

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records

**THIRD COMMITTEE, 1383rd
MEETING**

Wednesday, 5 October 1966,
at 10.45 a.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 95:

Question of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including policies of racial discrimination and segregation and of apartheid, in all countries, with particular reference to colonial and other dependent countries and territories (continued) 41

Chairman: Mrs. Halima EMBAREK WARZAZI (Morocco).

AGENDA ITEM 95

Question of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including policies of racial discrimination and segregation and of apartheid, in all countries, with particular reference to colonial and other dependent countries and territories (continued) (A/6303, chap. XI, sect. II; A/6442, A/C.3/L.1335-1340)

1. Mr. GYARMATI (Hungary) observed that the debate had made it clear that the question under discussion had many ramifications, embracing policies of apartheid, colonialism, other forms of racial discrimination and segregation and the responsibility of certain Western Powers. While the violation of human rights was the aspect of greatest concern to the Third Committee, it could not consider the item on its agenda properly without touching on the other aspects, and that did not mean that it was duplicating the work of other United Nations bodies.

2. Hungary had not only voted in favour of the United Nations resolutions on South Africa and Portugal but had implemented them by applying sanctions against those two countries in respect to trade, and also in the matter of sports and cultural affairs. Although exports were of prime importance to a small country like Hungary, it had not used the argument voiced by some Member States as an excuse for not complying with the relevant resolutions. In addition, it had signed the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

3. His delegation could support the draft resolution recommended for adoption by the General Assembly in Economic and Social Council resolution 1164 (XLI) (A/6442, annex I) and any other proposals which would strengthen that text. The report of the United Nations human rights seminar on apartheid (A/6412) also contained a number of valuable recommendations. His only specific comment, at the present stage, on the texts before the Committee related to operative

paragraph 8 of the draft resolution recommended by the Council and operative paragraph 11 of the sixty-one-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1340). The United Nations already had a number of bodies, including the Third Committee, to deal with the question of publicizing the views of the world community on the policies of apartheid, and it had appropriate machinery within the Secretariat to help in that task. Consequently, whatever text was adopted must not be interpreted as a mandate to set up a new organ; rather, what was needed was a strengthening of the existing machinery and the full implementation of the resolutions on sanctions.

4. Miss HART (New Zealand) said that her delegation was in general agreement with the statement made at the previous meeting by the representative of Guinea, and her own comments would relate to some of the same issues. Discrimination based on race was one of the most serious moral and social problems of the time. Her own country's record in the matter spoke for itself; it was a record of harmonious development towards a fully integrated society composed of different ethnic groups.

5. The present item raised, among other things, the question of how and to what extent the human rights organs of the United Nations should seek to deal with particular instances of violations of human rights. Those organs had sought to set universal standards through the elaboration of declarations, recommendations and conventions; they had sought through education and persuasion—by means of seminars, human rights fellowships, advisory services and periodic reporting by Member States—to bring about the acceptance of the standards; and they had sought ways and means of ensuring that the standards were in fact observed. The concern to find new ways and means of securing observance was reflected in a number of new initiatives, among them the proposed creation of the office of High Commissioner for Human Rights, the adoption of comprehensive clauses of implementation under the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the proposals set forth in operative paragraphs 8 and 9 of the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council (A/6442, annex I) and some of the proposals made in the amendments to that draft submitted by India, Nigeria and Pakistan (A/C.3/L.1335).

6. The human rights bodies of the United Nations were coming face to face with particularly serious violations of human rights with which other, political bodies of the Organization had been grappling for years. One of the origins of the draft resolution recommended by the Council had been a request to the Commission on Human Rights by the Special Committee on the Situation

with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. However, in calling for assistance from a human rights body, the Special Committee had not been asking for a repetition of the exhortations and recommendations it had itself issued. Nor was the Third Committee called upon to duplicate the debates held in the Special Political Committee, the Fourth Committee or the Security Council, or to borrow the techniques which they had employed. The human rights bodies could make their best contribution through the very techniques which they had been successfully working on for twenty years, including new techniques which they were peculiarly competent to elaborate.

