

## Chapter VII

**Questions relating to Africa****Matters concerning South Africa's apartheid policies**

During 1971, the question of the apartheid policies of the Government of South Africa were again considered by various United Nations organs. The Security Council did not meet on the question, but it received a number of communications, particularly relating to the arms embargo against South Africa and alleging that certain countries were furnishing arms to South Africa in violation of resolutions of the Council and General Assembly.

During the year, the General Assembly's enlarged 16-member Special Committee on Apartheid again considered various aspects of the question and submitted its report and recommendations to the Assembly and the Security Council in October. The Commission on Human Rights and the Economic and Social Council also examined aspects of the question and made several recommendations to the Assembly.

At its twenty-sixth session, which opened on 21 September 1971, the General Assembly considered the reports and recommendations before it and adopted a number of resolutions on various aspects of the apartheid question. On 9 November, it first adopted—as a matter of urgency—a resolution on the repression and maltreatment of opponents of apartheid in South Africa, and among other things asked the Special Committee on Apartheid to prepare a special report on the subject.

On 29 November, the Assembly adopted a resolution by which, among other things, it deplored the actions of Governments which had provided or allowed companies to provide assistance for the build-up of South African military and police forces. It declared that the arms embargo against South Africa made no distinction between arms for external defence and arms for internal repression and called for full implementation of the arms embargo against South Africa.

By another decision, the Assembly expressed its conviction of the special role education should play in efforts to eliminate apartheid and asked the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to prepare an educational kit on racial discrimination and apartheid in southern Africa for possible adaptation by national UNESCO commissions and for distribution to institutions of learning.

The Assembly endorsed the Special Commit-

tee's work programme for 1972 and authorized it, within budgetary limitations, to participate in international conferences on apartheid and to consult with organizations engaged in the campaign against apartheid.

With regard to apartheid in sports, the Assembly urged all States to promote adherence to the Olympic principle of non-discrimination and to encourage their sports organizations to withhold support from sporting events organized in violation of that principle. The South African Government was condemned for its actions in enforcing racial discrimination and segregation in sports.

The General Assembly again condemned the establishment of Bantu homelands (Bantustans) and the forcible removal of the African people of South Africa and Namibia to such areas as a violation of their inalienable rights. The Assembly considered that the establishment of Bantustans was designed to consolidate and perpetuate domination by a white minority and the dispossession and exploitation of the African and other non-white people of South Africa and Namibia. It declared that the United Nations would continue to encourage and promote a solution to the situation in South Africa through the full application of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including political rights, to all the inhabitants regardless of race, colour or creed.

By another decision, the Assembly expressed concern over the explosive situation in South Africa and in southern Africa as a whole resulting from the inhuman and aggressive policies of apartheid pursued by the South African Government. It condemned the continued and increasing co-operation of certain States and foreign economic interests with South Africa in military, economic and other fields, and appealed to Governments, organizations and individuals to assist the national movement of the oppressed people of South Africa in their legitimate struggle. The Assembly also, among other things, recommended that the Security Council consider urgently the situation in South Africa and in southern Africa as a whole with a view to adopting effective measures against South Africa.

Another resolution adopted by the General Assembly had to do with the dissemination of information about apartheid. By it, the Assembly

among other things asked the Secretary-General to intensify information activities with a view to promoting national and international action for the elimination of apartheid. The Special Committee on Apartheid was asked to take steps to promote the establishment of national committees against apartheid.

Also, the General Assembly, by a resolution concerning trade union activities against apartheid, appealed to all national and international trade union organizations to intensify their action against apartheid by discouraging the emigration of skilled workers to South Africa, by taking action on infringements of trade union rights and the persecution of trade unionists in South Africa, by exerting maximum pressure on foreign interests which were profiting from discrimination against non-white workers in South Africa, and by co-operating with other organizations engaged in the international campaign against apartheid.

The General Assembly, by another decision, appealed to States, organizations and individuals for generous contributions to the United Nations

Trust Fund for South Africa to meet increasing needs, and asked the Secretary-General to intensify the dissemination of information on the need for relief and assistance to persons persecuted under repressive and discriminatory legislation in South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia.

The Assembly also adopted a resolution relating to the credentials of the representatives of South Africa.

The Assembly at its twenty-sixth session also adopted resolutions concerning: the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination; the question of a draft convention on the suppression and punishment of apartheid; the importance of the right to self-determination; and the co-operation of the specialized agencies and international institutions in implementing the 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

These and other decisions of United Nations organs with regard to the apartheid question are described in the sections that follow.

## Political and related developments

### Communications to Security Council

During 1971, the Security Council, which did not meet on the question of South Africa's apartheid policies during the year, received a number of communications particularly relating to the arms embargo against South Africa and containing allegations that certain countries were furnishing arms to South Africa in violation of the Council's resolution of 23 July 1970,<sup>1</sup> the General Assembly's resolution of 13 October 1970,<sup>2</sup> and earlier resolutions of these bodies.

During February and March, the Security Council received communications relating to a decision announced on 22 February 1971 by the United Kingdom that it would grant export licences for helicopters and spare parts to South Africa under the terms of the Simonstown Agreement of 1955 (contained in an exchange of letters of 30 June 1955 between the two Governments).

On 24 February, the Executive Secretary of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) transmitted the text of a memorandum stating among other things that a study of the so-called Simonstown Agreement showed clearly that the United Kingdom had no obligation to sell any more military equipment to South Africa. The Agreement—concluded before the achievement of independence by most African States—was anachronistic and had little current validity. Any revitalization of the Agreement, accompanied by the breach of the arms embargo against South Africa, could only be

regarded by the independent African States as an unfriendly and hostile act.

On 1 March, the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia transmitted a statement by the Council that the United Kingdom's decision was contrary to Security Council resolutions calling on all States to refrain from selling arms and ammunition to South Africa.

On 5 March, the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples transmitted the text of a consensus adopted by the Special Committee on 4 March deploring the United Kingdom's decision which, the Special Committee said, would have serious repercussions throughout the whole of southern Africa.

The United Kingdom transmitted on 23 March the text of the Opinion of the Law Officers of The Crown for England and Wales on the extent of the existing legal obligations of the United Kingdom arising under the Simonstown Agreement of 1955. It was maintained that the Agreement was still valid and remained in force and that, contrary to the OAU memorandum, the United Kingdom had certain legal obligations subsisting under it.

In a letter dated 7 May 1971, the Chairman of the Special Committee on Apartheid transmitted a note concerning implementation of the arms

<sup>1</sup> See Y.U.N., 1970, pp. 146-147, text of resolution 282(1970).  
<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 148, text of resolution 2624(XXV).

embargo against South Africa, and the text of a communique issued by the Special Committee about the resumption of arms sales to South Africa by the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom's decision to accord export licences for helicopters and spare parts to South Africa was viewed by the Special Committee as a breach of relevant Security Council resolutions and of its international obligations under the United Nations Charter.

The letter went on to say that information concerning the involvement of the United Kingdom had been more readily available than that of other countries because of the public and political controversy it had created. In the case of France—currently the main supplier of arms—Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Israel, Switzerland, the United States and others, information had been restricted, so that the amount of coverage given in the note to the collaboration of those countries did not necessarily reflect the full extent to which they were involved in the arms trade.

Subsequent communications to the Security Council from Israel, Belgium, the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany and Switzerland replied to allegations contained in the report of the Special Committee.

On 23 September, the text of a consensus—adopted on 13 September by a joint meeting of the Special Committee on Apartheid, the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the United Nations Council for Namibia—was transmitted to the Security Council.

### **Report of Special Committee on Apartheid**

The General Assembly's Special Committee on Apartheid submitted its report to the Security Council and the Assembly on 11 October 1971. The report reviewed the Special Committee's work during 1971 and new developments in South Africa since the previous report. It also contained the Special Committee's conclusions and recommendations for consideration by the Assembly and the Council.

The Special Committee held a special session in New York from 22 to 24 March in connexion with the observance of both the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination—21 March—and the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, proclaimed for 1971.

The meeting in observance of the International Day was attended by representatives of Member States, the specialized agencies and the Organization of African Unity (OAU). Statements were made by the Secretary-General, the President of the twenty-fifth (1970) session of the General Assem-

bly, the President of the Security Council and the Chairmen of the Committee of Trustees of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and the Special Committee. The meeting closed with a silent tribute to the memory of the victims of Sharpeville and all who had fallen victim to racial persecution and racial injustice.

Attending the meetings in connexion with the observance of the International Year were, among others, representatives of the specialized agencies and OAU, representatives of international non-governmental organizations active against apartheid, and representatives of liberation movements.

