

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records



**1816th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Friday, 21 November 1969,  
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

### Agenda item 34:

The policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa: report of the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa

Report of the Special Political Committee . . . . . 1

### Agenda item 65:

Question of Territories under Portuguese administration:  
(a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(b) Report of the Secretary-General  
Report of the Fourth Committee . . . . . 4

### Agenda item 102:

Question of Southern Rhodesia: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples  
Report of the Fourth Committee . . . . .

*President:* Miss Angie E. BROOKS (Liberia).

*In the absence of the President, Mr. Mojsov (Yugoslavia), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

## AGENDA ITEM 34

**The policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa: report of the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa**

### REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/7773 AND CORR.1)

1. Mr. AKONGO (Uganda), Rapporteur of the Special Political Committee: It is my privilege to present on behalf of the Special Political Committee the report of the Committee's examination of agenda item 34 [A/7773 and Corr.1].

2. The report of the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa [A/7625/Rev.1] was considered by the Special Political Committee at twenty meetings held between 21 October and 14 November 1969. Thirteen delegations took part in the general debate. On Friday, 14 November, the Committee adopted two draft resolutions, sponsored by 46 and 42 delegations respectively, the texts of which are contained in paragraph 18 of the report now before the Assembly.

*Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the Special Political Committee.*

3. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their vote.

4. Mr. OHIN (Togo) (*translated from French*): Although statements should relate to explanations of vote, I believe that in view of the special importance which we attach to the subject to be considered this morning, I should give some brief details of my Government's views and explain why Togo is one of the sponsors of the draft resolutions on which the Assembly will be called upon to vote.

5. The incredible anachronism of the régimes now rampant in southern Africa and in the territories under Portuguese occupation becomes apparent in all its horror if we try to place it in the context of the history of colonization across the centuries. We should then have to glance briefly at colonization as a whole, at the morality behind it, at the reaction of the colonized peoples and at the duty to decolonize. We may thus go back to the earliest times, to the banishment from the Garden of Eden when land was given to man to occupy and cultivate for his own needs.

6. Colonization in the first few thousand years of history, on land where there was no human population, and the colonization which started in the sixteenth century—as well as its significance from the nineteenth century until today—are surely not identical. The increase in the world's population, the evolution of races and the progress of civilization have profoundly changed its nature. The basic needs which necessitated migrations towards more fertile lands and their occupation, marked by more or less violence and more or less oppressive exploitation, were replaced by the needs and ambitions of the great modern nations, which seek in their colonies economic resources and the means to expand their power.

7. The problem today is the duty to decolonize; but before speaking of decolonization, we should try to find out whether there is a colonial morality. The colonial morality was defined in the first half of the sixteenth century. The discovery and colonization of the Americas by the Spaniards coincided with the Renaissance, when money reigned supreme. The missionaries who accompanied the Conquistadores were unable to protect the native inhabitants from ruthless exploitation. Las Casas, the most famous of them all, travelled to Europe several times in order to denounce in Madrid the evil deeds of the colonizers. At that time, he was called the "theologian of colonization". He was detested by his compatriots, who even tried to lynch him and accused him of being a

crypto-Lutheran. In Spain itself a Dominican theologian, Francisco de Vitoria, who could not tolerate these evils in distant lands, was considered as the founder of international law. The eighteenth century seemed to herald the end of colonization. Empires disappeared; England lost America, from which Spain had to withdraw after three centuries of domination. Nevertheless, the nineteenth century saw colonization at its height: Queen Victoria had more subjects than Alexander the Great or Charles V; the West established itself in Asia and all the Pacific islands were conquered. Africa became the favourite area to which the English, French and Germans sent their pioneers, soldiers and traders to conquer the black continent, while the death throes of the Ottoman empire opened the doors to North Africa.

