

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records

**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 541st  
MEETING**

Monday, 12 December 1966,  
at 11 a.m.



**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	Page
<i>Agenda item 34:</i>	
<i>The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa: report of the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued) . . . . .</i>	253

**Chairman:** Mr. Max JAKOBSON (Finland).

**AGENDA ITEM 34**

The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa: report of the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued) (A/6356, A/6412, A/6486, A/6494, A/SPC/L.115, A/SPC/L.135 and Add.1, A/SPC/L.136, A/SPC/L.142)

1. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should first consider the two draft resolutions A/SPC/L.135 and Add.1 and A/SPC/L.136. He would first of all call on the Secretary of the Committee who, in accordance with rule 154 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, would explain the financial implications of draft resolution A/SPC/L.135 and Add.1.

2. Mr. CHAI (Secretary of the Committee) said that the appropriations for the international conference or seminar proposed in paragraph 6 (a) of draft resolution A/SPC/L.135 and Add.1 would have to be provided under section 2 of the 1967 budget under the head "Special meetings and conferences". The estimated costs for a two-week session amounted to approximately \$88,000. If the conference was held away from New York or Geneva, the Government of the host country would defray the additional costs involved, in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2116 (XX). The estimate was based on the assumption that there would be no summary records of the proceedings and that the conference would be held in Africa. If it was held in western Europe, the costs would be reduced by \$14,000, as the travelling expenses would be less.

3. It was not possible at the moment to provide any reliable estimate of the expenses entailed by paragraph 8 of the draft resolution—which authorized the Special Committee to meet outside the Headquarters or to send a sub-committee on a consultative mission—as no definite plan had yet been drawn up. The Secretary-General therefore proposed that he should be authorized to enter into the necessary com-

mitments by virtue of the General Assembly resolution on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses for the financial year 1967, subject to the prior approval of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

4. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) expressed regret that the major trading partners of South Africa had not been willing to engage in a fruitful discussion on the question of apartheid. To him it seemed difficult to avoid accusing some of them of maintaining a guilty silence.

5. He wished to express his appreciation to the delegations which had had kind words for the members of the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa. His own delegation would make every effort to ensure that the question of apartheid continued to be considered by the United Nations and that the recommendations of the Special Committee were ratified by the competent organs of the Organization. He had no doubt that the other members of the Special Committee shared that concern.

6. When it had accepted the chairmanship of the Special Committee, Guinea had been fully conscious of the heavy responsibility it was assuming and the difficulties lying before it. Being convinced, however, of the basic importance of the struggle against apartheid and colonialism, it had undertaken to carry out that task with impartiality, even if it meant incurring the displeasure of certain major Powers. The Special Committee had tried to keep the problem free of all ideological considerations and to lay the main stress on the threat which it involved for international peace and security. Despite the attempts made to paralyse its work, the Special Committee had resolutely pursued its task and would continue to do so with the same determination if the Committee adopted draft resolution A/SPC/L.135 and Add.1 providing for an extension and enlargement of its terms of reference. The successes which the Special Committee had achieved had been due, moreover, to the understanding of the Secretary-General, who had made available to it all the necessary means for facilitating its work.

7. He expressed his appreciation to the Czechoslovak Government, which had pledged a contribution of \$2,000 to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and was awarding scholarships to South African students; to the Indian Government, which had pledged a contribution of 25,000 rupees for aid to political prisoners; to the Japanese Government, which had contributed \$20,000 to the United Nations educational and training programme for South Africans; and to the Italian Government, which had contributed to the

Trust Fund and had also decided to contribute to the educational and training programme.

8. With regard to the Italian delegation's denials concerning the shipment of arms and ammunition to South Africa, he explained that the items had actually consisted of military vehicles, which, however, also came under the embargo. There had been many articles in the South African Press about the supplying of Macchi jet aircraft, which were at present assembled in Italy under United Kingdom licence and would shortly be manufactured in South Africa. He was willing to supply the Italian delegation with all the necessary particulars so that Italy could, if it so wished, stop its shipments when all the facts were made known to it.