In accordance with a request by the General Assembly, the Special Committee sent a mission to Europe and Africa to consult with the specialized agencies and various regional organizations and non-governmental organizations on means to promote further concerted international action against apartheid. Between 3 and 26 June, the three-member mission visited Dublin (Ireland), London (United Kingdom), Brussels (Belgium), Geneva (Switzerland), Paris (France), Yaounde (Cameroon) and Addis Ababa (Ethiopia) and held 34 meetings for consultations with specialized agencies, OAU, liberation movements, anti-apartheid movements and other organizations. It attended a United Nations seminar on racial discrimination held at Yaounde in June and its members also attended as observers the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU in Addis Ababa on 24 June.

In its report, the Special Committee expressed its concern that South Africa had continued its efforts to suppress all protests against its apartheid policy by repressive measures which violated all principles of law. A significant development in the past year had been the application of such repressive measures against churchmen who had criticized apartheid or assisted its victims. The Anglican Dean of Johannesburg, the Very Reverend G. A. French-Beytagh, had been detained in January and subsequently put on trial under the notorious Terrorism Act. Threats had been directed against churches and against student and other organizations.

The Special Committee reported that South Africa had continued its military build-up: the defence budget for 1971-1972 reached a record figure of \$443.1 million, an increase of 18 per cent over the previous year. The Special Committee noted that South Africa had been able to obtain military equipment—as well as assistance for local manufacture of such equipment—from other countries despite the arms embargo called for by the Security Council.

The Special Committee stated that South Africa had been obliged to make certain adjustments and concessions in its policies and practices because of

international and internal opposition, and economic and other difficulties. However, the discrimination laws, the implementation of the "Bantustans" policy and the relegation of Africans to reservoirs of cheap labour, as well as other measures, remained unchanged. In the face of the defiant intransigence of the South African régime, the international community was left with no other choice but to intensify its efforts to isolate that régime and to provide assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and their movement for liberation.

In the framework of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, the Special Committee recommended that the General Assembly adopt a declaration on the elimination of apartheid, stressing the grave concern of the international community over the situation in South Africa and restating the essential elements of a solution in accordance with the United Nations Charter. Such a declaration would help counteract the propaganda and manoeuvres of the South African régime and its friends, and would represent a programme of action for the opponents of racism everywhere.

The Special Committee deplored the fact that the arms embargo called for by the Security Council in its resolution 282(1970) of 23 July 1970<sup>3</sup> had not yet been implemented by certain States, which were supplying additional equipment and technical assistance to the South African Government for its military build-up. The attitudes and actions of those powers constituted an encouragement to the South African régime in its defiance of the United Nations and in its pursuit of the inhuman policy of apartheid. The Special Committee reiterated that it was essential that the Security Council declare that the arms embargo against South Africa was mandatory.

The Special Committee also drew attention to the continued and increasing collaboration by some Governments and private enterprises with the South African régime and South African companies in violation of repeated recommendations of the General Assembly. It recommended that such activities be condemned, and suggested that reports on continued collaboration by Governments and private enterprises with South Africa be prepared and published periodically.

In order to ensure the provision of greater assistance to the national movement of the oppressed people of South Africa, the Special Committee recommended that the General Assembly welcome the establishment of the OAU Assistance Fund for the Struggle against Colonialism and Apartheid, and appealed for contributions by Governments, organizations and individuals to the Fund or directly to liberation movements.

The Special Committee also recommended that

the United Nations should greatly increase its information activities on apartheid, and it suggested certain specific measures in that regard.

Also suggested by the Special Committee were measures that specialized agencies might take in their respective fields in the campaign against apartheid. It also felt that the establishment of national committees against apartheid in all countries would greatly contribute to the campaign.

The Special Committee expressed satisfaction at the response in many countries to the appeals of the General Assembly and the Special Committee for the boycott of racially selected South African sports teams. In connexion with the observance of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, the Special Committee recommended that the Assembly adopt a declaration against racism in national and international sports—inviting Governments, sports organizations and the public to pledge to combat racial discrimination in sports and not to patronize any sporting events in which teams selected on the basis of racial discrimination participated.

With regard to refugees from South Africa, the Special Committee recommended that the General Assembly issue an appeal to all Member States, especially African countries and those neighbouring South Africa, to assist South African refugees to obtain travel documents, education and training and suitable employment.

The Special Committee emphasized again the need to consider the problem of apartheid in its wider context in southern Africa, where the South African régime had become the bastion of racism and colonialism. A thorough study of the interrelationships of the problems of southern Africa should be made and a plan formulated for more effective international action to secure the elimination of apartheid and colonialism in the area.

#### **Decisions of Human Rights Commission and of Economic and Social Council**

##### **Decisions of Commission**

At its meetings in February and March 1971, the Commission on Human Rights took a number of decisions having to do with apartheid.

By one of these, the Commission approved the text of a resolution on policies of apartheid and racial discrimination which it recommended for adoption by the Economic and Social Council. (See below for action by the Council. See also pp. 405-6.)

On the question of racial discrimination in the political, economic, social and cultural spheres, the Commission approved a text also for adoption by

<sup>3</sup> See footnote 1.

the Economic and Social Council. (See below for Council action, and pp. 411-12.)

Another resolution recommended by the Commission for adoption by the Economic and Social Council was one having to do with the question of slavery and the slave trade in all their practices and manifestations, including the slavery-like practices of apartheid and colonialism. (See below for action by the Council, and page 434.)

The Human Rights Commission also adopted a text relating to the implementation of United Nations resolutions on the right of peoples under colonial and alien domination to self-determination. This text was proposed for adoption by the Economic and Social Council and it contained the text of a resolution which the Council would ask the General Assembly to adopt. (For decisions by the Council and the Assembly, see below. See also pp. 420-24.)

The Human Rights Commission also adopted a resolution on the report of its Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts in which, among other things, it stated that it looked forward to receiving the text of a study concerning the question of apartheid (which had been declared a crime against humanity) from the point of view of international penal law. The study had been requested by the Commission in 1970.<sup>4</sup>

#### Decisions of Economic and Social Council

On 21 May 1971, the Economic and Social Council adopted resolution 1591(L) on the policies of apartheid and racial discrimination. Among other things, the Council:

(1) requested the Security Council to find means of enforcing its own resolutions, by which all United Nations Members were called upon not to supply arms to South Africa, and of effectively implementing the pertinent resolutions of the General Assembly;

(2) urged States and, in particular, the major trading partners of South Africa to apply fully the resolutions concerning apartheid adopted by the General Assembly, the Security Council and other United Nations organs;

(3) invited the specialized agencies—and especially the financial institutions—to follow towards South Africa a policy in conformity with those resolutions;

(4) invited all States to strengthen and expand their programmes of assistance to the victims of apartheid and to respond as promptly as possible to the Assembly's appeal for substantial contributions to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa;

(5) invited all States to undertake, with the assistance of non-governmental organizations—including workers, religious, social and professional organizations, universities, youth and civic groups

and national women's organizations, where appropriate—an educational programme designed to acquaint the public of each country and territory with the evil consequences of the policy of apartheid;

(6) also invited non-governmental organizations in consultative status with special interest in the elimination of racism and racial discrimination, independent of any action being undertaken by States, to mount a regular and constant campaign against apartheid both at the national and international levels and to report their endeavours and progress biennially to the Council;

(7) appealed to all humanitarian organizations, and to the International Committee of the Red Cross in particular, to take an active role in assisting the victims of apartheid, especially those who were detained or imprisoned;

(8) urged the General Assembly to provide funds on the scale required to combat effectively the propaganda undertaken by South Africa by which that country sought to defend and justify the policy of apartheid; and

(9) invited the Secretary-General to make special efforts, utilizing the existing information services available to the United Nations, to alert world public opinion, and particularly that of countries trading with South Africa, to the recommendations made by various United Nations bodies on the subject of apartheid, in order to facilitate compliance by Governments with those recommendations.

(For further details, see pp. 405-6.)

Also on 21 May, the Council adopted resolution 1588(L), on racial discrimination in the political, economic, social and cultural spheres, by which it recommended that certain actions be taken against racial discrimination, particularly during 1971—designated as the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. (For details, see pp. 411-12.)

On the question of slavery and the slave trade in all their practices and manifestations, including the slavery-like practices of apartheid and colonialism, the Economic and Social Council on 21 May adopted resolution 1593(L). (For details, see page 434.)

The Council adopted another resolution (1599(L)) on the same date on the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts in connexion with allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights in southern Africa. (For details, see pp. 434-35.)