8. Every colonial Power has its own methods and attitudes towards the native inhabitants, but one fact is quite clear: none of these Powers can ignore the moral duty to decolonize, because decolonization is an inseparable corollary of colonization. In other words, the aim of colonization is decolonization. Some believe, however, that a colony is indefinitely linked to the metropolitan country because of the treaties signed by native kings and chiefs renouncing their sovereignty. If we accept Christian morality, we are bound to recognize that these treaties can in no way relieve colonial powers of the duty to decolonize, and none of these so-called treaties can be used as an official title to colonization because, as Baumel put it:

“We are trying to convince ourselves that we respect the right of local populations by giving the impression that they signed voluntarily. Everyone knows that this is far from the truth. The native leaders were compelled to sign under the threat of arms and without having the slightest idea of what they were giving up; morally, this was a unilateral act.”

9. The two world wars gradually eroded the foundations of colonialism. However, in his book *“L’histoire des colonisations”*,<sup>1</sup> René Sédillot already suspected that there were two forms of colonialism, colonialism in its undeclared and paternalist form, supposedly to liberate oppressed peoples, and economic and financial colonialism. To conclude his particularly thorough study, a true monument to the exploitation of man by man, René Sédillot wrote: “In the book of history, colonialism continues”. Unfortunately, colonialism does indeed continue. It continues in southern Africa and the countries under Portuguese occupation; it continues in the most abject forms; and it continues in an apparently endless upward curve.

10. This exploitation of man by man is so ferocious that, when account is taken of the progress of civilization in the twentieth century and of modern concepts of human rights and social justice, it would make the expeditions of Cortés and Pizarro pale into insignificance and resemble mere boy scout outings. And for almost twenty-five years, the abundant light of the noble principles of the United Nations Charter has not succeeded in penetrating the darkness of southern Africa.

11. On 14 December 1946, the General Assembly adopted its first resolution [65 (I)] on South West Africa. Since then, eighty further resolutions on this subject have been adopted by the Assembly, each in stronger terms than the one before, and they have all been rejected by the South African authorities with increasingly arrogant defiance. Then came the judgment,<sup>2</sup> surprising to say the least, of the International Court of Justice. The General Assembly reacted indignantly with resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966. Unfortunately, we then had to stand by helplessly, while the United Nations Council for Namibia failed to carry out its mission and to implement the resolution of 27 October 1966. And its famous expedition to Windhoek ended by foundering lamentably in the Zambezi River.

12. Will this Council one day have the support of the 126 nations represented here and will it ever find sufficient courage to cross this new Rubicon? The humiliation of its failure rebounds on us all. Thus who would dare contradict our President who, in opening the session, spoke of the “seeming decline in effectiveness of the United Nations and its reputation in the wake of world events” [1753rd meeting, para. 48]?

13. On 13 November 1965, two days after the Unilateral Declaration of Independence in Rhodesia, a fraternal country urgently submitted a draft resolution to the Security Council the purpose of which was to bring about the elimination of the cankerous régime of Ian Smith. But it was not even possible to put this draft to a vote, because there were those who, like Ian Smith, wished to accommodate international interests which were far more important than four million Africans. When, on 29 May 1968, the Security Council finally adopted resolution 253 (1968) against Rhodesia, it was obvious that the final result would be illusory. Similar economic measures—less rigid, it is true, had in fact been tried against Italy during its unfortunate colonialist adventure in 1935-1936. They ended in total failure. Paradoxically, it needed the war of Hitlerite nazism and its consequences to dislodge Mussolini’s fascism from Ethiopia. Must we again try to cure evil by evil?

14. I am very much afraid it might come to that if the Assembly continues to be satisfied with unimplemented resolutions which are no more than pious wishes and which are still-born because they are smothered in this very hall by the systematic abstention of certain great Powers. This is no longer a secret. These abstentions are implacable vetoes. Our main task is to dispel the cloud of hatred and violence which hangs over southern Africa and threatens to poison the entire continent. The alliance which is emerging particularly actively between Pretoria, Lisbon and Salisbury with the strong support of international capital, exporting as it does the dogma of *apartheid*, the slavery of the twentieth century, only serves economic interests that are foreign to our continent.