7. She therefore had serious doubts about the Polish and Saudi Arabian draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1339), which would request the Security Council to take measures in connexion with apartheid. The sixty-one-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1340) drew heavily on the draft recommended by the Council, and she took it that it was intended to replace the Council's text. Unfortunately, it tended to repeat earlier General Assembly resolutions and did not introduce sufficient new elements that would promote further progress in the human rights bodies of the United Nations. Operative paragraph 2 would have the violation of any of the rights and freedoms set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights condemned as "crimes against humanity". That expression had a very special legal meaning deriving from the prosecution of war criminals, and even if it was to be broadened it could hardly be applied to all violations of human rights. The last preambular paragraph contained an endorsement of the conclusions and recommendations of the United Nations human rights seminar on apartheid (A/6412, para. 138), but it should be noted that not all the recommendations of that seminar had been adopted unanimously and not all of them were proper subjects for the Third Committee. Operative paragraph 10 of the sixty-one-Power text was related to operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution recommended by the Council but did not go as far as the latter which made the very important proposal that new ways and means should be sought for combating violations of human rights. She hoped that the substance of that proposal would be retained.

Mr. Macdonald (Canada), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

8. Mr. KOITE (Mali) said he hoped that the sponsors of the various proposals before the Committee would be able to agree on a single draft resolution that would command general support. His delegation could pledge its endorsement of such a text.

9. Respect for an observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms had been a major concern of the international community for many years. Racial discrimination continued to afflict millions of human beings, however, and by arousing hostility and conflict it adversely affected relations among men and nations.

10. Portugal, which practised terror, discrimination and apartheid in its colonies, must be made to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations. South

Africa continued on its vicious course of racism, causing the rest of Africa the deepest concern. Indeed, despite the advances made in decolonization, the world was far from that state of stability and sovereign equality which was the ultimate objective of the United Nations Charter.

11. Racism was the consequence of the reactionary ideologies of colonialism and imperialism, which had more than once caused mankind untold suffering. More than ever before the international community must seek whatever means remained within its power to put an end to the abhorrent practices of racial discrimination and apartheid. He felt certain that the Committee, at the present session, when developments such as the recent decision of the International Court of Justice had made the situation in Africa more explosive than ever, would prove able to shoulder its responsibilities in the interests of world peace and harmony.

12. Mr. TSAO (China) said that his delegation was firmly opposed to all racial discrimination wherever it existed, in dependent territories or in independent States. Apartheid, one of the worst forms of racism, was alien to Chinese tradition; it was not only morally indefensible, it was politically self-destructive. His delegation had supported every resolution aimed at the eradication of racial discrimination, and it had been prepared to support the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council (A/6442, annex I). That text took a well-balanced approach to a question which was partly political and partly social and humanitarian. It sought the backing of public opinion, called on Member States for their co-operation and appealed to inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations for their assistance. He had one drafting suggestion to make concerning that text. The word "celebration" in operative paragraph 6 might be replaced by "observance", in view of the nature of the theme proposed for Human Rights Day in 1966.

13. He agreed generally with the provisions of the sixty-one-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1340) and appreciated the distinction it maintained between political issues and social and humanitarian ones. At the same time, he endorsed the New Zealand representative's criticisms. The expression "crimes against humanity" had a definite and very serious connotation. It might be used in referring to grave violations of human rights, but to apply it to minor violations of any of the human rights proclaimed in the Universal Declaration—violations which occurred daily in almost every country of the world—would be to render the expression meaningless.

14. The Chilean draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1336) contained a number of constructive ideas. However, since several of its salient points had been incorporated in the sixty-one-Power draft, he wondered if it was to be maintained. The Polish and Saudi Arabian draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1339) was intended to single out the political aspect of the apartheid question and refer it to the Security Council. However, the Security Council had been closely considering the question of apartheid for some time. He doubted that a procedural resolution of the kind proposed was required of the Third Committee at present. The United States amendment (A/C.3/L.1338) related only

to a point of United Nations procedure. He generally approved the amendments submitted by India, Nigeria and Pakistan (A/C.3/L.1335) but wondered whether they would be maintained following the submission of sixty-one-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1340). The Committee's proceedings would be clearer and its final action carry more weight if a single text could be produced by the sponsors of the various proposals, points of disagreement, if any, being left for the Committee to consider separately.