Also approved by the Council on 21 May was a resolution (1592(L)) by which it recommended that the General Assembly adopt a draft resolution

<sup>4</sup> See Y.U.N., 1970, p. 514.

on the implementation of United Nations resolutions relating to the right of peoples under colonial and alien domination to self-determination. This text was adopted later in 1971 by the General Assembly as its resolution 2787(XXVI). (For details, see page 420.)

### Consideration by General Assembly

#### General aspects

An item relating to the policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa was included in the agenda of the twenty-sixth (1971) session of the General Assembly on the recommendation of the Assembly's General Committee.

During the discussion regarding the adoption of the agenda, the representative of South Africa reaffirmed his Government's reservations with regard to the inscription in the agenda and the eventual consideration of the item. The Assembly, however, approved the inclusion of the item in the agenda, allocating it to the Special Political Committee.

The Rapporteur of the Special Committee on Apartheid, introducing the Special Committee's report, said it had been hoped that during the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination efforts would be made to develop wider awareness of the dangers of racism, and particularly apartheid, resulting in more effective national and international measures. However, the deteriorating situation in South Africa had continued to belie that hope. All appeals, decisions and suggestions by various United Nations organs for a peaceful and equitable solution to the problem had only strengthened the South African racist régime in its intransigence and defiance of world public opinion.

The Special Committee on Apartheid had, he pointed out, documented the evidence of continued violations of the arms embargo by various countries, and it was hoped that the General Assembly and the Security Council would give thorough and urgent consideration to the matter and take the necessary decisions to secure full implementation of the embargo.

Military and economic support of the South African Government had, he went on, encouraged it to intensify its application of callous apartheid measures, and the ensuing racial bitterness and resolute opposition and resistance to them had further intensified the danger of violent conflict. In the year under review, repressive measures had increased in severity and had been more widely applied. The Special Committee on Apartheid was gravely concerned about the people who had been gaoled under South Africa's numerous security laws, especially since at least 15 persons were

known to have died while in arbitrary detention, including one detained in 1971.

The Rapporteur deplored the fact that the South African Government had continued its relentless assault on the fundamental human rights of "non-white" South Africans and had caused them untold misery and hardship. In 1971, thousands of Africans and Indians had been uprooted from their homes and communities and systematically forced into "resettlement camps," which lacked the most rudimentary facilities, in areas which could barely provide even a meagre livelihood. The Special Committee on Apartheid, he said, was convinced that there could be no peaceful and just solution within the framework of Bantustans and apartheid institutions which confined Africans to one eighth of the land.

The Rapporteur said the Special Committee was convinced that the situation in South Africa constituted a serious and ever-growing threat to international peace and security and required the prompt application of decisive mandatory sanctions and related economic measures. Special emphasis should be given to the need for greater assistance by States and organizations to the oppressed people of South Africa in their legitimate struggle for freedom. The need for vigorous and diversified information programmes on the evils and dangers of apartheid was greater than ever before. At the end of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, efforts to implement concrete and realistic action should be redoubled. The report of the Special Committee on Apartheid outlined various measures for the elimination of apartheid provided, he stressed, that the international community was willing to make the necessary effort.

The Chairman of the Special Committee on Apartheid said that despite the arms embargo imposed by the Security Council, South Africa had continued to obtain military equipment, technical assistance and licences for the manufacture of arms from many States. Countries which supplied South Africa with arms continued to maintain their fraudulent distinction between arms for internal repression and arms for external security, and to pretend ignorance of the fact that aircraft or helicopters supplied for so-called non-military purposes could easily be converted for military use.

South Africa, he continued, had felt the need to guard against further isolation by initiating its new so-called outward policy of dialogue with African States. Those States should be warned that in return for South African financial aid and technical assistance, they could only expect a new colonial relationship. By providing new markets for South African manufactured goods they would reinforce the industrial system built on apartheid,

and by entering into a dialogue with South Africa they were contributing to that country's efforts to undermine the international campaign against apartheid. Such a dialogue, he stressed, would not restore to the non-white people of South Africa their political, social and economic rights.

The Chairman stressed that the international campaign to isolate South Africa must be pursued until the South African Government showed its willingness to carry out the kind of consultation within South Africa called for by the Security Council's Group of Experts in 1964,<sup>5</sup> or the kind of dialogue called for by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in the Lusaka Manifesto of 1969.<sup>6</sup>

The Chairman further emphasized that national and international trade unions could play an important role in the campaign against apartheid by effectively discouraging the immigration of skilled workers to South Africa, by conducting a vigorous campaign to end the persecution of trade unionists in South Africa and by bringing pressure to bear on investors in the Western countries.

He went on to say that there was heartening evidence of the strength of the anti-apartheid movements in many countries. The boycotts of all-white South African teams by a number of international and national sports associations had had measurable repercussions in South Africa, where many sportsmen were demanding an end to racism in sport for fear of total international isolation. It would be a tremendous contribution to the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination if Governments followed the moral lead given by so many of their peoples and took action to complete the boycott of apartheid in sports.

The Chairman pointed out that in their resolutions and decisions various United Nations bodies had stressed the need for the widest possible dissemination of information on the evils and dangers of colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa, and on United Nations efforts to eradicate such phenomena.

The Special Political Committee first took up a proposal—eventually sponsored by 56 Member States—on the question of the ill-treatment and torture of political prisoners and others detained or in police custody in South Africa for their anti-apartheid activities. The Special Political Committee approved the text, as revised by the sponsors, by a roll-call vote of 98 to 1, with 2 abstentions, on 3 November 1971, and recommended its adoption by the General Assembly as an interim measure and as a matter of urgency. The Assembly adopted it on 9 November by a recorded vote of 109 to 2, as its resolution 2764(XXVI).

By this text, the Assembly among other things

expressed grave concern at continuing reports of ill-treatment and torture of opponents of apartheid in detention in South Africa and at the deaths of several detainees during interrogation. It also noted the recent deportations, bannings, detentions and trials of a number of religious leaders in South Africa for their opposition to apartheid and assistance to victims of that inhuman policy.

By the operative paragraphs of the text, the Assembly:

(1) expressed grave indignation and concern over any and every act of maltreatment and torture of opponents of apartheid in South Africa and the increased persecution of religious leaders opposed to that policy;

(2) again called upon all States to do everything in their power to promote the cause of justice for all people in South Africa and to exert their influence to secure: (a) the repeal of all legislation designed to give effect to the oppressive policies of apartheid and all legislation designed to persecute and suppress the rights of those opposed to such policies; (b) the liberation of all persons imprisoned or detained for their opposition to apartheid; and (c) the removal of orders against those banned or banished for their opposition to apartheid;

(3) appealed to national and international associations of jurists to take all appropriate steps in support of the purposes of the present resolution;

(4) urged all religious organizations to continue and intensify their efforts for the elimination of apartheid and racial discrimination;

(5) requested the Special Committee on Apartheid to prepare a special report on all known cases of maltreatment and torture of prisoners in South Africa, together with any other information pertinent to those cases;

(6) invited all organizations and individuals with knowledge of such cases to provide the Special Committee with all available information;

(7) asked the Secretary-General: (a) to bring the present resolution to the attention of Governments, organizations and anti-apartheid movements, including religious organizations and associations of jurists; (b) to publicize, through the Unit on Apartheid of the United Nations Secretariat and the United Nations Office of Public Information, all available information on the maltreatment and torture of prisoners and detainees in South Africa and the persecution of opponents of apartheid, including religious leaders; and (c) to assist the Special Committee in preparing the report requested and publicize it as widely as possible.

<sup>5</sup> See Y.U.N., 1964, pp. 107-9.

<sup>6</sup> See Y.U.N., 1969, pp. 147-52.

The resolution was sponsored by Afghanistan, Algeria, Barbados, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, the Congo, Cyprus, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Iran, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, the Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, the Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, the Ukrainian SSR, the United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire and Zambia.

Introducing the draft resolution in the Special Political Committee, the representative of Somalia said it reflected the concern and indignation aroused by recent events in South Africa. He and many other speakers deplored the death of Ahmed Timol while under detention in Johannesburg, and the arrest and conviction of the Anglican Dean of Johannesburg, the Very Reverend G. A. French-Beytagh. The representative of Nigeria hoped the resolution could be adopted unanimously in order to express the concern felt at the inhuman policies of the South African Government. Zambia, a sponsor, deplored the increased sufferings of non-whites in police custody and prison in South Africa, the petty nature of the offences for which they were being imprisoned, the appalling conditions to which anti-apartheid fighters were being subjected, and the arrogant attitude of the South African Government towards efforts to end apartheid.

(For text of resolution 2764(XXVI), see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

Following the approval of the resolution concerning maltreatment and torture of opponents of apartheid, the Special Political Committee returned to a general discussion of South Africa's apartheid policies, which were again deplored by a majority of speakers.

