Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 70 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.

34. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 3.

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

In favour: Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon.

Against: Portugal, Belgium.

Abstaining: Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Dominican Republic, France.

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 70 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

35. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 4.

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

In favour: Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary.

Against: Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Belgium, France.

Abstaining: Italy, Netherlands, Spain, Dominican Republic, Finland.

Operative paragraph 4 was adopted by 67 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions.

36. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole.

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

In favour: New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal.

Against: Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Belgium, France.

Abstaining: Spain, Dominican Republic, Finland, Netherlands.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 68 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.

37. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) said that Indonesia, like South Africa, was a multiracial community. However, the composition and the status of the various ethnic groups in Indonesia were quite different from what they were in the Union of South Africa, where a majority of Africans and a relatively large minority of people of Asian origin were struggling for equality before the law with the white population. In Indonesia a substantial minority of people of Asian and European origin had opted for Indonesian citizenship at the time of the country's accession to independence and therefore enjoyed equality before the law with the native Indonesians. In addition, there were those born in Indonesia or whose families had lived there for generations. While they considered Indonesia to be their country, they did not wish to acquire Indonesian citizenship and maintained their foreign status. They also enjoyed human rights and freedoms but not certain political rights such as those provided in article 21 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Indonesian delegation wished to make that clear in view of the wording of operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution just adopted. In that context, clearly the words "all persons" in the phrase "equality before the law of all persons" applied only to the citizens of a country. It was on that understanding that the Indonesian delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution.

38. Mr. HUOT SAMBATH (Cambodia) said that his delegation had refrained from speaking in the general debate; but that did not imply any lack of concern over the racial conflict in South Africa and the sufferings of the African inhabitants caused by the Union Government's apartheid policy. The Cambodian delegation had voted for the draft resolution in order to make clear the position of its Government which, while it had no wish to interfere in the internal affairs of other States,

would like to see racial discrimination completely disappear. It also wished to emphasize once again that there existed in other parts of the world a danger no less serious than that of racial discrimination—the enforced assimilation of an ethnic minority against its expressed will by a particular racial group. At the twelfth session of the General Assembly the Cambodian delegation had called the Committee's attention to article 15 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which provided that everyone had the right to a nationality and that no one should be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality or denied the right to change his nationality (63rd meeting, para.18). It wished to state once again that that right should be granted to all ethnic groups and should be observed by every State Member of the United Nations.

39. Mr. PLAJA (Italy), explaining his delegation's vote on the draft resolution, said that Italy remained faithful to the principle of observance of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It therefore disapproved of any policy of racial discrimination wherever it might be practised. That was why the Italian delegation had voted in favour of the first three operative paragraphs of the draft resolution. It had abstained on the preamble and operative paragraph 4 because they contained a specific reference to a policy practised by the Government of a Member State. The Italian delegation still doubted whether the General Assembly was competent to consider the question of the racial conflict in South Africa. While it was true that some Articles of the Charter related to human rights and fundamental freedoms, Member States which had subscribed to the Charter were also bound by the provisions of Article 2 (7). There was undoubtedly some relationship, or even contradiction, between that Article and the Articles relating to human rights; all that could be said was that it had not yet been possible to find the right balance between them.

40. The Italian delegation appreciated how difficult it was for the Union Government to solve the problems of a country with a multiracial society, and hoped that it would find a way to solve them in accordance with the principles enshrined in the Charter. With those considerations in mind, the Italian delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, which expressed the views of a large majority of the Committee.

41. Mr. GASHKA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that a number of delegations had felt that the draft resolution, although constructive, did not go far enough and was couched in unduly broad terms. The delegation of the USSR understood operative paragraph 3 to apply to those Member States which at present practised racial discrimination in any form, and primarily to the Union of South Africa which pursued a racial policy condemned by an overwhelming majority of the Member States and inconsistent with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.