15. Miss LAURENS (Indonesia) said that her country was resolutely opposed to imperialism and colonialism in all its forms and manifestations and would support any effort to secure observance of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples. The violations of human rights in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and the Portuguese colonies were simply the last vestiges of imperialism and colonialism. However, the colonial and political aspects of racial discrimination, segregation and apartheid were discussed in other bodies of the United Nations, and the Third Committee had to deal with the subject with emphasis on human rights. She trusted that the Committee would be able to make a positive contribution towards the over-all solution of the problem.

16. In general, her delegation endorsed the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council. Wishing to see it strengthened, however, it had co-sponsored the sixty-one-Power draft. She hoped that a single text could be worked out which the Committee might adopt unanimously. Her delegation could support the Polish and Saudi Arabian procedural resolution if it was put to the vote.

17. Miss GROZA (Romania) said that the social and political changes which had transformed the world had enlarged the concept of human rights, and the liberties thus gained had stimulated ever larger groups to an unprecedented degree of political, economic and social activity. The indignation expressed in the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council at the violation of human rights in colonial and dependent Territories was therefore fully justified and constituted an implicit recognition of the need for more resolute action to bring about the speedy eradication of all such manifestations. She welcomed the fact that that problem would continue to be discussed in the Council and the Commission on Human Rights.

18. In her delegation's view, the recommendations which the Committee adopted should emphasize the most flagrant forms of violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms, which were particularly anachronistic at a time of great scientific advances by mankind. In countries where racial discrimination was practised, its victims were deprived of the enjoyment of the most elementary rights and freedoms. Three quarters of the population of South Africa was subject to the most odious form of racial discrimination, apartheid. The legislation of the Government of South Africa was evidence of its failure to carry out its obligations under the Charter in the field of human rights. The methods used by the Portuguese authorities maintained in a state of slavery in the so-called "Overseas Territories" hundreds of thousands of Africans, who were sold to work in the mines and

plantations of Southern Rhodesia and South Africa. Those methods were part and parcel of colonialism which was of its nature incompatible with the observance of human rights, because only members of a free people could enjoy fundamental freedoms.

19. Romania, whose Constitution assured complete freedom and equality under law for all its citizens, condemned the repression practised by South Africa and Portugal against all those fighting for the abolition of inhuman practices. Believing it to be in the interest of all peoples, of human progress in general and of the development of international relations in particular to ensure the observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms, her delegation would support any specific measure which aimed to solve the problem confronting the Committee. She hoped for the earliest possible implementation of international measures which would have the moral and legal force to ensure the full application of man's fundamental rights and freedoms.

20. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) said that her delegation had for many years sought new avenues for United Nations action to ensure observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The necessity to secure their effective observance throughout the world was one of the most important obligations which the Charter had imposed on all Member States. Her country's participation in the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa was evidence of its desire to co-operate in the search for ways and means to enforce fulfilment of the Charter provisions concerning human rights.

21. The international tragedy unleashed by the insanity of the nazis was an eloquent reminder of what might happen in South Africa if that country continued to practise racial segregation and extended that practice to the Territory which it administered under the Mandate. The same racial epidemic had also infected Southern Rhodesia. There, a privileged minority had established a government which infringed the rights of the indigenous majority, who aspired to independence with democratic constitutional guarantees enabling them to develop on a footing of equality with the white inhabitants of the Territory.

22. Her delegation attached great importance to the dissemination of information concerning the social scourge of racial discrimination in general and apartheid in particular. It therefore welcomed the conclusions and recommendations of the United Nations human rights seminar on apartheid which had been held at Brasilia from 23 August to 4 September 1966.

23. The draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council could, she felt, be strengthened to place greater emphasis on the specific topic of apartheid. However, it was necessary to bear in mind that the item before the Committee referred to the larger topic of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms and that apartheid must be treated within that context. The Committee should concern itself with the need to devise effective measures to secure prompt observance of human rights. Her delegation would take its position on the various proposals before the Committee in the light of those considerations.