Many Members commended the efforts of the Special Committee on Apartheid in gathering information concerning South Africa's repressive policies and endorsed the conclusions and recommendations contained in the Special Committee's report. It was noted that the dangers of apartheid were spreading beyond South Africa, whose authorities were using their increased military power to extend the inhuman practice of apartheid to other territories, to suppress national liberation movements throughout the African continent and to threaten the sovereignty of independent African States. It was the duty of all Member States of the United Nations to adopt the necessary measures to curb the South African racists.

Many speakers condemned the economic and military co-operation of major Western powers

with South African authorities. By giving military and economic assistance to South Africa those powers were grossly violating United Nations resolutions. Any money channelled into Pretoria helped to fortify apartheid and every delivery of arms served to encourage its military ventures. It was the opinion of many speakers that South Africa's trading partners and those who violated the arms embargo were largely responsible for the ineffectiveness of United Nations decisions. It was again stressed that the United Nations must consider mandatory measures to control a situation that might spark unprecedented violence.

Most Members emphasized the importance of spreading information on the evils of apartheid and of eliciting the support of people in all parts of the world. The Special Committee on Apartheid was urged to continue and intensify dissemination of information about those countries that were co-operating with the Pretoria racist régime and on the evils and atrocities committed by the South African racists. Also stressed was the need for publicizing United Nations decisions on apartheid.

Many Members emphasized the importance of co-ordinating the efforts of anti-apartheid and national liberation movements in their struggle against apartheid. A number pledged their Governments' material and moral support to those struggling against the system of racial oppression.

The general debate on the apartheid question resulted in the adoption, on 29 November, of nine additional resolutions by the General Assembly. One of these—resolution 2774(XXVI)—dealt with the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and is described in another section of this chapter (see pp. 86-88). The others are described below.

By the first resolution—2775 A (XXVI)—the Assembly among other things expressed grave concern at the continued build-up of South African military and police forces and noted that South Africa continued to receive military equipment—and technical and other assistance for the manufacture of such equipment—from certain Member States in contravention of the arms embargo.

After reaffirming its resolution of 13 October 1970,<sup>7</sup> the Assembly declared that the arms embargo against South Africa made no distinction between arms for external defence and arms for internal repression, and deplored the actions of those Governments which had provided, or allowed companies registered in their countries to provide, assistance for the build-up of the military and police forces.

The Assembly called upon all Governments to implement fully the arms embargo against South

<sup>7</sup> See footnote 2.

Africa and urgently appealed to all national and international organizations to discourage and denounce all military collaboration with South Africa and ensure implementation of Security Council resolutions on the arms embargo.

The Security Council was invited to consider the situation in the light of the reports and communications addressed to it by the Special Committee on Apartheid and of the present resolution, with a view to securing full implementation of the Council's resolution of 23 July 1970.<sup>8</sup>

Finally, the Assembly asked the Special Committee on Apartheid to undertake a comprehensive study of the military collaboration with, and military assistance to, South Africa by Governments and private enterprises and to report thereon to the Assembly at its 1972 session.

The resolution was adopted by the General Assembly by a recorded vote of 107 to 2, with 5 abstentions, on the recommendation of the Special Political Committee, which approved it, as amended by Sierra Leone, on 15 November by a roll-call vote of 87 to 1, with 6 abstentions.

(For text of resolution 2775 A (XXVI), see **DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.**)

The sponsors of the resolution were Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Colombia, the Congo, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, the Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, the Ukrainian SSR, the United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

The next resolution adopted by the Assembly—2775 B (XXVI)—concerned educational material on apartheid. The text, which was twice revised, was approved in the Special Political Committee on 15 November by a roll-call vote of 97 to 0, with 2 abstentions, and adopted by the Assembly on 29 November by a recorded vote of 112 to 1, with 3 abstentions. It was sponsored by Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, the Congo, Costa Rica, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, the Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Jamaica, Kenya, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, the Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, the Ukrainian SSR, the United Republic of

Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

By this resolution, the General Assembly among other things considered that the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination should be the occasion to add new emphasis to efforts to enlighten the international community about the evils of apartheid and racial discrimination in South Africa. It was convinced of the special role education should play in international efforts to eliminate apartheid and other forms of racial discrimination.

By the operative parts of the text, the Assembly commended the proposal of the Special Committee on Apartheid for the preparation of an educational kit on racial discrimination and apartheid in southern Africa, and it asked the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to prepare such a kit for possible adaptation by national UNESCO commissions and for distribution to institutions of learning.

The Assembly also asked UNESCO to consider the production of films and audio-visual material on apartheid, with special reference to its adverse effects on education, science and culture, and invited all concerned to co-operate with UNESCO to ensure the widest possible use of the material prepared.

(For text of resolution 2775 B (XXVI), see **DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.**)

By another resolution adopted on 29 November—2775 C (XXVI)—the General Assembly endorsed the programme of work of the Special Committee on Apartheid contained in its report and authorized it, within the budgetary provisions to be made for this purpose: (a) to send representatives or delegations, as appropriate, to international conferences dealing with the problem of apartheid and (b) to hold consultations with experts and with representatives of the oppressed people of South Africa, as well as anti-apartheid movements and non-governmental organizations concerned with the campaign against apartheid.

The Assembly adopted this text by a recorded vote of 108 to 1, with 5 abstentions, on the recommendation of the Special Political Committee, which approved it, as revised, on 15 November, by 89 votes to 0, with 4 abstentions. It was sponsored by Afghanistan, Algeria, Cameroon, the Congo, Egypt, the Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the Philippines, Senegal, Sierra Leone,

<sup>8</sup> See footnote 1.

Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, the Ukrainian SSR, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen and Zambia.

(For text of resolution 2775 C (XXVI), see **DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.**)

Another resolution adopted on 29 November by the General Assembly—2775 D (XXVI)—had to do with the question of apartheid in sports. After recalling its requests to all States and national and international sports organizations to suspend exchanges of sporting events with South African teams selected under apartheid policies, the Assembly declared its unqualified support of the Olympic principle that no discrimination be allowed on the grounds of race, religion or political affiliation, and affirmed that merit should be the sole criterion for participation in sports activities.

The Assembly then called upon all national and international sports organizations to uphold the Olympic principle of non-discrimination and to discourage and deny support to sporting events organized in violation of that principle. It also called upon individual sportsmen to refuse to participate in any sports activity in which there was an official policy of racial discrimination or apartheid in the field of sports.

By this text, the Assembly then urged all States to promote adherence to the Olympic principle of non-discrimination and to encourage their sports organizations to withhold support from sporting events organized in violation of that principle. National and international sports organizations and the public were asked to deny any form of recognition to any sports activity from which persons were debarred or in which they were subjected to any discrimination on the basis of race, religion or political affiliation.

The General Assembly then condemned the actions of the South African Government in enforcing racial discrimination and segregation in sports.

Some national and international sports organizations, the Assembly noted with regret, had continued exchanges with teams from South Africa selected for international competition on the basis of competition closed to otherwise qualified sportsmen solely on the basis of their race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin.

The Assembly commended those international and national sports organizations that had supported the international campaign against apartheid in sports, and requested all States to urge their national sports organizations to act in accordance with the present resolution. It asked the Secretary-General to bring the resolution to the attention of international sports organizations, to keep the Special Committee on Apartheid informed as to its

implementation and to report on the matter to the Assembly at its 1972 session.

The resolution was adopted by the General Assembly by a recorded vote of 106 to 2, with 7 abstentions, on the recommendation of the Special Political Committee, which approved it on 15 November by a roll-call vote of 91 to 0, with 8 abstentions. The text was sponsored by Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, the Congo, Cyprus, Egypt, Ethiopia, the Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Kenya, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, the Ukrainian SSR, the United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

(For text of resolution 2775 D (XXVI), see **DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.**)

In connexion with the question of the establishment of Bantustans, the General Assembly on 29 November adopted resolution 2775 E (XXVI) by a recorded vote of 110 to 2, with 2 abstentions. It had been approved in the Special Political Committee on 15 November—as revised to take into account amendments by Egypt, by Ghana and by Sierra Leone—by a roll-call vote of 99 to 1, with 3 abstentions.

The General Assembly thereby noted, in the preambular part of the text, that South Africa, while treating its white inhabitants—irrespective of their national origin—as constituting one nation, sought artificially to divide the African people into "nations" according to their tribal origins and justified the establishment of non-contiguous Bantu homelands (Bantustans) on that basis. The Assembly recognized that the real purpose of the establishment of Bantustans was to divide the Africans, setting one tribe against the other with a view to weakening the African front in its struggle for its inalienable and just rights.