9. He expressed his appreciation to the Chairman of the Committee of Trustees of the Trust Fund and said he hoped that the Powers which had supported the idea of establishing the Trust Fund would be generous. He pointed out, however, that humanitarian programmes would not solve the problem of apartheid. The situation called for a political solution, which could be achieved by peaceful means, if the United Nations would make the attempt, or by force, if the Powers primarily concerned refused to co-operate.

10. Draft resolution A/SPC/L.135 and Add.1 contained a number of specific and workable proposals. The sponsors had deliberately refrained from reproducing certain provisions of earlier resolutions so that all the countries which sincerely wished to put an end to apartheid would be able to support the draft resolution. In order to obtain the widest possible support and to avoid difficulties for certain delegations, he proposed that the sponsors of the draft resolution should delete the words "and reaffirming" in the first preambular paragraph.

11. His delegation had noted with interest the statements of certain delegations, such as that of Italy, which had expressed the hope that effective measures would soon be taken to resolve the situation in South Africa under the best possible conditions. He hoped that South Africa's major trading partners would cease to behave as though they were strictly dependent on the South African economy and would refuse to yield to South Africa's blackmail, thus showing that the moral values they upheld prevailed over their material interests. Their refusal to support draft resolution A/SPC/L.135 and Add.1 would be an admission of complicity with the South African Government.

12. The CHAIRMAN asked all delegations to note the amendment made in the first preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/SPC/L.135 and Add.1 by the representative of Guinea. He announced that the draft resolutions would probably be put to the vote at the afternoon meeting.

13. Mr. HOPE (United Kingdom), commenting on draft resolution A/SPC/L.135 and Add.1 said that the United Kingdom's position continued to be the same as had been stated in the Committee at the twentieth session (472nd meeting). Successive United Kingdom Governments had all indicated clearly their opposition to the policies of apartheid and to all manifestations of racial discrimination or domination. In support of

those statements, the Government had, in November 1964, taken steps to impose an embargo on shipments of arms to South Africa. That embargo had been strictly applied and would continue to be, even though it represented a sizable loss for the United Kingdom and was of only limited effectiveness because South Africa was receiving arms from other sources. Thus, the assertions that the United Kingdom was one of the major suppliers of arms to South Africa were entirely groundless, and he supported the appeal that was made to States in paragraph 5 (a) of draft resolution A/SPC/L.135 and Add.1.

14. On the other hand, his delegation did not think that the present situation with regard to apartheid called for enforcement measures under Chapter VII of the Charter, and it therefore opposed paragraphs 2 and 7 of the draft resolution. Similarly, it could not subscribe to the idea that trade could be used by a country as a weapon to express its disapproval of the domestic political system of a sovereign State, and it could therefore not support the proposals contained in paragraphs 3 and 4. His delegation also had serious reservations regarding other sub-paragraphs of paragraph 5. In particular, the United Kingdom had already stated its views on the question of the economic and financial relations with South Africa mentioned in sub-paragraph (b), and the expression "material assistance" in sub-paragraph (c) might be defined more clearly. However, his delegation endorsed sub-paragraph (d), which called upon all States to contribute to humanitarian programmes designed to assist the victims of apartheid. It also supported the whole of the draft resolution on the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa (A/SPC/L.136).

15. With regard to the other paragraphs of draft resolution A/SPC/L.135 and Add.1, the specialized agencies and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development must be guided solely by their statutes and not by political considerations. Account should also be taken of the need for economy and working efficiency.

16. In conclusion, he reaffirmed his delegation's sympathy with the countries which detested the racial policies of the South African Government. It would therefore not vote against the draft resolution as a whole if the Committee would agree to a separate vote on paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 7.