15. Africa cannot remain powerless for ever. When Mr. Macmillan announced the “wind of change”, the wind of freedom the response was a veritable flood of drastic repressive measures against the innocent black populations

<sup>1</sup> R. Sédillot, *Histoire des Colonisations*, Paris, Arthème Fayard, 1958.

<sup>2</sup> *South West Africa, Second Phase, Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 1966*, p. 6.

of South Africa, Namibia and Rhodesia, and massive contributions to Portugal's colonial wars. Yet Ghana, negotiating peacefully with the United Kingdom for its independence, set off an irresistible chain reaction which was to lead to the liberation of other United Kingdom colonies, not only in Africa but throughout the world.

16. The French writer Joseph Folliet defined the duty to decolonize in these words: "The colonial Power should first seek the interests of the colonized people and thus indirectly the interests of mankind." His illustrious compatriot, the man of Brazzaville who will certainly remain the man of the century for the African countries formerly under French administration, did not hesitate, by means of the 1958 referendum, to ask the French colonies freely to decide their own future. It was in the same conviction that freedom was the natural aspiration of all peoples that General de Gaulle gave Algeria back to the Algerians. All this happened on the African continent, in territories where the French had been established many decades before the voyage of Cecil Rhodes to Africa. If this was possible despite the violent opposition of the Organization of the Secret Army, a few hours away from Paris, I think it is high time that Rhodesia was returned to the people of Zimbabwe.

17. In the sixteenth century, Francisco de Vitoria, who was regarded at that time as a doctor of colonial law, said:

"If vast kingdoms in the Indies, with their multitudes of reasonable and intelligent people who have built cities and societies which are better organized than our own, have to be seized for the benefit of Spain, I shall regard this as a tyrannical act and a diabolical crime which must be condemned both by natural reason and by human and Christian philosophy."

By contrast, hardly a month ago, Mr. Vorster, appearing before BBC cameras on the programme "Panorama", forcefully stated that the blacks in South Africa would never have the same rights as the whites.

18. Serious concern is now being felt about the future of the blacks in southern Africa, and the results of the elections in April 1970 could be the final blow for them, since on 25 October 1969—just three weeks ago—at Johannesburg, the dissident ultra-conservative wing of the South African National Party adopted a resolution condemning Mr. Vorster for his policy, alleged to be too liberal and contrary to the interests of the country. Just imagine: Mr. Vorster is becoming an angel of Africa! Mr. Albert Herzog, leader of the new reconstituted National Party of South Africa, favours super-apartheid in southern Africa. And meanwhile, our Heads of State are submitting the Lusaka Manifesto on Southern Africa [A/7754] here at the United Nations! On the one hand, boastful verbiage and total contempt for human rights, and on the other, a masterpiece of compromise and conciliation within the United Nations framework.

19. I met the Reverend Michael Scott for the first time in 1957, when he was already very well-known as a defender of the rights of the peoples of South West Africa. At the time, we were both petitioners in the Trusteeship Council; we were both fighting for the independence of two former

German colonies and we cherished the hope that one day our two countries would be represented here as free and sovereign nations. The other day, I saw the Reverend Michael Scott again in the Fourth Committee. He has remained as convinced as ever that Namibia, too, is entitled to independence. Do you think that Mr. Scott, that untiring apostle of human brotherhood, has any more chance of being heard in the United Nations in 1969 than did Father Las Casas in Madrid in the sixteenth century?