After recalling previous resolutions on South Africa's apartheid policies, the Assembly noted further that under those resolutions crimes against humanity were committed when enslavement, deportation and other inhuman acts were enforced against any civilian population on political, racial or religious grounds. It also noted that many African communities had been uprooted and that large numbers of Africans had been forcibly removed from their homes in pursuance of the policies of apartheid.

The Assembly considered that the establishment of Bantustans and other measures adopted by South Africa in pursuance of apartheid were

designed to consolidate and perpetuate domination by a white minority and the dispossession and exploitation of the African and other non-white people of South Africa, as well as of Namibia.

By the operative parts of the text, the Assembly:

(1) again condemned the establishment by South Africa of Bantustans and the forcible removal of the African people of South Africa and Namibia to those areas as a violation of their inalienable rights, contrary to the principles of self-determination and prejudicial to the territorial integrity of the countries and the unity of their peoples;

(2) declared that the United Nations would continue to encourage and promote a solution to the situation in South Africa through the full application of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including political rights, to all the inhabitants of the territory of South Africa as a whole, regardless of race, colour or creed; and

(3) decided to keep the situation in South Africa constantly under review.

(For text of resolution 2775 E (XXVI), see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

The text was sponsored by Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, the Congo, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, the Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Kenya, the Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, the Ukrainian SSR, the United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

Another resolution—2775 F (XXVI)—adopted by the General Assembly on 29 November concerned the situation in South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid.

In the preambular part of the resolution, the Assembly among other things considered that the United Nations organs concerned should adopt a concerted and co-ordinated approach to the inter-related problems of southern Africa. It was gravely concerned over the explosive situation in South Africa and in southern Africa as a whole resulting from the inhuman and aggressive policies of apartheid pursued by the South African Government. The United Nations and Member States, the Assembly considered, should intensify their efforts to solve the situation in accordance with the Charter and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

By the operative parts of the text, the Assembly reaffirmed its resolution 2671 (XXV) of 8 December 1970 (which dealt, in several parts, with aspects

of the apartheid question).<sup>9</sup> It then commended all States, organizations and individuals struggling against apartheid and racial discrimination, especially in South Africa.

The Assembly declared that the current tactics of the racist Government of South Africa in pursuance of its so-called "outward policy" were designed primarily to obtain acquiescence in its racial policies, to confuse world public opinion, to counter international isolation, to hinder assistance to the liberation movements by the international community and to consolidate white minority rule in southern Africa.

The Assembly condemned the continued and increasing co-operation of certain States and foreign economic interests with South Africa in military, economic, political and other fields, as such co-operation encouraged the South African Government in the pursuit of its inhuman policies.

By this text, the Assembly also reaffirmed the legitimacy of the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa to eliminate, by all means at their disposal, apartheid, racial discrimination and similar ideologies and to attain majority rule in the country as a whole, based on universal adult suffrage. It appealed to Governments, the specialized agencies, national and international organizations and individuals to provide every assistance—directly or through the OAU Assistance Fund for the Struggle against Colonialism and Apartheid—to the national movement of the oppressed people of South Africa in their legitimate struggle.

The Assembly reaffirmed the determination of the United Nations to intensify its efforts to remedy the grave situation in southern Africa and to ensure the achievement of the legitimate rights of all the inhabitants of that area, irrespective of race, colour or creed.

All States were asked by the Assembly to take more effective action for the elimination of apartheid in the light of previous resolutions of the Assembly and the Security Council. They were also asked to take steps to dissuade their nationals from emigrating to South Africa so long as the South African Government pursued policies of apartheid.

The Assembly commended the activities of States, organizations and individuals engaged in dissuading economic interests from increasing collaboration with South Africa and profiting from racial discrimination and exploitation of African and other non-white workers.

The Special Committee on Apartheid was asked to arrange—in consultation with the Secretary-General—for the preparation of special studies on

<sup>9</sup> See Y.U.N., 1970, pp. 149-53, texts of resolutions 2671 A-D and F (XXV), and p. 156, text of resolution 2671 E (XXV).

apartheid and its international repercussions and for publication of a periodic bulletin on the collaboration of Governments and private enterprises with the South African régime and South African companies.

The Assembly also asked the Special Committee on Apartheid to continue its close co-operation with other United Nations bodies concerned with apartheid, racial discrimination and colonialism in southern Africa, with a view to co-ordinated action to find ways and means of eliminating those evils.

It was again recommended by the Assembly that the Security Council consider urgently the situation in South Africa and in southern Africa as a whole, with a view to the adoption of effective measures against South Africa, including those under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.<sup>10</sup>

Finally, the Secretary-General was asked to report on the implementation of the present resolution to the Assembly at its 1972 session.

(For text of resolution 2775 F (XXVI), see **DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.**)

The General Assembly adopted the text by a recorded vote of 86 to 6, with 22 abstentions, on the recommendation of the Special Political Committee, which approved it on 15 November—as revised to take into account amendments by Cameroon, by Lebanon and by Sierra Leone—by a roll-call vote of 76 to 6, with 21 abstentions. The text was sponsored by Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, the Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guinea, India, Kenya, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Republic, Mali, Mauritania, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Somalia, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

Another resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 29 November—2775 G (XXVI)—had to do with the dissemination of information about apartheid. The text, as amended by Sierra Leone, was approved in the Special Political Committee on 16 November by 82 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions. The Assembly adopted it by a recorded vote of 108 to 2, with 6 abstentions.

By this text, the Assembly among other things recognized the importance of the widest dissemination of information on the evils and dangers of apartheid, and of United Nations efforts for the elimination of apartheid, in order to secure increasing support of world public opinion. By the operative paragraphs, the Assembly:

(1) requested the Secretary-General, in conformity with the relevant parts of his report on the review and reappraisal of United Nations information policies and activities and in compliance with recommendations of the Special Committee on Apartheid, to intensify information activities with a

view to promoting national and international action for the elimination of apartheid;

(2) requested the Secretary-General to ascertain the needs and to take into account the recommendations of the General Assembly bodies concerned with the problems of southern Africa in intensifying information activities on those problems;

(3) invited Governments, specialized agencies and regional organizations, as well as non-governmental organizations, information media and educational institutions, to co-operate with the United Nations in disseminating information on apartheid;

(4) invited the specialized agencies to contribute to the campaign against apartheid in the light of the relevant recommendations of the report of the Special Committee on Apartheid;

(5) requested the Special Committee on Apartheid, in consultation with non-governmental organizations concerned with the campaign against apartheid, to take appropriate steps, where necessary, to promote the establishment of national committees against apartheid;

(6) appealed to Governments and organizations to make voluntary contributions to enable the Organization of African Unity (OAU) to acquire equipment for recording and distributing information on apartheid through various broadcasting facilities and to lend their co-operation to OAU in preparing and disseminating radio broadcasts on apartheid; and

(7) requested the Secretary-General to submit a detailed report to the Assembly at its 1972 session on the implementation of the present resolution and on means of securing adequate publicity for United Nations efforts against apartheid in the light of recommendations by the General Assembly bodies concerned.

(For text of resolution 2775 G (XXVI), see **DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.**)

The text was sponsored by Afghanistan, Algeria, the Congo, Cyprus, Egypt, Ethiopia, the Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, the Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the Philippines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

Finally, the General Assembly adopted a resolution—2775 H (XXVI)—concerning trade union activities against apartheid.

After noting the report of the Special Committee on Apartheid concerning ways and means of

<sup>10</sup> For text of Chapter VII of the Charter, see APPENDIX II.

promoting concerted action against apartheid by the trade union movements, the Assembly appealed to all national and international trade union organizations to intensify their action against apartheid, in particular by: (a) discouraging the emigration of skilled workers to South Africa; (b) taking appropriate action in connexion with the infringements of trade union rights and the persecution of trade unionists in South Africa; (c) exerting maximum pressure on foreign economic and financial interests which were profiting from racial discrimination against non-white workers in South Africa, in order to persuade them to cease such exploitation; and (d) co-operating with other organizations engaged in the international campaign against apartheid.

The Assembly also decided to give further consideration at its 1972 session to a proposed international trade union conference.

The Special Committee on Apartheid was requested and authorized by the Assembly to send a mission to hold consultative meetings, if possible, with the workers' representatives to the fifty-seventh (1972) session of the International Labour Conference, to consider lines of action which the trade union movement might take against apartheid—including the holding of an international trade union conference—and to invite representatives of international and regional trade union federations to those consultative meetings.

Finally, the Assembly requested the International Labour Organisation and invited the workers' representatives to lend their co-operation to the Special Committee on Apartheid in preparing and holding the consultative meetings.

