



Chairman: Mr. Abdul Samad GHAUS  
(Afghanistan).

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 (concluded) (A/8022 and Add.1, A/8109, A/8117, A/SPC/L.181, A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2, A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1, A/SPC/L.192/Rev.1, A/SPC/L.195)**

1. The CHAIRMAN said that in coming to the conclusion of its consideration of agenda item 34 the Committee had before it two draft resolutions: draft resolution A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2, the financial implications of which were set out in document A/SPC/L.192/Rev.1, and draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1, the financial implications of which were set out in document A/SPC/L.195. A roll-call vote had been requested on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1 and on that draft resolution as a whole.

2. Mr. DURAISWAMY (Ceylon), referring to draft resolution A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2, said that the text had been twice revised to accommodate the points of view of all representatives who recognized the need for ensuring wider dissemination of information on *apartheid*, and he hoped that it would be adopted by an overwhelming majority. Its sponsors believed that knowledge of the pitiless measures which were carried out to impose *apartheid* and the miserable living conditions the non-whites experienced as a result of that policy would awaken the conscience of all men and finally bring about the abolition of *apartheid*.

3. Mr. AMONOO (Ghana) urged the Committee to put draft resolution A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2 to the vote as soon as possible. He hoped that, in view of the changes which had been made in it, it would be adopted virtually unanimously.

4. The sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1 had agreed to make no more changes in it; he therefore asked for it to be put to the vote in its existing form. Some delegations had asked for changes to be made in operative paragraph 2. Yet the Fourth Committee had recently adopted a draft resolution on the Territories administered by Portugal<sup>1</sup> which reaffirmed the legitimacy of the struggle of the peoples of those Territories to achieve their right to self-determination by all necessary means at their disposal. He felt, therefore, that there should be no problem in adopting the draft resolution without change.

<sup>1</sup> Subsequently adopted by the General Assembly as resolution 2707 (XXV).

5. The CHAIRMAN called upon the members of the Committee to explain their votes.

6. Mr. REECE (Canada) said that the text of draft resolution A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2 represented a considerable improvement on the original text. However, he still had some doubts with regard to operative paragraphs 5 and 6, which, as currently worded, left open the possibility of the United Nations granting financial aid to another organization for the broadcasting of radio programmes over which it would have no control. He therefore suggested the addition in operative paragraph 5, after the word "broadcasts" of the words "of United Nations material", and the insertion before the word "radio" in operative paragraph 6 of the words "United Nations". If the sponsors and the Committee as a whole found those amendments acceptable, the Canadian delegation would be able to vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

7. Mr. FARAH (Somalia) said that he would like to consult the other sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2 on the amendment proposed by the Canadian representative, but the contemplated co-operation between OAU and the United Nations was in fact based on the use by OAU of United Nations material and programmes.

8. Mr. GOMEZ NAAR (Colombia) said that he would vote in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2, but would like certain faults in the Spanish text—in particular the use of the verb "*radiar*" in operative paragraph 5—to be corrected.

9. He would also be able to support draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1, if the word "appropriate" could be inserted in operative paragraph 2 before the word "means". When, in a spirit of conciliation, he had proposed such an amendment at the 725th meeting, he had formed the impression that the sponsors accepted it. For that matter the General Assembly itself, in its Declaration on the Occasion of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the United Nations (resolution 2627 (XXV)), had used such an expression in connexion with the struggle of the colonial peoples for freedom.

10. This delegation was disturbed at the thought of the General Assembly recommending the use of violence to eliminate *apartheid*, when the United Nations itself was unable to eliminate *apartheid*, by applying the enforcement measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter for the maintenance of peace, which was seriously threatened by that inhuman policy. The General Assembly could not declare the struggle of a people against an act of aggression legitimate unless it was convinced that that legitimacy was consistent with the principles of the Charter. The security of countries which were not world Powers rested only on

the law, since they did not possess armed forces adequate to ensure respect for their security. Accordingly, the United Nations could not authorize the use of force except within a context of legal principles, in other words, if such authorization was consistent with the Charter.