20. Mr. SOTO (Peru) (*translated from Spanish*): The draft resolutions contained in the report of the Special Political Committee [A/7773 and Corr.1, para. 18] were put to the vote the day after they were published in their final form. My delegation voted in favour of the substantive draft resolution (draft resolution B) and we shall vote in its favour now. We had some reservations, however, when it came to a vote on draft resolution A, particularly with respect to paragraph 4. That did not mean that our negative attitude towards the *apartheid* policies of the Government of South Africa had changed in any way. We continue to condemn those policies, as indicated by our favourable vote on the substantive resolution. This is in line with Peru's policy with regard to racial discrimination and colonialism.

21. Peru's abstention, in fact, was of an interim nature only, pending the adoption of a final position after careful consideration of the matter. Today, a week later, we are glad to announce that, having overcome the technical obstacle that had prevented us from expressing our position of principle, which is identical with that of the sponsors, we shall vote in favour of draft resolution A. My delegation has particular pleasure in announcing this decision, because it will now be able to vote with the conviction derived from a long and careful study of all the implications of the draft resolution.

22. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Nigeria on a point of order.

23. Mr. ALO (Nigeria): My delegation's point of order relates to the statement in paragraph 5 of the report of the Fifth Committee [A/7778 and Corr.1], that the amount of \$5,000 covering the costs of travel of the representatives referred to in paragraph 12(b) of the draft resolution adopted in the Special Political Committee would "require a specific authorization by the General Assembly to incur this expenditure".

24. As the report of the Special Political Committee indicates in paragraphs 13 and 14, the question of the financial implications of draft resolution B adopted by the Committee was fully discussed in the Committee before it proceeded to vote on the draft resolution. It will also be recalled that the sponsors of the draft resolutions had made absolutely clear their intentions in regard to paragraph 12(b). They had stated that it was their intention that the representatives concerned should be brought to New York for consultations with the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa at the expense of the United Nations. The Committee discussed this question and adopted the draft resolution in full knowledge of its financial implications.

25. It is therefore the understanding of my delegation that if draft resolution B, including its paragraph 12(b), is



adopted, that act by the Assembly will constitute a specific authorization to the Secretary-General to incur the expenditure concerned.

26. The PRESIDENT: The point of order of the representative of Nigeria is concerned with draft resolution B. We shall first vote on draft resolution A.

27. There are no more speakers in explanation of vote and I invite Members to turn their attention to paragraph 18 of document A/7773 and Corr.1. We shall vote first on draft resolution A. The financial implications of this draft resolution are contained in the report of the Fifth Committee [A/7778 and Corr.1].

*Draft resolution A was adopted by 101 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions [resolution 2506 A (XXIV)].*

28. The PRESIDENT: Before the Assembly proceeds to the vote on draft resolution B, I should like to state that I consider that the understanding expressed by the representative of Nigeria in his point of order is correct. I would therefore suggest that if there is no objection the Assembly take note of that point of order.

*It was so decided.*

29. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution B.

*Draft resolution B was adopted by 80 votes to 5, with 23 abstentions [resolution 2506 B (XXIV)].*

## AGENDA ITEM 65

### Question of Territories under Portuguese administration:

- (a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/7768)

## AGENDA ITEM 102

### Question of Southern Rhodesia: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/7759)

30. The PRESIDENT: I invite the Rapporteur of the Fourth Committee, Mr. Abdulla of Southern Yemen, to present in one intervention the reports of the Committee on agenda items 65 [A/7768] and 102 [A/7759].

31. Mr. ABDULLA (Southern Yemen), Rapporteur of the Fourth Committee: I have the honour to introduce the report of the Fourth Committee concerning the question of Territories under Portuguese administration [A/7768].

32. During its consideration of the item the majority of members noted with serious disquiet that, in disregard of relevant United Nations resolutions, the Portuguese Government had persisted in its refusal to give effect to the principle of self-determination in the Territories under its domination. Further, they strongly condemned the war waged by the Portuguese Government against colonial peoples who are struggling to attain their legitimate aspirations for freedom and independence. They deemed that such military operations, carried out with the assistance which Portugal receives from certain Governments, constituted a crime against humanity and a grave threat to international peace and security. The majority of delegations expressed deep regret that the new Government of Portugal has not seen fit to change its policies of colonial domination.

