

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records



**THIRD COMMITTEE, 1779th  
MEETING**

Wednesday, 4 November 1970,  
at 3.40 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

Chairman: Miss Maria GROZA (Romania).

**AGENDA ITEMS 53 AND 60**

**Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination (*continued*) (A/8003, chap. IX, sect. A; A/8027, A/8057, A/8061 and Add.1, A/8062 and Add.1 and 2, A/8117, A/C.3/L.1765, A/C.3/L.1803):**

- (a) **International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General;**
- (b) **Measures for effectively combating racial discrimination and the policies of *apartheid* and segregation in southern Africa: report of the Secretary-General;**
- (c) **Report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, submitted under article 9 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;**
- (d) **Status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General**

**The importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and of the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights (*continued*) (A/7998, A/C.3/L.1802/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1804, A/C.3/L.1805)**

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS**  
(*concluded*)

1. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) announced that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1802/Rev.1 had decided to replace the word "Noting" in the eighth preambular paragraph by the word "Recalling". In addition, the words "by international instruments" in operative paragraphs 1 and 5 would be deleted so as to take account of objections raised by some delegations. He was in agreement with some of the suggestions made by the representative of Costa Rica but the other sponsors had stated that they were not willing to accept further changes. However, he wished to point out that the concepts of the territorial integrity of States and of non-interference in the internal affairs of States had been uppermost in the minds of the sponsors and it was for that reason that the two paragraphs in question included the words "recognized as being entitled to". He hoped that the representative of Costa Rica would now be able to support the present formulation. The purpose of operative paragraph 6 was to ensure that the question of the right of peoples under colonial domination to self-determination would be studied as a human right, but no attempt had

been made to dictate to the Commission on Human Rights the manner in which it was to deal with the subject.

2. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) said that she still had serious reservations regarding operative paragraph 1 and requested a separate vote on the phrase "by whatever means at their disposal". Similarly, she was opposed to mentioning peoples by name and would like a separate vote on the phrase "especially of the peoples of southern Africa and Palestine" in operative paragraph 5. In view of her request, perhaps the Israeli representative would withdraw his amendment (A/C.3/L.1804) proposing the deletion of the words "and Palestine" in that same paragraph.

3. Mr. PAPADEMAS (Cyprus) said that, since the sponsors had agreed to delete the references to "international instruments" in operative paragraphs 1 and 5, he failed to see why those words had been retained in operative paragraph 3.

4. Mr. LORCH (Israel) said his Government felt that the draft resolution dealt with two completely separate issues. However, Israel's position with regard to the question of southern Africa had been clearly stated and, in deference to the wishes of the Costa Rican representative, he would withdraw his amendment (A/C.3/L.1804).

5. Mr. MANI (India) requested roll-call votes on operative paragraphs 1, 3, 4 and 5.

6. Mr. PAOLINI (France) asked for a separate vote on the third preambular paragraph.

7. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.3/L.1802/Rev.1 and the amendments thereto.

*The third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution was adopted by 85 votes to 2, with 7 abstentions.*

*The preamble as a whole was adopted by 77 votes to 2, with 17 abstentions.*

*The phrase "by whatever means at their disposal" in operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 65 votes to 27, with 8 abstentions.*

*At the request of the Indian representative, the vote on operative paragraph 1 was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Barbados, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burundi,

Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, People's Republic of the Congo, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Swaziland, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania.

*Against:* Australia, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Honduras, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Malawi, Mexico, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, Spain.

*Operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 70 votes to 20, with 16 abstentions.*

*At the request of the Indian representative, the vote on operative paragraph 3 was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, People's Republic of the Congo, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Canada, Colombia, Cyprus, Nicaragua, Peru, Portugal, Sweden, United States of America, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Cameroon.

*Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 93 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.*

*The Saudi Arabian oral sub-amendment proposing the replacement of the words "by force in violation" in the*

*Indian amendment (A/C.3/L.1805) by "in contravention" was adopted by 39 votes to 4, with 55 abstentions.*

8. Mr. MANI (India) said that, in view of the adoption of the Saudi Arabian sub-amendment, his delegation now wished to withdraw its own amendment (A/C.3/L.1805).

9. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon), supported by Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica), pointed out that, under rule 123 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, it was not possible to withdraw an amendment once it had been sub-amended.

*The Indian amendment (A/C.3/L.1805), as orally amended, was adopted by 36 votes to 3, with 61 abstentions.*

*At the request of the Kuwaiti representative the vote on the phrase "especially of the peoples of southern Africa and Palestine" in operative paragraph 5 was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, People's Republic of the Congo, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Swaziland, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic.

*Against:* United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Honduras, Israel, Jamaica, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Rwanda.

*Abstaining:* Venezuela, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Madagascar, Mexico, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Singapore, Sweden, Togo.

*The phrase was adopted by 49 votes to 22, with 35 abstentions.*

*At the request of the Indian representative, the vote on operative paragraph 5 as a whole was taken by roll-call.*

*Upper Volta, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Chile, China, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia,

Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Pakistan, People's Republic of the Congo, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Swaziland, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania.

*Against:* Uruguay, Brazil, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Israel, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Rwanda, United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Madagascar, Mexico, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Singapore, Sweden, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

*Operative paragraph 5 was adopted by 51 votes to 13, with 43 abstentions.*

10. Mr. PAOLINI (France) asked for a separate vote on operative paragraph 6.

*Operative paragraph 6 was adopted by 79 votes to 12, with 16 abstentions.*

*The operative part of the draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 66 votes to 13, with 25 abstentions.*

*At the request of the Pakistan representative, the vote on the draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Swaziland, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Barbados, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Pakistan, People's Republic of the Congo, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone.

*Against:* United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Canada, France, Israel, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Portugal.

*Abstaining:* Sweden, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Cambodia, Cameroon,

Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Madagascar, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Rwanda.

*Draft resolution A/C.3/L.1802/Rev.1 as a whole, as orally revised and as amended, was adopted by 67 votes to 12, with 28 abstentions.*

*Mrs. Barish (Costa Rica), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

### *Explanations of vote*

11. Mr. RAKOTOSIHANAKA (Madagascar) said that his delegation had voted in favour of both the draft resolutions on the elimination of racial discrimination (A/C.3/L.1799/Rev.1 and A/C.3/L.1800/Rev.1) because it wished to join in denouncing the inhuman policy of *apartheid* and other forms of racism. Nevertheless, it considered that the eighth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1800/Rev.1 did not reflect the purely humanitarian objectives with which the Committee should be concerned, and it had abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 4 because it believed that the General Assembly should not make statements of the kind contained in that clause without a prior recommendation by the Security Council. Finally, although his delegation agreed with many of the provisions of the draft resolution on the right of self-determination (A/C.3/L.1802/Rev.1), it had abstained in the vote on the resolution as a whole because it thought it inadvisable for the Committee to deal with questions which were being considered at a different level in other Committees.

12. Mrs. OGATA (Japan) said that, although her delegation was aware of the difficulties of separating human rights from political questions and of constantly advocating restraint and patience when political measures seemed to be ineffective in alleviating misery, correcting injustice and eradicating evil, it nevertheless considered that the Third Committee should not be turned into a purely political forum and that its resolutions on racial discrimination should not be identical with those of the Special Political Committee and the Fourth Committee. Japan had therefore abstained from voting on draft resolution A/C.3/L.1800/Rev.1, but its abstention should not be taken to indicate a negative attitude towards the elimination of racial discrimination, particularly of *apartheid*. It had voted for draft resolution A/C.3/L.1799/Rev.1 because it considered that the proposed legislative, educational and social measures were all-encompassing and conducive to the elimination of racial discrimination on a long-term basis. Moreover, that text was complementary to draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1801).

13. Turning to the draft resolution on the right to self-determination (A/C.3/L.1802/Rev.1), she said that her delegation appreciated the constructive approach of the sponsors in accepting certain suggestions, including one of its own, and had been able to support operative paragraph 2. However, it had been obliged to abstain in the vote on the resolution as a whole, mainly because operative paragraph 1 would allow peoples under colonial and alien domination to restore their right to self-determination "by whatever means at their disposal". In introducing the draft,

the Pakistan representative had said that the paragraph was based on the relevant principle of the Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, but it should be borne in mind that under that principle peoples in pursuit of the exercise of their right to self-determination were entitled to seek and receive support in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter. Japan attached the greatest importance to the strict observance of the principle of peaceful settlement of international disputes set out in the Charter and could not subscribe to any text which might imply that the United Nations condoned the use of force in the settlement of disputes.