24. Mr. NABER (Jordan) said that his country, which, because of its geographical position astride Asia and Africa, had seen the rise and fall of many civilizations and had been affected by many religions, had laid down as a basic principle of its Constitution the equality of all its citizens without distinction as to race, religion or colour. Under Islam, discrimination had been abolished in the seventh century and the Arab countries had always assimilated all those who had come to live within their borders.

25. His country was therefore concerned not only that some Governments continued to tolerate violations of human rights and freedoms but also that others had begun to do so. Except for South Africa, few States could vie with Israel in the practice of racial discrimination. Not only had Israel been founded on a racial and religious basis, but discrimination motivated its policies. The Arab and Christian minority in Israel was treated as the Jews had been treated in Nazi Germany. The members of that minority, who were considered second-class citizens, were confined to security zones from which they could be expelled without recourse to the courts, their land could be confiscated without compensation and, as the case of the Majorca Catholic Jews had shown, they could even be deported from Israel. While under Israel law citizenship was granted to any Jew from any part of the world, it was withheld from Arabs who had been born in Palestine and who had lived there all their lives. As one writer had said, the Israel Government must do more than proclaim principles of religious freedom; it must effectively apply those principles to Israeli Catholics suffering discrimination. A cable had been sent to the Secretary-General appealing to him in the name of humanity and justice to intercede with the Israel Government to mitigate the innumerable measures it had taken with regard to the Arab minority in Israel and imploring United Nations intervention to find a solution of the problem.

26. The Government of Jordan condemned violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms wherever they occurred. His delegation would therefore support any measure designed to put an end to them. His delegation, considering the draft resolution submitted by the Economic and Social Council too weak and diluted to be effective, had become a sponsor of the sixty-one-Power draft resolution and would support the Polish-Saudi Arabian draft resolution, which supplemented it.

Mrs. Embarek Warzazi (Morocco) resumed the Chair.

27. Mr. ALLAGANY (Saudi Arabia), replying to a question by Mr. RIOS (Panama), said that the sponsors did not plan to withdraw draft resolution A/C.3/L.1339 in view of the submission of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1340, of which text his delegation was also a co-sponsor. They proposed to include the symbol of the latter resolution, if and when it was adopted, in the second preambular paragraph of their text.

28. Mrs. STEVENSON (Liberia) said that in her country respect for the fundamental human rights and freedoms was guaranteed by the Constitution and appropriate legislation to all citizens alike and educational, social and economic opportunities were avail-

able to all. Liberian youth was brought up in an atmosphere free of racial discrimination or hatred.

29. The continued existence of racial discrimination in certain countries twenty-one years after the signing of the United Nations Charter was a deplorable but undeniable fact. In an age of advanced technology and modern science, no one could remain indifferent to the suffering and humiliation caused by the myth of racial, ideological or political superiority. Just as the world could not continue with the present enormous gap between the haves and the have-nots, so it could not continue to progress with its inhabitants half-slave and half-free. Accordingly, racial discrimination was one of the most urgent problems facing the world and was closely linked with the preservation of world peace.

30. The practice of apartheid by South Africa was not only diametrically opposed to the principles embodied in the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, but also aimed at destroying the very nature of man. That evil was also being extended to the Territory under South Africa's jurisdiction. While some Governments were enacting legislation to stamp out violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms, the Governments of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia were framing legislation to prevent the fulfilment of the political, economic, social and educational aspirations of their African populations. All appeals to those Governments had met with stubborn defiance and United Nations efforts to induce a change of policy had been to no avail.

31. South Africa had been able to continue and intensify its racial policies because of the support it received from certain Members of the United Nations. Its trading partners therefore must bear an equal responsibility for the crimes that were being committed against humanity.

32. In support of the struggle of its African brothers who were still smarting under the yoke of colonialism, Liberia, together with Ethiopia, had brought a legal action in the International Court of Justice challenging South Africa on its administration of the Territory of South West Africa. In its judgement of 18 July 1966,^{1/} the Court had turned back the hand of progress by dismissing the case on the ground that the Applicants had had no legal interest in it. That decision, which had stirred the conscience of the world, had accelerated the persistent, methodical and remorseless erosion of the liberties of the Africans of South West Africa, South Africa and Southern Rhodesia and had frustrated the hopes and aspirations of the oppressed. Mere condemnation of that evil was not sufficient; it was the responsibility of all Governments to give practical expression to United Nations resolutions designed to eradicate one of the most devastating evils of all times.