33. Many delegations condemned the policy of the Portuguese Government of the violation of the fundamental rights of the indigenous people by the arbitrary regrouping of the African population and the establishment of an increased number of Portuguese settlements in the Territories. Several members also condemned the activities of the financial and other interests operating in those Territories as exploiting the human and material resources of the Territories and as arresting the progress towards freedom and independence of the inhabitants. Others have condemned Portugal for its policy of using those Territories for violation of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of independent African States. There was a wide measure of agreement that all States should give the peoples of the Territories under Portuguese domination the moral and material assistance necessary for the restoration of their inalienable rights. In addition, several delegations emphasized the need for increased assistance by the specialized agencies and international organizations concerned in that respect.

34. Furthermore, many delegations urged that the Security Council, with a view to the immediate implementation of the Declaration in respect of those Territories, should take effective steps in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and in view of the determination of the international community, to put an end to colonialism and racial discrimination in Africa.

35. Those considerations are reflected in the draft resolution contained in paragraph 14 of the Fourth Committee's report, which is recommended for adoption by the General Assembly. The draft resolution sponsored by 44 Powers was adopted by the Fourth Committee by a roll-call vote of 88 to 3, with 16 abstentions.

36. On behalf of the Fourth Committee, I recommend the report for the serious attention of the General Assembly.

37. I also have the honour to introduce the report of the Fourth Committee concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia [A/7759].

38. During the consideration of that question, the majority of the members noted with deep regret that more than four years have elapsed since the take-over by the illegal racist minority régime in Salisbury. The sanctions applied so far by the majority of Member States in response

to the relevant United Nations decisions have not yet succeeded in bringing down that régime. It was the general feeling of members that the responsibility for that failure lay with those Governments which have not taken the necessary measures to comply with those decisions, particularly the Governments of Portugal and South Africa. Many delegations noted that those two Governments are collaborating militarily and otherwise with the illegal régime for the purpose of consolidating their own control over the Territories under their domination. They underlined in particular the threat posed to the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the neighbouring African States by the continued presence of South African armed forces in the Territory. Concern was also expressed at the steps being taken by the illegal régime to entrench its policies of separate racial development in the Territory to the detriment of the legitimate rights of the African population.

39. In view of the deteriorating situation obtaining in the Territory, many members urged the Government of the United Kingdom, in fulfilment of its responsibilities as the administering Power, to take effective measures, including the use of force, to put an immediate end to the illegal régime and to transfer all powers to the people of Zimbabwe on the basis of majority rule. They called upon all States which continue to maintain political, economic, military and other relations with that régime to bring them to an immediate end. Several delegations also stressed the importance of the role that could be played by international institutions, particularly the specialized agencies, in extending all moral and material assistance to the national liberation movements of the Zimbabwe people, in co-operation with the Organization of African Unity. Several delegations felt that the Security Council should widen the scope of the sanctions against the illegal régime to include all the measures laid down in Article 41 of the Charter and that it should impose sanctions against South Africa and Portugal, which have blatantly refused to carry out the mandatory decisions of the Security Council in that connexion.

40. Those considerations are reflected in the draft resolution contained in paragraph 12 of the present report. The forty-one Power draft resolution was approved by the Fourth Committee by a roll-call vote of 79 to 8, with 17 abstentions.

41. On behalf of the Fourth Committee, I recommend the report for the serious attention of the General Assembly. I express the hope that the draft resolution will be adopted unanimously by the Assembly.

*Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Fourth Committee.*

42. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who have indicated their desire to explain their votes.