11. If, however, Article 51 of the Charter was considered to be applicable by analogy to the struggle of the South African people, it had to be assumed that if for so many years that people had been faced with the need for self-defence, the reason was no fault of its own but the fact that the Security Council had not imposed the enforcement measures provided in that Article in order to restore the peace broken by the Government of South Africa.

12. Thus what operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution should state was not that the South African people should defend itself by all means because its struggle was legitimate, but that the General Assembly reaffirmed the legitimacy of the struggle being carried on by the people of South Africa and authorized it to use in its defence all appropriate means at its disposal, until such time as the Security Council discharged its ineluctable obligation: to apply enforcement measures in order to put an end to *apartheid*. In that way, the United Nations would be recognizing the fact that it had not succeeded in carrying out its basic task. If, however, the Committee did not want to raise that problem, it could at least qualify as “appropriate” to the means to be resorted to by the South African people in its heroic struggle.

13. Mr. HIERRO GAMBARDILLA (Uruguay) said that he would vote in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2, subject to the same textual reservations expressed by the representative of Colombia.

14. In operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1, he suggested the deletion of the words “by all means at their disposal”, which was not only repetitious but vague, and might give the impression that the United Nations was renouncing its responsibilities and encouraging the use of violence.

15. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had studied draft resolution A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2 carefully. The Soviet Union’s position on *apartheid* was well known; it must be ended at the earliest possible moment and the most rigorous measures must be taken against the racists who were imposing it. He accordingly supported draft resolutions A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2 and A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1. However, in connexion with the statement made by the Assistant Secretary-General for Public Information (714th meeting), to which reference was made in the preamble to draft resolution A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2, he wished to state that he could not agree to OAU broadcasts being financed from the regular budget of the United Nations; that would be contrary to the Charter. On the other hand, OAU could perhaps be granted funds under the programmes of development assistance. He supported the idea of technical and financial co-operation as provided for in operative paragraph 7, on the understanding that the funds already appropriated must not be exceeded.

16. Mr. FARAH (Somalia) said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2 had no objection to the

Canadian representative’s proposal for the insertion of the words “of United Nations material” in operative paragraph 5. However, he saw no reason for changing paragraph 6, which was the logical corollary of paragraph 5; it was obvious that the Secretary-General could make available only United Nations radio programmes and material.

17. He was glad that the USSR representative agreed in principle to financial and technical co-operation in the proposed joint OAU-United Nations enterprise. In speaking of financial arrangements, however, the sponsors assumed that the Secretary-General would consider all possible sources of assistance which were in keeping with the Charter; the possibilities should therefore not be limited to development assistance alone.

18. As to the Colombian representative’s proposal, the sponsors felt that it was a matter for the South African people, not the Committee, to decide on the means to be employed. So far as the South African people were concerned, all means were legitimate and appropriate, since they had no possibility of legal recourse. Perhaps the Colombian representative could explain by what he meant “appropriate” means.

19. The sponsors anticipated a large number of abstentions on draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1, given the tremendous interests that many Member States had in South Africa. In addition to the roll-call vote on operative paragraph 3, they would also like the Committee to vote by roll-call on paragraph 11, so that they could learn the views of members of the Committee on the proposed joint meeting. It was important that the three organs established by the General Assembly for the struggle against *apartheid* should meet periodically to study means of co-ordinating their efforts.