The resolution was adopted by the General Assembly on 29 November by a recorded vote of 104 to 1, with 9 abstentions, on the recommendation of the Special Political Committee, which approved it on 16 November by a roll-call vote of 92 to 0, with 10 abstentions. The text was sponsored by Algeria, Chile, the Congo, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, the Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, the United Republic of Tanzania, and Zambia.

(For text of resolution 2775 H (XXVI), see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below. For further details about the question of trade union rights, see pp. 434-36.)

#### Other General Assembly decisions

At its 1971 session, the General Assembly adopted a number of other resolutions having a bearing on the question of apartheid and racial discrimination. These are described briefly below.

#### ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

In a four-part resolution (2784(XXVI)) on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination, the General Assembly requested the President of the Assembly to forward to all heads of State or Government of each State a message containing specific recommendations to be taken to ensure the continuation of the campaign against racial discrimination, bearing in mind that the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination should be considered as the opening year for a full decade of vigorous struggle against the evil of racial discrimination.

The Secretary-General was asked to submit a report based on replies from Governments to the message, and the Economic and Social Council was asked to request the Commission on Human Rights to submit suggestions for launching continued international action to combat racism on the basis of a "Decade for vigorous and continued mobilization against racism and racial discrimination in all its forms."

By a second part of the resolution, the General Assembly, after reaffirming that apartheid was a crime against humanity, called for increased and continued moral and material support to all peoples struggling for their liberation, self-determination and the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. The Economic and Social Council was invited to ask the Human Rights Commission to make recommendations for the further elaboration of international instruments to deal with crimes against humanity, particularly those arising from the policies of apartheid. All Governments continuing to supply arms to the Pretoria régime in violation of relevant resolutions of the Assembly and the Security Council were strongly condemned.

By the third part of the resolution the Assembly among other things called upon all the trading partners of South Africa to abstain from any action encouraging the continued violation of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination by South Africa and the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia, and to use their influence to ensure the eradication of the policies of apartheid and racial discrimination in the international territory of Namibia and Southern Rhodesia.

The Assembly invited the Economic and Social Council to ask the Human Rights Commission to continue its comprehensive studies of policies and practices of racial discrimination, taking into account in particular discrimination against peoples of African origin in all countries, and to report to the Assembly not later than in 1973 with recommendations for combating such policies and practices.

Finally, the Assembly, by the fourth part of the resolution, decided to consider the matter again at its session in 1972.

Annexed to the resolution was the text of the President's message to heads of State or Government.

These decisions were embodied in resolution 2784(XXVI), adopted on 6 December 1971. (For details and text of resolution, see pp. 398-400 and 402-4.)

#### IMPORTANCE OF THE RIGHT TO SELF-DETERMINATION

In a resolution adopted on 6 December 1971 on the importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and of the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights, the General Assembly among other things expressed the belief that the main objectives and principles of international protection of human rights could not be effectively implemented while some States—particularly Portugal and South Africa—pursued the imperialist policy of colonialism, used force against independent African States and developing countries and peoples fighting for self-determination, and supported régimes that were applying the criminal policy of racism and apartheid.

(For details and text of resolution 2787(XXVI), see pp. 420-22 and 423-24.)

#### CO-OPERATION OF SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

Among the provisions of a resolution on implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations were two which related to South Africa. The General Assembly thereby requested the specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system to discontinue all collaboration with the Governments of Portugal and South Africa, as well as with the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the Assembly and of the Security Council relating to colonial territories in southern Africa.

The Assembly also urged the specialized agencies and other organizations in the United Nations system—in particular the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund—to take all necessary measures to withhold financial, economic, technical and other assistance from Portugal and South Africa until they renounced their policies of racial discrimination and colonial domination.

These decisions were among those embodied in resolution 2874(XXVI), which the Assembly

adopted on 20 December 1971. (For details and text of resolution, see pp. 526-27 and 528-29.)

#### DRAFT CONVENTION ON SUPPRESSION AND PUNISHMENT OF APARTHEID

By another decision, the General Assembly among other things invited the Secretary-General to transmit to the Commission on Human Rights the text of a draft convention on the suppression and punishment of the crime of apartheid (submitted in the Assembly's Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee by Guinea and the USSR), so that the Commission and the Economic and Social Council—in co-operation with the Special Committee on Apartheid—could submit a text to the Assembly at its 1972 session.

In doing so, the Assembly recognized that the conclusion of such a convention would be an important contribution to the struggle against apartheid, racism, economic exploitation, colonial domination and foreign occupation.

The Assembly took these decisions when it adopted resolution 2786(XXVI) on 6 December 1971. (For details and text of resolution, see pp. 406-7 and 408.)

#### Credentials

At the meeting of the Credentials Committee on 17 December 1971, the representative of Somalia noted that the General Assembly had in 1970 approved the first report of the Credentials Committee except with regard to the credentials of the representatives of the Government of South Africa.<sup>11</sup> He stated that the credentials of those representatives should again be singled out for special consideration by the Assembly. He was supported by Liberia, Mongolia and the USSR.

The French representative said the question was not political but a simple one of whether or not the credentials of representatives emanated from their Governments.

The representative of Colombia emphasized that rule 27 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure<sup>12</sup> called only for the Credentials Committee to pronounce itself on whether the credentials had been submitted in due form. In his opinion—and aside from his country's abhorrence of colonialism and racial discrimination—the Committee could not assume prerogatives properly belonging, under the United Nations Charter, to the General Assembly and the Security Council.

Somalia emphasized that South Africa's membership in the United Nations was not in question.

<sup>11</sup> See Y.U.N., 1970, pp. 143-45.

<sup>12</sup> Rule 27 of the Assembly's rules of procedure states: "The credentials of representatives and the names of members of a delegation shall be submitted to the Secretary-General if possible not less than one week before the opening of the session. The credentials shall be issued either by the Head of the State or Government or by the Minister for Foreign Affairs."

The question was that South Africa's whole posture towards the Organization had been changing since 1948; today its application for membership would be rejected since it did not follow the principles of the Charter. Somalia could not endorse as valid the credentials of the representatives of South Africa. The examination of credentials could not be reduced to the mere verification of a piece of paper.

The United States stressed that rule 27 laid down purely technical requirements for the verification of credentials and recalled that the Committee had in the past rejected similar attempts to exclude representatives of Member States.

A proposal by Somalia that the credentials of the representatives of South Africa should be reported upon separately and that the Committee should not pronounce itself on the acceptability of those credentials was rejected by 5 votes to 4.

The Committee eventually recommended—by a vote of 5 to 2, with 2 abstentions—that the Assembly adopt a draft resolution approving the report of the Credentials Committee.

At a plenary meeting of the Assembly on 20 December, a Somali amendment to the draft, by which the Assembly would approve the report of the Credentials Committee "except with regard to the credentials of the representatives of South Africa," was adopted by the Assembly by a vote of 60 to 36, with 22 abstentions. The draft resolution submitted by the Credentials Committee, as thus amended, was then adopted by the Assembly by a vote of 103 to 1, with 16 abstentions, as resolution 2862(XXVI). The Assembly thereby approved the report of the Credentials Committee except with

regard to the credentials of the representatives of South Africa.

(For text of resolution 2862(XXVI), see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

The representative of Somalia said that his reason for challenging the credentials of the South African representatives was based on the fact that the issuing authority—the so-called Government of South Africa—represented only a small minority group; it did not represent the 15 million Bantus, or the 500,000 Asians, or the 1.5 million Coloured people, who together made up over 70 per cent of the population.

#### **Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa**

During 1971, a total of 191 South African students were studying abroad in 21 countries on scholarships granted under the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa, established by the Assembly in 1967.

Applications received from South Africans during the period 1 November 1970 to 8 October 1971 totalled 248. Forty-seven new awards were granted and 144 were extended.

The General Assembly reviewed the programme at its 1971 session and, among other things, urgently appealed to all States, organizations and individuals to make generous contributions to the trust fund for the Programme so that it might not only be continued but also strengthened and expanded.

(For additional information about the Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa and the decisions of the Assembly thereon, see pp. 123-25.)

#### **DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES**

- Communications to Security Council  
S/10092. Report of 3 February 1971 of Secretary-General in pursuance of Security Council resolution 282(1970) of 23 July 1970 concerning question of apartheid.  
S/10132. Letter of 24 February 1971 from Executive Secretary of Organization of African Unity (OAU) at United Nations (transmitting memorandum on Simonstown Agreement prepared by OAU).  
S/10143. Letter of 1 March 1971 from President of United Nations Council for Namibia.  
S/10147. Letter of 5 March 1971 from Chairman of Special Committee on Situation with regard to Implementation of Declaration on Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (transmitting text of consensus adopted by Special Committee on 4 March 1971, meeting 782).  
S/10162. Letter of 23 March 1971 from United Kingdom (transmitting text of Opinion of Law Officers of The Crown for England and Wales on extent of existing legal obligations of Her Majesty's Government, arising under Simonstown Agreements of 1955).  
S/10190. Letter of 7 May 1971 from Chairman of Special Committee on Apartheid (transmitting notes of 16 March, 9 April and 6 May 1971 and communiqué of 24 February 1971).