43. Mr. KATAPODIS (Greece): The Greek delegation abstained from voting on the draft resolution on agenda item 65 [A/7768, para. 14] when it was considered by the Fourth Committee. Our abstention was motivated by our reservations on its paragraphs 12 and 13 as well as on the

accuracy of paragraph 7. Those reservations are still valid. However, in order to express our solidarity with the African peoples who have not yet been given the opportunity of exercising the right of self-determination, a right which Greece has always regarded as sacred, we shall now vote in favour of the draft resolution.

44. Mr. BOZA (Peru) (*translated from Spanish*): When this draft resolution [A/7768, para. 14] was put to the vote in the Fourth Committee, the delegation of Peru abstained. We were obliged to adopt that attitude in view of certain technical difficulties we encountered with respect to paragraphs 4 and 11 which, owing to a lack of information at the time, we were unable to overcome. However, we stated clearly on that occasion that the position of the Peruvian delegation should not be regarded as final until the draft resolution had been submitted to the General Assembly in plenary. That moment has now come, and my delegation wishes to announce that it will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in the report.

45. The position we have now adopted is based on the fact that the information we received subsequently has enabled us to overcome our technical difficulties with respect to paragraphs 4 and 11, although we would certainly have preferred the wording of the same ideas which was approved in paragraphs 8 and 5 respectively of resolution 2395 (XXIII), adopted by the General Assembly in 1968, since the situation does not appear to have substantially changed. Fundamentally, however, the position that we have now taken up is based on the fact that the Revolutionary Government of Peru, in accordance with its policy, rejects all forms of colonialism, whether political or economic, since it considers that the practice of colonialism endangers international peace and security by creating ill will and arousing passions.

46. With your permission, Mr. President, I should like to conclude this explanation by repeating what the Foreign Minister of Peru said in his address to the Assembly. On that occasion, speaking with respect to peace, he referred to:

“... the flagrant incongruity of the existence, in these days, of peoples subjected to colonial régimes. Like all those countries which waged a hard battle for their political independence and whose concept of the world is based on principles of Christian inspiration, Peru rejects any sort of colonialism.” [1757th meeting, para. 103.]

47. The PRESIDENT: Before the Assembly votes, I should like to invite Members to turn their attention to paragraph 14 of the draft resolution in document A/7768. The Fourth Committee recommends that the General Assembly should invite the Secretary-General, in the light of General Assembly resolution 2431 (XXIII) of 18 December 1968 and in consultation with the specialized agencies and the host Governments, to develop and expand training programmes for the indigenous inhabitants of the Territories under Portuguese domination, taking into account their needs for qualified administrative, technical and professional personnel to assume responsibility for the public administration and the economic and social development of their own countries.

48. With regard to the financial requirements for the implementation of this recommendation it is assumed that

Members, in considering agenda item 70 on the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa, will take into account the proposal of paragraph 14 of this draft resolution.

49. I now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in paragraph 14 of document A/7768. A roll-call vote has been requested.

*A vote was taken by roll call.*

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

*In favour:* Denmark, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, Cambodia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Austria, Barbados, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Czechoslovakia.

*Against:* Portugal, South Africa.

*Abstaining:* Dominican Republic, France, Gabon, Italy, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Cuba.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 97 votes to 2, with 18 abstentions [resolution 2507 (XXIV)].*

50. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the report of the Fourth Committee on agenda item 102 [A/7759].

51. Since there are no representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting, the Assembly will now proceed to vote on the draft resolution recommended by the Fourth Committee, which appears in paragraph 12 of its report [A/7759]. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Algeria, Barbados, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

*Against:* Australia, Belgium, Netherlands, New Zealand, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Austria, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, Denmark, Finland, France, Gabon, Honduras, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Lesotho, Malawi, Norway, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 83 votes to 7, with 20 abstentions [resolution 2508 (XXIV)]. \**

*The meeting rose at 12.5 p.m.*

\* The delegations of Argentina and Thailand subsequently informed the Secretariat that they wished to be recorded as having voted in favour of the draft resolution.

The delegation of Portugal subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to be recorded as having voted against the draft resolution.