20. Mr. GOMEZ NAAR (Colombia) felt that the Somalian representative had not rightly understood his point and that of the representative of Uruguay. The manner in which the South African people should pursue its struggle could be considered from two points of view: there was absolutely no doubt that the South African people were fully entitled to use all means at their disposal, but the situation was quite different for the United Nations, which could either make no recommendation at all or recommend means of action which were appropriate and consistent with the Charter. If the General Assembly affirmed the legitimacy of the struggle of the South African people, that was because that struggle was in keeping with the Charter, and in that case, Article 51 of the Charter was applicable. By analogy with the situation provided for in that Article it could be considered that the South African people were victims of aggression, of a kind which was a threat to peace, on the part of the Government of South Africa, and the United Nations could thus apply the measures laid down in Chapter VII of the Charter. It was precisely because of that point, which was of fundamental importance in his delegation’s view, that he wished the adjective “appropriate” to be inserted in the text.

21. Mr. REECE (Canada) said that he would now be able to vote for operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2 if it was voted on separately. He would have preferred his own version of paragraph 6, but with the

change made in paragraph 5 the text was clear. It being understood that the Secretary-General would supply United Nations radio material and programmes, his delegation could support that paragraph and the draft resolution as a whole.

22. Mr. AMONOO (Ghana) felt that no agreement could be reached between the Latin American countries and the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1 on operative paragraph 2. The discussion had ended in a deadlock, and he asked the Chairman to close the debate on that point and to put the draft to the vote.

23. Mr. HERNDL (Secretary of the Committee) read out operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2, as amended.

24. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote draft resolution A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 89 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.*

25. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1.

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

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

*In favour:* Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, People's Republic of the Congo, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of the), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia.

*Against:* Portugal.

*Abstaining:* Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, France, Italy, Malawi.

*Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 88 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions.*

*At the request of the representative of Somalia, the vote on operative paragraph 11 of the draft resolution was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, People's Republic of the Congo, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of the), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand.

*Against:* Portugal.

*Abstaining:* Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Australia, Brazil, Canada, France, Italy, Malawi, Netherlands.

*Operative paragraph 11 was adopted by 86 votes to 1, with 11 abstentions.*

*At the request of the representative of Somalia, the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1 as a whole was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, People's Republic of the Congo, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Togo, 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, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, China, Congo (Democratic Republic of the), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya.

*Against:* Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, France.

*Abstaining:* Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Finland, Guatemala, Italy, Japan, Malawi.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 76 votes to 5, with 17 abstentions.*

26. The CHAIRMAN invited delegations to explain their votes.

27. Mr. RYDBECK (Sweden), speaking for the delegations of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, expressed gratification that some of the Committee's draft resolutions had been adopted almost unanimously; it was particularly encouraging that a wide measure of agreement had been reached on the draft resolutions concerning the existing arms embargo and the question of humanitarian assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa.

28. The five Nordic delegations wished to stress very strongly that they had the greatest sympathy and understanding for the general aims and objectives underlying draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1 and they could also understand and sympathize with the mounting impatience that had moved the sponsors in drawing it up. Nevertheless, it was their conviction that it would have been preferable to aim at a draft that could have achieved a wider measure of agreement.

29. The objections of the five Nordic countries related to the operative paragraphs in the draft resolution which called upon Member States to adopt sanctions against South Africa in practically every aspect of international relations. For such a measure to be effective, it would have to be applied by all countries. As binding decisions could only be taken by the Security Council it was logical that by the terms of operative paragraph 6 the General Assembly should draw the attention of the Security Council to the grave situation in South Africa and recommend urgent consideration of the problem with a view to adopting effective measures. Likewise, the delegations of the Nordic countries were unable to support any paragraphs containing an endorsement of the use of force and violence; furthermore, the Governments of those countries had no constitutional means whereby they could cause the sports organizations of their countries to boycott such organizations in other countries. That was why those delegations had cast a negative vote or abstained in the vote on the two operative paragraphs of draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1 on which separate votes had been taken. The adoption of those paragraphs had compelled them to vote against the draft resolution as a whole—regrettably, since the virtual unanimity with which Member States condemned *apartheid* should be reflected so far as possible in the votes on draft resolutions. The delegations of the five Nordic countries therefore attached particular importance to the wide measure of agreement reached on the other draft resolutions, which were a demonstration of the general repudiation of the policies of *apartheid*.