14. Mr. KUEI (China) said that, although his delegation had voted for draft resolution A/C.3/L.1800/Rev.1 as a whole, in the conviction that the policies of racial discrimination and *apartheid* were both morally indefensible and politically self-defeating, it had been obliged to abstain in the votes on the eighth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 6. The preambular paragraph took certain States to task for disregarding earlier General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, and the operative paragraph called upon Governments still maintaining diplomatic, consular and other relations with South Africa to terminate such relations immediately. His country, because of the large number of Chinese residents in South Africa, had for a number of years maintained a consulate-general in Johannesburg, with the sole function of rendering services to and protecting those residents. Its continuation should not be construed in any way as an indication of support for the South African Government in its racial policies.

15. Mr. COVACI (Romania) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1800/Rev.1 because of Romania's solidarity with the struggle of peoples for liberation from imperialist and colonial domination and for the maintenance and consolidation of their national independence and sovereignty. His country supported the right of peoples to self-determination, regarded the policy of racial discrimination and *apartheid* as a crime against humanity, and condemned the policy of oppression and racial discrimination imposed on the peoples of the Territories under Portuguese colonial rule. It maintained and was extending mutually profitable co-operative relationships with the newly independent States of Africa and Asia. It consistently advocated the prompt application by all States of the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on effective measures to combat racial policy and practices. Draft resolution A/C.3/L.1800/Rev.1 provided for a wide range of political and humanitarian measures, going beyond educational and legislative actions, which were obviously inadequate for achieving the desired objective of eliminating colonial domination, racial discrimination and *apartheid*. His delegation had voted in favour of operative paragraph 4 on the understanding that its provisions constituted political support in the struggle against racial discrimination and *apartheid*. The resolution represented a new step by the United Nations towards the liquidation of the remnants of colonialism and racial policy and practices.

16. His delegation had also voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1802/Rev.1 because his country stead-

fastly advocated the affirmation and application of the principles of self-determination of peoples and respect for the right of all peoples to decide their own fate, to pursue the social and political development in keeping with their wishes and their vital interests, to promote foreign policy in conformity with the world's aspirations for peace, and to participate with equal rights in the activities of the community of nations. It had voted for operative paragraph 5 of that resolution in conformity with Romania's position on the Middle East question. As stated at the 1893rd plenary meeting of the General Assembly, on 2 November 1970, Romania considered that the achievement of stability and a lasting settlement of that conflict depended on the solution of the problem of the Palestinian people in accordance with their national interests, which presupposed respect for their right to self-determination and hence the creation of an independent national State. The draft resolution, together with other United Nations documents, constituted a broad affirmation of the principles of self-determination and the rights of peoples to decide their fate according to their own interests and aspirations.

17. Mrs. DINCMEN (Turkey) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1800/Rev.1. It had supported the sixth preambular paragraph because it agreed with the views expressed in that text. However, it stressed that the mission which the Security Council had entrusted to the United Kingdom Government as administering Power for Southern Rhodesia had not yet come to an end. Her delegation's votes for operative paragraphs 1 and 2 should be interpreted in the light of the Declaration on the Occasion of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the United Nations. It had abstained on certain paragraphs because it did not agree with their wording.

18. Turkey had been able to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1799/Rev.1 in spite of its weakness because draft resolution A/C.3/L.1800/Rev.1 had already been adopted.

19. Her delegation had also supported draft resolution A/C.3/L.1802/Rev.1. Its vote for the retention of the words "by whatever means at their disposal" in operative paragraph 1 and for operative paragraph 1 as a whole should also be interpreted in the light of the Declaration on the Occasion of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the United Nations.