- S/10195. Letter of 14 May 1971 from Israel.  
S/10201. Letter of 19 May 1971 from Belgium.  
S/10202. Letter of 20 May 1971 from Vice-Chairman of Special Committee on Apartheid (transmitting addendum to note of 16 March 1971).  
S/10211. Note of 27 May 1971 by President of Security Council (transmitting letter of 26 May 1971 from Permanent Observer of Federal Republic of Germany).  
S/10212. Letter of 25 May 1971 from United States.  
S/10243. Letter of 25 June 1971 from Secretary-General (transmitting relevant text of Economic and Social Council resolution 1591(L)).  
S/10272. Letter of 13 July 1971 from Executive Secretary of OAU at United Nations (transmitting resolutions adopted by 8th Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU).  
S/10311. Note of 8 September 1971 by President of Security Council (transmitting letter of 8 September 1971 from Acting Permanent Observer of Switzerland).  
S/10331. Letter of 23 September 1971 from Chairman of 9th meeting of Joint Meeting of Special Committee on Apartheid, Special Committee on Situation with regard to Implementation of Declaration on Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and United Nations Council for Namibia (transmit-

ting consensus adopted by Joint Meeting on 13 September 1971).

S/10354. Letter of 6 October 1971 from Chairman of Special Committee on Apartheid.

S/10366 and Corr.1 (A/8422/Rev.1). Report of 8 October 1971 of Special Committee on Apartheid.

#### Reports of Special Committee on Apartheid

A/8422/Rev.1 (S/10366 and Corr.1). Report of Special Committee on Apartheid. (Chapter I E: Commemoration of International Day for Elimination of Racial Discrimination; Annex III: List of documents of Special Committee.)

A/8515/Rev.1. Ways and means of promoting concerted action against apartheid by trade union movement. Report of Special Committee on Apartheid.

#### Consideration by General Assembly

##### GENERAL ASPECTS

General Assembly—26th session

Special Political Committee, meetings 757-780.

Fifth Committee, meeting 1462.

Plenary meetings 1939, 1981, 1997.

A/8401. Report of Secretary-General on work of the Organization, 16 June 1970-15 June 1971, Part One, Chapter IV E.

A/8401/Add.1. Introduction to report of Secretary-General, September 1971, Part Two, Chapter VII.

A/8402. Report of Security Council, 16 June 1970-15 June 1971, Chapter 5.

A/8403. Report of Economic and Social Council on work of its 50th and 51st sessions, Chapter XVIII C.

A/8422/Rev.1. Report of Special Committee on Apartheid.

A/8467. Report of Secretary-General.

A/SPC/L.205. Afghanistan, Algeria, Barbados, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, Congo, Cyprus, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, Zambia: draft resolution.

A/SPC/L.205/Rev.1. Afghanistan, Algeria, Barbados, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, Congo, Cyprus, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Iran, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia: revised draft resolution, as further orally revised by sponsors, approved by Special Political Committee on 3 November 1971, meeting 766, by roll-call vote of 98 to 1, with 2 abstentions:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States,

Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Portugal.

Abstaining: Brazil, Malawi.

A/SPC/146. Resolution adopted by Special Political Committee on 3 November 1971, meeting 766.

A/8504. Report of Special Political Committee (part I).

RESOLUTION 2764(XXVI), as recommended by Special Political Committee, A/8504, adopted by Assembly on 9 November 1971, meeting 1981, by recorded vote of 109 to 2, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Portugal, South Africa.

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 2627(XXV) of 24 October 1970, strongly condemning the evil policy of apartheid as a crime against the conscience and dignity of mankind,

Further recalling its resolutions calling for the liberation of persons persecuted in South Africa for their opposition to apartheid and condemning the maltreatment and torture of prisoners and persons in police custody,

Taking note of the reports of the Special Committee on Apartheid and the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts on the treatment of political prisoners in South Africa, established under resolution 2(XXIII) of the Commission on Human Rights of 6 March 1967,

Gravely concerned at continuing reports of ill-treatment and torture of opponents of apartheid in detention in South Africa and at the deaths of several detainees during interrogation,

Noting also the recent deportations, bannings, detentions and trials of a number of religious leaders in South Africa for their opposition to apartheid and assistance to victims of that inhuman policy,

1. Expresses its grave indignation and concern over any and every act of maltreatment and torture of opponents of apartheid in South Africa and the increased persecution of religious leaders opposed to that policy;

2. Again calls upon all States to do everything in their power to promote the cause of justice for all people in South Africa and, to that end, to exert their influence to secure:

(a) The repeal of all legislation designed to give effect to the oppressive policies of apartheid and all legislation designed to persecute and suppress the rights of those who are opposed to such policies;

(b) The liberation of all persons imprisoned or detained for their opposition to apartheid;

(c) The removal of orders against those banned or banished for their opposition to apartheid;

3. Appeals to national and international associations of jurists to take all appropriate steps in support of the purposes of the present resolution;

4. Urges all religious organizations to continue and intensify their efforts for the elimination of apartheid and racial discrimination;

5. Requests the Special Committee on Apartheid to prepare a special report on all known cases of maltreatment and torture of prisoners in South Africa, together with any other information pertinent to those cases;

6. Invites all organizations and individuals that may have knowledge of such cases to provide all available information to the Special Committee on Apartheid;

7. Requests the Secretary-General:

(a) To bring the present resolution to the attention of Governments, national and international organizations and anti-apartheid movements, including religious organizations and associations of jurists;

(b) To publicize, through the Unit on Apartheid and the Office of Public Information, all available information on the maltreatment and torture of prisoners and detainees in South Africa and the persecution of opponents of apartheid, including religious leaders;

(c) To provide necessary services and assistance to the Special Committee on Apartheid in the preparation of the report requested in paragraph 5 above and to publicize the report as widely as possible.

A/SPC/145 (S/10354). Letter of 6 October 1971 from Chairman of Special Committee on Apartheid.

A/SPC/L.208. Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Colombia, Congo, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia: draft resolution, as amended by Sierra Leone, A/SPC/L.217, approved by Special Political Committee on 15 November 1971, meeting 778, by roll-call vote of 87 to 1, with 6 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Portugal.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, France, New Zealand, United Kingdom, United States.

A/SPC/L.217. Sierra Leone: amendment to 47-power draft resolution, A/SPC/L.208.

A/8504/Add.1. Report of Special Political Committee (part II), draft resolution II A.

RESOLUTION 2775 A (XXVI), as recommended by Special Political Committee, A/8504/Add.1, adopted by Assembly on 29 November 1971, meeting 1997, by recorded vote of 107 to 2, with 5 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo,

Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Portugal, South Africa.

Abstaining: Australia, France, Malawi, United Kingdom, United States.

The General Assembly,

Taking note of the report of the Special Committee on Apartheid and the letter dated 6 October 1971 from the Chairman of the Special Committee to the President of the General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 2624 (XXV) of 13 October 1970 calling upon all States to take immediate steps to implement fully the provisions of Security Council resolution 282 (1970) of 23 July 1970 to strengthen the arms embargo against South Africa,

Gravely concerned at the continued build-up of the South African military and police forces,

Noting that South Africa continues to receive military equipment, and technical and other assistance for the manufacture of such equipment, from certain Member States in contravention of the arms embargo,

1. Reaffirms its resolution 2624 (XXV);

2. Declares that the arms embargo against South Africa makes no distinction between arms for external defence and arms for internal repression;

3. Deplores the actions of those Governments which, in contravention of the arms embargo, have provided or have allowed companies registered in their countries to provide assistance for the build-up of the military and police forces in South Africa;

4. Calls upon all Governments to implement fully the arms embargo against South Africa;

5. Urgently appeals to all national and international organizations to discourage and denounce all military collaboration with South Africa and to ensure the implementation of the Security Council resolutions on the arms embargo against South Africa;

6. Invites the Security Council to consider the situation in the light of the reports and communications addressed to it by the Special Committee on Apartheid and of the present resolution, with a view to securing the full implementation by all States of Council resolution 282 (1970);

7. Requests the Special Committee on Apartheid to undertake a comprehensive study of the military collaboration with, and military assistance to, South Africa by Governments and private enterprises and to submit a report thereon to the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session.

A/SPC/L.209. Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Kenya, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Philippines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia: draft resolution.