30. Mr. YIN (China) said that his delegation had been able to vote in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2 as a result of the amendment which had been made to operative paragraph 5 thereof and because it was fully convinced that an enlightened public opinion could help to put an end to the policy of *apartheid* in South Africa.

31. His delegation had voted in favour also of draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1, although it had certain reservations about the provisions which prejudged measures to be taken by the Security Council. Operative paragraph 7, sub-paragraph (a), too, had placed his delegation in a

difficult position, since China still maintained a consulate in Johannesburg, the function of which was to protect Chinese nationals living in South Africa. The fact that the consulate was maintained in no way meant that China approved of the South African Government's policy of *apartheid*. His delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution should certainly not be interpreted as prejudging the position of the Chinese Government with regard to the termination of consular relations with the South African Government.

32. Mr. REECE (Canada) said he was pleased that the spirit of conciliation displayed by the sponsors had enabled his delegation to vote in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2. On the other hand, his delegation regretted that it had been obliged to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1. His delegation felt compelled to express serious reservations with regard to those paragraphs in which Member States were urged to isolate South Africa, because it considered that isolation would strengthen the South African Government in its determination to apply its policy of *apartheid*. It could not endorse operative paragraph 6 either, because it considered that only the Security Council could determine whether the measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter should be applied.

33. He recalled the measures recently adopted by the Canadian Government to comply with the provisions of Security Council resolution 282 (1970). Canada also supported various practical measures which were intended to combat *apartheid* by peaceful means. However, his delegation did not consider that armed conflict was the right solution for the problem of *apartheid*. It was therefore unable to support measures which might lead to an armed conflict in South Africa and southern Africa and which would have incalculable consequences for all races in the area.

34. Mr. PETRIE (United Kingdom) explained that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1 because it considered that some of its provisions were inappropriate, in particular the reference to measures under Chapter VII of the Charter and the measures proposed for the isolation of South Africa by the rupture of economic, diplomatic and other relations. His delegation had also been unable to accept the implicit sanction of the use of force. It had abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 3 because of the doubtful implications of the last part of the paragraph and on operative paragraph 11, of the draft resolution.

35. It had abstained in the vote also on draft resolution A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2, operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 of which had given rise to much controversy and many amendments. Not only did his delegation share the doubts which had been expressed about the budgetary implications of the provisions of operative paragraph 7, but it considered that any assistance that might be extended to a regional organization, for additional activities over which the Secretary-General would not exercise clearly defined control, might constitute an unfortunate precedent.

36. The seven draft resolutions adopted by the Committee out of the eight drafts originally proposed were not the

only ones which related to the policy of *apartheid*, since the Third Committee had recommended at least two similar draft resolutions for adoption by the General Assembly and the Fourth Committee had recommended one relating to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa. There was certainly some room for confusion among so many draft resolutions, and his delegation wished to draw attention to a number of salient points. Virtual unanimity had been achieved on the ultimate objective, namely the elimination of *apartheid*, but opinions were clearly divided on the means of achieving that end. There was some disagreement about the suitable nature of the part which, in the opinion of some, should be played by the United Nations or a particular United Nations agency; there was also disagreement about the budgetary implications of the proposals submitted. In addition, some Governments sincerely wondered whether there were not other means of eliminating *apartheid* besides isolation and the use of force. The United Kingdom Government was one of those who considered that such other means existed and that contacts, dialogue and persuasion had always been more effective means of bringing about lasting changes. His delegation hoped that that view would be shared by others. Meanwhile, it was essential to recognize that there were differences of opinion about the means to be pursued and that it was not in the interest of the United Nations to conceal them under ambiguously worded resolutions, just as there was nothing to be gained by questioning the motives of those who had different opinions on the question.

37. Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2 in order to express once again its opposition to *apartheid* and its approval of all efforts to disseminate information on that policy and the reactions which it provoked in world opinion. He nevertheless wished to point out that in view of the financial position of the United Nations special care must be taken in selecting the appropriate information system. It was therefore essential that prospective action or initiatives should not exceed existing United Nations resources.

38. Mr. COTTON (New Zealand) said that if there had been a separate vote, his delegation would have supported several provisions of draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1, but it was resolutely opposed to a number of other paragraphs. It had consequently abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole. Its vote should be regarded as a further sign of New Zealand's general opposition to *apartheid*.

39. His delegation had been obliged to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2 since it had not had time to consult the New Zealand Government on the amendments accepted by the sponsors at the current meeting. It was nevertheless grateful to them for the goodwill they had shown in seeking to formulate a text which was acceptable to all.

40. Mr. YAÑEZ-BARNUEVO (Spain) said that he regretted that, after voting in favour of five of the six draft resolutions relating to *apartheid*, his delegation had been obliged to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1, about which it had some reservations.

41. First, his delegation was convinced that the United Nations—whose main purpose was the maintenance of international peace and security—could in no circumstances sanction violence as a means of settling conflicts. In that connexion, it regretted that the sponsors had not accepted the amendment submitted by the representative of Colombia. Secondly, there was a danger that international isolation of the South African Government would result in a hardening of its position. Thirdly, it did not consider that the problems of southern Africa, which were diverse by their legal nature and political basis, should be confused. Finally, his delegation considered that the General Assembly should respect the special competence of the Security Council.

42. Spain, which was currently a member of the Security Council, did not wish to commit itself in the General Assembly by adopting a particular position on a problem which might be submitted to that body. It was none the less prepared to assume its responsibilities if necessary, as was demonstrated by its support of Security Council resolution 282 (1970).

43. Mr. GARCIA DE SOUZA (Brazil) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolutions A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2 and A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1. It had considered it a duty to vote in favour of a draft resolution, operative paragraph 1 of which declared that the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa were a negation of the United Nations Charter and constituted a crime against humanity. He nevertheless wished to point out that his delegation could not accept a number of provisions in draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1. Its affirmative vote should therefore be interpreted as a sign of its resolute and systematic opposition to *apartheid* and an indication of its support for operative paragraph 1 of that draft.

44. Mr. AKATANI (Japan) said that he had been obliged to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1 because it embodied a number of measures which his delegation could not support. His delegation's abstention should not, however, be regarded as a sign of indifference to *apartheid*, to which it remained resolutely opposed.

45. Mr. MUNK (Denmark) said that his delegation's reservations with regard to draft resolution A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2 referred to the provisions dealing with co-operation between the United Nations and OAU, especially those contained in operative paragraph 7.

46. His delegation awaited with interest the Secretary-General's projected report on that subject, and wanted to make it clear that its vote in favour of the resolution did not prejudice its position with regard to the consideration of that problem at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly.

47. Mr. MÜLLER (Finland) stated that his delegation had voted for draft resolution A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2 because he believed that information was an important factor in combating *apartheid*. Nevertheless, a number of provisions in the text hardly seemed to him to be acceptable, because they raised legal problems.

48. Mr. NIMON (Togo) said that, although his delegation had voted for draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1, he

wished to place on record its reservations with regard to the second, third and eighth preambular paragraphs.

49. Mr. CUREÑO (Mexico) said that his delegation had reservations with regard to operative paragraphs 7 and 10 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1, since it doubted whether the General Assembly had the authority to make recommendations on matters that were clearly within the competence of the Security Council. From that standpoint also, it understood operative paragraph 6—by which the Assembly would recommend that the Security Council should resume urgently the consideration of effective measures, including those under Chapter VII of the Charter—to mean that the General Assembly would be indicating in general terms one course which the Council might take, without, however, restricting the Council's freedom of action in considering the problem.