17. Mr. MONTEIRO (Portugal) recalled that the Portuguese Minister for Foreign Affairs, in a statement in the Security Council on 24 July 1963 (1042nd meeting), had explained some of the fundamental principles on which Portuguese policy was based. He had pointed out that that policy was founded on the firm conviction that no race was superior or inferior to any other race. Portugal was therefore opposed to any kind of racial segregation; it believed that racial democracy was the soundest basis of any human society and that all races should co-operate as equals for their common welfare. The second basic feature of Portuguese policy was that it aimed at an integrated multiracial society all the ethnic components of which were closely linked with one another by a deep sense of unity. Moreover, Portugal believed that the growth of a human society was better secured if all men were equal before the law and

the same opportunities for advancement in all fields were granted to all. In accord with those considerations, Portugal's policy was intended to increase the participation of the whole population in the political, cultural, economic and social activities of the community; under its Constitution—and in keeping with Articles 55 and 56 of the Charter—all persons were equal, all had the same civil and political rights, all enjoyed the same political representation, and all had access to the same opportunities for education and social advancement.

18. In conformity with those same principles, Portugal had acceded to the UNESCO Convention against discrimination in education and the ILO Convention concerning discrimination in respect of employment and occupation. It had also voted in favour of the Declaration and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

19. Reference had been made in the course of the discussion to the alleged establishment of a completely white southern Africa which would include Portugal, together with the territories of Angola and Mozambique. That statement must be refuted; to cooperate in an association of that kind would be contrary to the principles and the history of Portugal. Thanks to the fundamental principles of its traditional policy of non-discrimination, Portugal had been able, in the past, to establish one of the most perfect multiracial communities in Latin America. Similarly, it was in the process of establishing in Mozambique a community in which all citizens had equal rights and enjoyed the same political and social opportunities.

20. It had also been alleged that there existed between Portugal and South Africa a form of military and political collaboration directed against the African countries. His delegation categorically denied that statement, in view of the fact that the policy of apartheid exercised no influence on traditional Portuguese policy.

21. There did, of course, exist between Portugal and South Africa commercial and other relations which were a natural result of their geographical position and were analogous to those which Portugal maintained with every country in the world.

22. On the subject of draft resolution A/SPC/L.135 and Add.1, he wished to state that the political régime of a State Member of the United Nations was a matter within its domestic jurisdiction and that,

moreover, the application of universal economic sanctions was a power possessed solely by the Security Council, which was responsible for taking action in the case of a threat to peace. His delegation believed that, however abominable apartheid might be, it should not be a reason for violating a basic provision of the Charter; for that reason, his delegation would be unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

23. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) said that a number of delegations had referred to repeated violations of the arms embargo; he, too, deplored actions which he considered most regrettable. Governments which had agreed to apply the relevant Security Council decisions could, as matters stood, use those violations as a pretext for refusing to apply the attendant measures for fear of being supplanted by other countries in the South African market. The countries responsible for the current situation were France, Italy and the Federal Republic of Germany. The United States and the United Kingdom, for their part, had complied with the Security Council's decision, although some loopholes had been reported.

24. He drew attention to paragraph 5 (a) of draft resolution A/SPC/L.135 and Add.1 in which all States were requested to comply with the decisions of the Security Council. The United Nations would be discredited if a decision made by the Security Council was violated by one of the Council's permanent members. He was thinking particularly of France, whose attitude of defiance was to some extent encouraging others not to apply the resolutions of the Council. Italy appeared to be willing to fulfil its undertakings. He hoped that all delegations would unequivocally state their position with regard to a total embargo on arms and military equipment, perhaps in connexion with a separate vote on the relevant paragraph of the draft resolution.

25. His delegation had refrained from accusing Portugal of practising apartheid in its colonies; it was true, however, that the social structures established in those territories operated to the detriment of the indigenous population even though the Portuguese Government was not acting with racist intentions. The racial democracy on which Portugal prided itself could be no more than a mockery in countries which were still reduced to the status of colonies. In any event, the African countries were the first to defend the idea of a multiracial society.

*The meeting rose at 11.50 a.m.*