33. Mrs. DAES (Greece) said that, although her country had itself no problem of racial discrimination or segregation, it recognized the issue as a universal one because it affected the sacred rights of peoples. Greece, faithful to the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter, the European Convention for

^{1/} South West Africa, Second Phase, Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 1966, p. 6.

the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, the European Social Charter and the other instruments, would contribute to the best of its ability to the search for a solution in keeping with the principles and ideals set forth in the Charter.

34. With respect to the specific proposals before the Committee, her delegation considered the Polish-Saudi Arabian draft resolution unnecessary, since the Security Council was already dealing with the problem of apartheid. It supported the sixty-one-Power draft resolution in general and would express its views on the individual paragraphs later, if they were discussed separately.

35. Lady GAITSKELL (United Kingdom) observed that, as previous speakers had pointed out, the sixty-one-Power draft resolution not only was far-reaching but overlapped with the work allocated to other United Nations organs. The United Kingdom had firmly and consistently condemned apartheid in particular and racial discrimination in general and had, through the adoption of domestic measures, shown its readiness to join the United Nations in looking for new ways of working towards the eradication of those evils. She believed that the draft resolution needed considerable revision if it was to offer any hope of marking a further joint advance. The fact that it overlapped with other resolutions made it necessary to consider it most carefully in order to ensure that it did not cause confusion or even undo some of the good already achieved. She therefore proposed that, after the representative of South Africa had spoken in exercise of his right of reply, the meeting should be adjourned to allow delegations time to study the sixty-one-Power draft resolution.

36. Mrs. SOUMAH (Guinea), speaking on behalf of the African group, said that the African delegations wished to be considered morally absent while the representative of South Africa was making his statement, which they hoped would be disregarded by the other delegations.

37. Mr. BOTHA (South Africa) said that, since the representative of Ethiopia, at the preceding meeting, had made a statement casting doubt on his own reference to the admission by Ethiopia and Liberia of the facts produced by South Africa in the South West Africa cases and had denied that the Applicants had ever amended their submissions, he wished to set out the facts, as derived from the record of the proceedings of the International Court of Justice.

38. Concerning their admission of facts, the Applicants' Counsel had stated in Court on 27 April 1965: "The Applicants have advised Respondent as well as this Honourable Court that all and any averments of fact in Respondent's Written Pleadings will be and are accepted as true, unless specifically denied. And the Applicants have not found it necessary and do not find it necessary to controvert any such averments of fact."^{2/} With respect to the evidence of petitioners on which the applicants had originally relied, he had stated on 28 April 1965: "The Applicants have not relied on the accuracy of statements in such petitions."^{3/}

^{2/} International Court of Justice, C.R. 65/22, p. 39.

^{3/} *Ibid.*, C.R. 65/23, p. 42.

39. On the question of the amendment of the Applicants' submissions, he pointed out that Submissions Nos. 3 and 4 had originally been formulated as follows:

"3. The Union [of South Africa], in the respects set forth in Chapter V of this Memorial and summarized in Paragraphs 189 and 190 thereof, has practised apartheid, i.e., had distinguished as to race, color, national or tribal origin in establishing the rights and duties of the inhabitants of the Territory; that such practice is in violation of its obligations as stated in Article 2 of the Mandate and Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations; and that the Union has the duty forthwith to cease the practice of apartheid in the Territory;

"4. The Union, by virtue of the economic, political, social and educational policies applied within the Territory, which are described in detail in Chapter V of this Memorial and summarized at Paragraph 190 thereof, has failed to promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and social progress of the inhabitants of the Territory; that its failure to do so is in violation of its obligations as stated in the second paragraph of Article 2 of the Mandate and Article 22 of the Covenant; and that the Union had the duty forthwith to cease its violations as aforesaid and to take all practicable action to fulfil its duties under such Articles."^{4/}