50. His delegation shared the doubts of the representative of Colombia with regard to operative paragraph 2 of the same text. In its view, when the United Nations recognized the legitimacy of a struggle, it could do so only in the context of the Charter and 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 (General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV)). In their struggle for self-determination, freedom and independence peoples could, of course, seek and receive such support as was compatible with the purposes and principles set forth in the Charter.

51. Mr. THYNESS (Norway) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2, despite a number of reservations of a legal and constitutional nature. He wished to make it clear that its affirmative vote should not be taken as prejudging Norway's position when the report requested of the Secretary-General in operative paragraph 7 came up for discussion.

52. Mr. NAVEIRO DE LA SERNA (Argentina) stated that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.2 because of the importance it attached to an intensive information campaign against *apartheid*.

53. His delegation had voted for operative paragraphs 3 and 11 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1; although it could have supported most of the other provisions, it had been obliged to abstain on the text as a whole because of its reservations concerning some of them, such as those contained in operative paragraph 6, which referred to a matter within the competence of the Security Council. Argentina would become a member of the Council in 1971 and did not wish to anticipate its position on a question which the Council might have to consider.

54. Mr. OTUATHAIL (Ireland) said that he wished to express some reservations about the wording and content of certain paragraphs of draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1. If there had been separate votes on operative paragraphs 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of the draft his delegation would have abstained from voting on them, because of its belief that calls by the General Assembly for measures which there was no reasonable hope of implementing for the time being weakened rather than strengthened the text; that argument applied in particular to operative paragraph 7.

55. His delegation welcomed the fact that by operative paragraph 6 the General Assembly would recommend the Security Council to resume urgently the consideration of effective measures, as such action, if supported by the permanent members of the Council, could make real progress possible. On the other hand, his delegation did not support operative paragraph 5 which was worded in general terms, because it did not think that all economic activities without exception were detrimental to the interests of the black majority in South Africa.

56. With regard to operative paragraphs 8 and 9, he said that he was completely opposed to the introduction of racist considerations into cultural, educational and sports exchanges but did not think it desirable to suspend exchanges of that kind, because such contacts could hasten the erosion of the system of *apartheid*.

57. Operative paragraph 10 repeated proposals in regard to which his delegation had expressed its reservations at the twenty-fourth session (663rd meeting).

58. Notwithstanding those reservations, his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1 as a whole, as well as the other draft resolutions on *apartheid*, in order to demonstrate the repulsion with which it regarded such policies.

59. With respect to draft resolution A/SPC/L.187, he expressed satisfaction at the contemplated enlarging of the scope of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa. Ireland was one of the twenty-one countries that had contributed to the Fund during the past year. In regard to Namibia, however, he would like to express the hope that care would be taken to ensure that there was no duplication between the work of the Trust Fund and that of the comprehensive United Nations Fund for Namibia which had been proposed by the Fourth Committee.

60. His delegation also welcomed the provisions of other draft resolutions relating to the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

61. His delegation felt that efforts should be made by all the Governments represented in the Special Political Committee, in conjunction with the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa, towards the adoption of worth-while programmes at the national and international levels, which would make the coming year a focal point in the history of United Nations action to combat racism and *apartheid*.

62. Mr. EILAN (Israel) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1 because it subscribed to the general principles on which the text was based. Nevertheless, its support of the draft resolution was not entirely free of reservations, and if there had been a separate vote on the various paragraphs, his delegation would not have cast the same vote on all the provisions.

63. Mr. ALVARADO (Venezuela), explaining why his delegation had abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 11 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1, said that that paragraph concerned the convening early in 1971 of a joint meeting of the Special Committee on the Policies of

*Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa, the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (the Committee of Twenty-four) and the United Nations Council for Namibia. Those were three separate bodies, each of which had a special function to fulfil. The Committee of Twenty-four had already decided upon its programme of work.