20. Mr. DIETZ (Norway) said that, while his delegation attached great importance to the matter discussed under item 53, it considered that the political implications of the problem should be dealt with in other committees. That observation applied to draft resolution A/C.3/L.1800/Rev.1, and his delegation had therefore, after careful consideration, felt obliged to vote against it. That vote was intended to emphasize Norway's view that the Committee should not attempt to do the work of other committees: it should not be interpreted as representing his country's position on the questions of racial discrimination and *apartheid* in the Third or any other Committee.

21. Mrs. STEVENSON (Liberia) recalled that it was Liberia and Ethiopia which had brought the question of South West Africa before the International Court of Justice

in 1960. During the Commemorative Session, Liberia had reiterated its opposition to any form of oppression in any part of the world, particularly in Africa, and its commitment, through the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations, to stamp out colonialism and racism in Africa. It was a matter of the deepest regret that twenty-five years after the founding of the United Nations gross violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms were still being perpetrated in certain parts of the world and that racial discrimination persisted despite repeated condemnation in the United Nations.

22. Her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1800/Rev.1 because it was in keeping with the aims of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. Its purpose in requesting a separate vote on the beginning of operative paragraph 7 had been not—as had been suggested—to juggle with words, but to bring the paragraph into line with operative paragraph 5 and put the facts in logical sequence. It had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.3/L.1799/Rev.1 because the sponsors had been unable to include the words “take effective measures” in operative paragraph 4. It had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1802/Rev.1 because that text reflected its position on the questions of racial discrimination, *apartheid* and the right of peoples to self-determination.

23. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1799/Rev.1 because of the humanitarian approach to the problems of racial discrimination and *apartheid* which it reflected. In dealing with those inhuman policies and practices the Committee should be concerned mainly with their effects on the daily life of the people concerned. Her delegation agreed with the views of the sponsors concerning the roots of racial discrimination and *apartheid* and the need to combat them by education and information as well as through the abolition of discriminatory laws. It had also supported the draft resolution because it referred to all human beings discriminated against and did not only single out those who were the victims of *apartheid*.

24. Her delegation had abstained on draft resolution A/C.3/L.1800/Rev.1. Although it, too, referred to all forms of racial discrimination, its approach did not appear to be realistic or constructive, nor was it in line with the principles and provisions of the Charter. Italy had voted against the eighth preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 because of their condemnation of countries maintaining relations with South Africa and of the United Kingdom Government in relation to the situation in Southern Rhodesia: it believed that in order to combat *apartheid* a dialogue with South Africa should be maintained and intensified. It had voted against operative paragraph 4 because it dealt with questions which were regulated by Article 5 of the Charter of the United Nations and were outside the Committee's competence, and because the opinion expressed in that paragraph seemed to be at variance with the principles of the Charter. Despite those reservations, her delegation had not voted against the draft resolution as a whole but had abstained in order to confirm that the Italian people and Government condemned all forms of racial discrimination and *apartheid* in particular.

25. Her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1801, as it represented an important step forward by the United Nations in the field of action to combat racial discrimination. In that connexion, she informed the Committee that preparations by her country for ratification of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination were far advanced.

26. Her delegation had, with regret, abstained on draft resolution A/C.3/L.1802/Rev.1 because it contained certain statements with which it could not agree.

27. Mr. TANNER (Finland) said that he would explain his vote on draft resolution A/C.3/L.1800/Rev.1 by quoting from the statement made by the representative of Norway at the 1776th meeting on behalf of the five Nordic countries. Norway had said that those countries feared that the total effect of the United Nations resolutions on racial discrimination, *apartheid* and the right to self-determination would be greatly reduced unless each Committee was left to conduct its own affairs. The Third Committee could do very important work in the field of human rights, but it would detract from the value and reduce the impact of the resolutions of the other Committees, as well as its own, if it tried to do their work for them.

28. His delegation's firm stand against *apartheid* and other forms of racial discrimination was well known and remained unchanged; however, agreement on the goal did not automatically mean agreement on the ways of reaching it. He regretted that the draft resolution included a number of provisions which would slow down rather than hasten the elimination of *apartheid* and other forms of racial discrimination.

29. Those principles had also dictated his delegation's voting on draft resolutions A/C.3/L.1799/Rev.1 and A/C.3/L.1802/Rev.1.