40. Paragraphs 189 and 190 of the Applicants' Memorials, to which reference was made in the submissions, enumerated the charges of oppression and read, in part, as follows:

"189. ... Under apartheid, the status, rights, duties, opportunities and burdens of the population are fixed and allocated arbitrarily on the basis of race, color and tribe, without any regard for the actual needs and capacities of the groups and individuals affected. Under apartheid, the rights and interests of the great majority of the people of the Territory are subordinated to the desires and conveniences of a minority... Apartheid, as it actually is and as it actually has been in the life of the people of the Territory is a process by which the Mandatory excludes the 'Natives' of the Territory from any significant participation in the life of the Territory except insofar as the Mandatory finds it necessary to use the 'Natives' as an indispensable source of common labor or menial service.

"190. Deliberately, systematically and consistently, the Mandatory has discriminated against the 'Native' population of South West Africa...

"...

"The Mandatory has progressively reduced the proportion of farm land available for cultivation or pastoral use of the 'Native' population, while it has progressively increased the proportion of such farm land available to 'Europeans'...

"...

"The Mandatory has effectively and almost completely denied liberty of movement to the 'Native'

^{4/} *Ibid.*, South West Africa Case (Ethiopia [Liberia] v. the Union of South Africa): Memorial submitted by the Government of Ethiopia [Liberia]—April 1961, p. 168.

population of the Territory, in a large number and variety of ways hereinabove more particularly described...

"In the entire complex of provisions for the arbitrary arrest of 'Natives' and tight restrictions upon their residence and movement, the Mandatory has given consideration solely to the convenience or advantage of the Mandatory government of the 'European' citizens and residents of the Territory.

"...

"The Mandatory is responsible for a system of education in which a far smaller fraction of the 'Native' children within the Territory receive any schooling than in the case of the 'European' children of the Territory...".^{5/}

41. The Applicants, having admitted all the facts presented by South Africa in contradiction of the original allegations of oppression, had accordingly amended their original submissions, on 19 May 1965, to read as follows:

"3. Respondent, by laws and regulations, and official methods and measures, which are set out in the pleadings herein, has practised apartheid... and that Respondent has the duty forthwith to cease the practice of apartheid in the Territory:

"4. Respondent, by virtue of economic, political, social and educational policies applied within the Territory, by means of laws and regulations, and official methods and measures, which are set out in the pleadings herein, has, in the light of applicable international standards or international legal norm, or both, failed to promote... and that Respondent has the duty forthwith to cease its violations as aforesaid and to take all practicable action to fulfil its duties under such Articles."^{6/}

42. Thus, the Applicants had omitted from their amended Submissions Nos. 3 and 4 the vital reference

^{5/} Ibid., pp. 132-137.

^{6/} South West Africa, Second Phase, Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 1966, p. 15.

to paragraphs 189 and 190 of their Memorials, thereby abandoning all their original charges of oppression. In order to make sure that there could be no misunderstanding on that point, they had added formal interpretations and explanatory comments to their amended submissions which made it clear that they were no longer making a case of oppression, and they had stated in court that they were not relying upon any improper intent or motives on South Africa's part nor on the effects or results of its policies. That could be illustrated abundantly from the Court's record if required.

43. The representative of Ethiopia, in an attempt to justify his contention that the Applicants had never amended their case, had quoted from a statement by their Counsel which had been made towards the end of the proceedings when the Applicants had been commenting on the evidence and attempting to depart from the case on which they had so emphatically rested at the time of the amendment of their submissions. No one had been misled by the Applicants' attempt to disown their admissions of fact, as was clear from the separate opinion of one of the dissenting judges, who had stated:

"Applicants' cause is no longer based directly on a violation of the well-being and progress by the practice of apartheid, but on the alleged violation of certain international standards or international legal norm and not directly on the obligation to promote the well-being and social progress of the inhabitants."^{7/}

44. He believed that the foregoing fully substantiated his earlier statement with regard to the Applicants' withdrawal of their charges of oppression.

45. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United Kingdom motion for the adjournment of the meeting.

The motion was adopted by 48 votes to 16, with 16 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.

^{7/} Ibid., p. 286.