64. Moreover, at its twenty-fourth session the General Assembly, on the basis of the report of the Special Political Committee, had adopted resolution 2506 B (XXIV), by operative paragraph 12 (c) of which the Assembly had requested the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa to consider holding joint meetings with other appropriate organs of the United Nations to increase its co-operation and co-ordinate its efforts with such organs. Contacts had been made with that in view but so far no final decision had been taken. His delegation had therefore abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 11 in order to reserve its position during the consideration of the question in the Committee of Twenty-four.

65. For the same reasons he considered that it was premature to request the Secretary-General to convene that meeting early in 1971, since one of the organs in question could still refuse to participate in the joint meeting. That would place the Secretary-General in a difficult position.

66. His delegation's abstention did not amount to the adoption of a position of substance with regard to the desirability of the joint meeting in question. Its sole purpose was to avoid prejudging the results of the negotiations in progress among the three organs which were supposed to hold the joint meeting.

67. Mr. BLANC (France) said that in voting in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2 as a whole, abstaining in the separate votes on operative paragraphs 3 and 11 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1 and voting against that text as a whole, his delegation had confirmed the discerning attitude it had adopted in earlier votes on the subject of *apartheid*. He regretted that the existing text put forward proposals which contravened the provisions of the Charter by encroaching on the competence of the Security Council and departing from the form of words used in the Declaration on the Occasion of the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the United Nations, and which, moreover, as experience had shown, did not contribute to the solution of the problem.

68. His delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2 on the understanding that the Secretariat would not be able to unload its responsibilities onto organs outside the United Nations and that, by the practice of economies, the resolution would not entail any additional expenditure.

69. He thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for their efforts to make them acceptable to the greatest number of delegations and expressed the hope that the spirit of conciliation and the desire for effectiveness that had been displayed during the preparation of those resolutions would prevail throughout all the work of the Committee at the twenty-sixth session.

70. Miss DINCER (Turkey) said that her delegation had voted in favour of all the draft resolutions on *apartheid* submitted to the vote. She wished, however, to state her delegation's position on certain provisions of draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1.

71. Her delegation had reservations regarding the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 6 of that draft. While it was fully aware of the gravity of the situation in South Africa, it did not think that there should be any attempt to influence the Security Council, which was the only organ competent to adopt the measures provided in Chapter VII of the Charter. That position, however, should certainly not be interpreted as a sign of indifference on the part of Turkey, which had always shown that it favoured the adoption and implementation of effective measures in the matter. Her delegation's vote in favour of operative paragraph 2, in particular with regard to the phrase "by all means at their disposal", should be interpreted in the light of the Declaration on the Occasion of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the United Nations. Her delegation reserved its position on operative paragraph 7, sub-paragraph (b), on operative paragraph 8 and on the whole of operative paragraph 10, in view of a number of difficulties to which their wording gave rise. The same reservations consequently applied to operative paragraph 12.

72. Mr. BILIMATISIS (Greece) said that his delegation had voted in favour of all the draft resolutions submitted to the vote. He wished to state, however, that, if there had been a separate vote on each of the provisions of draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1, his delegation would have voted against the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 6, 7 and 10 and would have abstained in the vote on operative paragraphs 5 and 8.

73. The meaning that his delegation attached to operative paragraph 2 in voting in favour of it had already been explained before the adoption of a similar resolution by the General Assembly during the discussions at the commemorative session.

74. Mr. NAYERI (Iran) said that his delegation had had no difficulty in voting in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.185/Rev.2.

75. It had some reservations about draft resolution A/SPC/L.188/Rev.1, and it would have abstained on a number of paragraphs, had they been put to the vote separately. He had nevertheless voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole in order to show Iran's opposition to the policy of *apartheid*.

#### *Organization of the Committee's work*

76. The CHAIRMAN declared that the Committee had now completed its consideration of agenda item 34. At its next meeting it would revert to its consideration of agenda item 35, relating to the report of the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East.

*The meeting rose at 1 p.m.*