30. Mr. DOS SANTOS (Portugal) said that his delegation's votes on all the draft resolutions submitted under items 53 and 60 had been cast with the fundamental role of the Committee in mind. It was right for the Committee to urge the observance of social, humanitarian and educational principles, but inadmissible for it to advocate violence or to seek the solution of essentially moral problems by political means, as did the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.3/L.1800/Rev.1 and A/C.3/L.1802/Rev.1. Those texts ran counter to the spirit of Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations, which provided that international disputes should be settled by peaceful means. It had been said during the debate that *apartheid* lay at the root of colonialism, imperialism and economic exploitation; his delegation, for its part, regarded *apartheid* and all other racial discrimination as a purely humanitarian problem which could not be solved by violence. Moreover, it was both inappropriate and inexpedient to urge all States to break off diplomatic and other relations with South Africa: from the point of view of the Committee, it was essential to maintain a dialogue with racist régimes and to use all possible legislative, social and educational means to persuade them to change their ways. His delegation had therefore voted against draft resolutions A/C.3/L.1800/Rev.1 and A/C.3/L.1802/Rev.1 and in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1799/Rev.1.

31. In conclusion, he wished to refute the charges that had been levelled against his country. Portugal did not practise racial discrimination, and regretted that such accusations had been made in the social, cultural and humanitarian Committee of the General Assembly, which should be concerned with individual human rights and freedoms rather than with measures against whole nations.

32. Miss EDMONDS (United States of America) recalled that during the debate the United States delegation had expressed concern over the proliferation of resolutions which, though well intended, often outdistanced the capacity of the United Nations machinery to implement them. It welcomed the adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1799/Rev.1, which reflected the Committee's concern about racial discrimination and called for appropriate action, in conformity with the Charter. However, it had voted against draft resolutions A/C.3/L.1800/Rev.1 and A/C.3/L.1802/Rev.1 because many of their provisions were political in character and required careful examination in appropriate United Nations bodies, such as the Special Political Committee and the Fourth Committee. The Third Committee should not exercise jurisdiction in areas which were clearly the province of other bodies.

33. Mr. RYBAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1800/Rev.1 because it contained important provisions on the struggle against racism and *apartheid*. It had voted against draft resolution A/C.3/L.1799/Rev.1 because it was contradictory to the other draft resolution, which it sought to weaken, and was vaguely worded. The fact that it had been adopted by a majority of only two showed that it carried little moral weight and that, despite the efforts made in the United Nations, no effective measures had as yet been taken to put an end to colonialism. The fact that Portugal had supported the draft resolution was no accident. It was regrettable that the resolution had been supported by five African countries in addition to the Western States. However, he was glad that, despite the many votes cast against certain important provisions, draft resolutions A/C.3/L.1800/Rev.1 and A/

C.3/L.1802/Rev.1 had been adopted by overwhelming majorities. He had welcomed the assurance given by the Director of the Division of Human Rights at the 1777th meeting that the special study on racial discrimination referred to in the note by the Secretary-General (A/C.3/L.1803) would be distributed in Russian. His delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1802/Rev.1. Its position on operative paragraph 4 would be clear from the fact that the USSR was one of the sponsors of the draft resolution on measures for the strengthening of international security.<sup>1</sup>

34. Miss AGUIRRE (Mexico) said that her delegation had abstained on operative paragraphs 2 and 4 and voted against operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1800/Rev.1 because of their political implications. It was opposed to the use of force, which was contrary to the principles of the Charter, and considered that peaceful measures had not yet been exhausted. It had abstained on the draft resolution as a whole because its provisions were such that it would have been more appropriate to discuss it in the Special Political Committee.

35. Her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1799/Rev.1, which was more closely in accordance with the Third Committee's humanitarian, social and cultural functions, and in favour of the constructive draft resolution in document A/C.3/L.1801.

36. With regard to draft resolution A/C.3/L.1802/Rev.1, her delegation had abstained on operative paragraph 5 because it believed that all peoples had the right to self-determination and it was invidious to name any in particular, but it had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, interpreting operative paragraph 1 as implying the use of peaceful means in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

*The meeting rose at 6 p.m.*

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 32, document A/8096, para. 5 (a)