A/SPC/L.209/Rev.1. Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Kenya, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, New

Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Philippines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia: revised draft resolution.

A/SPC/L.209/Rev.2. Revised draft resolution, sponsored by above 56 powers and by Iceland, Jamaica and Rwanda, approved by Special Political Committee on 15 November 1971, meeting 778, by roll-call vote of 97 to 0, with 2 abstentions, as follows:

In favour. Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United States, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against None.

Abstaining: Portugal, United Kingdom.

A/8504/Add.1. Report of Special Political Committee (part II), draft resolution II B.

RESOLUTION 2775 B (XXVI), as recommended by Special Political Committee, A/8504/Add.1, adopted by Assembly on 29 November 1971, meeting 1997, by recorded of 112 to 1, with 3 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: South Africa.

Abstaining: Malawi, Portugal, United Kingdom.

The General Assembly,

Considering that the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination should be the occasion to add new emphasis to efforts to enlighten the international community about the evils of apartheid and racial discrimination in South Africa and about the role of the United Nations in this cause,

Convinced of the special role that education should play in international efforts to eliminate apartheid and other forms of racial discrimination,

Considering the important role of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in such a cause,

Commending the activities of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in disseminating information on apartheid, with special reference to its effects on education, science and culture,

Taking note of the report of the Special Committee on Apartheid, in particular the account of its consultations with anti-apartheid movements and with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization concerning the need for the preparation of an educational kit on southern Africa,

Noting with satisfaction the growing interest among educational and other institutions in educational material to enlighten their students on the evils of apartheid and racial discrimination,

1. Commends the proposal for the preparation of an educational kit on racial discrimination and apartheid in southern Africa;

2. Requests the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization to prepare such an educational kit for possible adaptation by national commissions of that organization and for distribution to institutions of learning;

3. Further requests the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization to consider the production of films and audio-visual material on apartheid, with special reference to its adverse effects on education, science and culture;

4. Invites all concerned to lend their full co-operation to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization to ensure the widest possible use of the material prepared by that organization.

A/SPC/L.210. Afghanistan, Algeria, Cameroon, Congo, Egypt, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Philippines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia: draft resolution, approved by Special Political Committee on 15 November 1971, meeting 778, by 89 votes to 0, with 4 abstentions.

A/SPC/L.216. Administrative and financial implications of 38-power draft resolution, A/SPC/L.210. Statement by Secretary-General.

A/C.5/1403, A/8408/Add.12, A/8534. Administrative and financial implications of draft resolutions II C, II G and II H recommended by Special Political Committee in A/8504/Add.1. Statement by Secretary-General and reports of Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) and Fifth Committee.

A/8504/Add.1. Report of Special Political Committee (part II), draft resolution II C.

RESOLUTION 2775 C (XXVI), as recommended by Special Political Committee, A/8504/Add.1, adopted by Assembly on 29 November 1971, meeting 1997, by recorded vote of 108 to 1, with 5 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: South Africa.

Abstaining: France, Malawi, Portugal, United Kingdom, United States.

The General Assembly,

Noting with appreciation the work of the Special Committee on Apartheid in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 2671 (XXV) of 8 December 1970,

Considering that further efforts should be made to intensify the international campaign against apartheid,

Endorsing the programme of work of the Special Committee on Apartheid contained in its report,

Authorizes the Special Committee on Apartheid, within the budgetary provisions to be made for this purpose:

(a) To send representatives or delegations, as appropriate, to international conferences dealing with the problem of apartheid;

(b) To hold consultations with experts and representatives of the oppressed people of South Africa, as well as anti-apartheid movements and non-governmental organizations concerned with the campaign against apartheid.

A/SPC/L.211. Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Congo, Cyprus, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Kenya, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia: draft resolution, approved by Special Political Committee on 15 November 1971, meeting 778, by roll-call vote of 91 to 0, with 8 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United States, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Central African Republic, France, Greece, Madagascar, New Zealand, Portugal, United Kingdom.

A/8504/Add.1. Report of Special Political Committee (part II), draft resolution II D.

RESOLUTION 2775 D (XXVI), as recommended by Special Political Committee, A/8504/Add.1, adopted by Assembly on 29 November 1971, meeting 1997, by recorded vote of 106 to 2, with 7 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay,

People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Malawi, South Africa.

Abstaining: Australia, Central African Republic, Greece, Madagascar, New Zealand, Portugal, United Kingdom.

The General Assembly,

Recalling that Member States have pledged themselves, under Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations, to promote and encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion,

Recalling further its request to all States and national and international sports organizations to suspend exchanges of sporting events with South African teams selected under apartheid policies,

Bearing in mind that 1971 was designated as the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, to be observed in the name of the ever-growing struggle against racial discrimination in all its forms and manifestations and in the name of international solidarity with those struggling against racism,

1. Declares its unqualified support of the Olympic principle that no discrimination be allowed on the grounds of race, religion or political affiliation;

2. Affirms that merit should be the sole criterion for participation in sports activities;

3. Solemnly calls upon all national and international sports organizations to uphold the Olympic principle of non-discrimination and to discourage and deny support to sporting events organized in violation of this principle;

4. Calls upon individual sportsmen to refuse to participate in any sports activity in a country in which there is an official policy of racial discrimination or apartheid in the field of sports;

5. Urges all States to promote adherence to the Olympic principle of non-discrimination and to encourage their sports organizations to withhold support from sporting events organized in violation of this principle;

6. Requests national and international sports organizations and the public to deny any form of recognition to any sports activity from which persons are debarred or in which they are subjected to any discrimination on the basis of race, religion or political affiliation;

7. Condemns the actions of the Government of South Africa in enforcing racial discrimination and segregation in sports;

8. Notes with regret that some national and international sports organizations have continued exchanges with teams from South Africa that have been selected for international competition on the basis of competition closed to otherwise qualified sportsmen solely on the basis of their race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin;

9. Commends those international and national sports organizations that have supported the international campaign against apartheid in sports;

10. Requests all States to urge their national sports organizations to act in accordance with the present resolution;

11. Requests the Secretary-General:

(a) To bring the present resolution to the attention of international sports organizations;

(b) To keep the Special Committee on Apartheid informed on the implementation of the present resolution;

(c) To submit a report on this matter to the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session.

A/SPC/L.212. Afghanistan, Algeria, Cameroon, Congo, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia,

Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia: draft resolution.

A/SPC/L.212/Rev.1. Revised draft resolution, sponsored by above 43 powers and by Bulgaria, Burundi and the Philippines, as further amended by Ghana (A/SPC/L.215) and Sierra Leone (A/SPC/L.218), approved by Special Political Committee on 15 November 1971, meeting 779, by roll-call vote of 99 to 1, with 3 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Portugal.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, United Kingdom.

A/SPC/L.215. Ghana: amendment to 43-power draft resolution, A/SPC/L.212.

A/SPC/L.218. Sierra Leone: amendment to 43-power draft resolution, A/SPC/L.212.

A/8504/Add.1. Report of Special Political Committee (part II), draft resolution II E.

RESOLUTION 2775 E (XXVI), as recommended by Special Political Committee, A/8504/Add.1, adopted by Assembly on 29 November 1971, meeting 1997, by recorded vote of 110 to 2, with 2 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Portugal, South Africa.

Abstaining: France, United Kingdom.

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 103(I) of 19 November 1946 declaring that it is in the higher interests of humanity to put an immediate end to racial persecution and discrimination, and its resolution 395(V) of 2 December 1950, in which the General Assembly considered that a policy of "racial segregation" (apartheid) is necessarily based on doctrines of racial discrimination,

Recalling further its resolution 616 B (VII) of 5 December 1952 declaring that in a multiracial society harmony and respect for human rights and freedoms and the peaceful development of a unified community are best assured when patterns of legislation and practice are directed towards ensuring equality before the law of all persons regardless of race, creed or colour, and when economic, social, cultural and political participation of all racial groups is on a basis of equality,

Noting that the Government of South Africa, while treating the white inhabitants of that country, irrespective of their national origins, as constituting one nation, seeks artificially to divide the African people into "nations" according to their tribal origins and justifies the establishment of non-contiguous Bantu homelands (Bantustans) on that basis,

Recognizing that the real purpose of the establishment of Bantustans is to divide the Africans, setting one tribe against the other with a view to weakening the African front in its struggle for its inalienable and just rights,

Having regard to the subsequent resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council on the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa, and in particular General Assembly resolution 2671 (XXV) of 8 December 1970,

Recalling its resolution 95(I) of 11 December 1946, in which it affirmed the principles of international law recognized by the Charter of the International Military Tribunal, Nuremberg, and the judgement of the Tribunal,

Bearing in mind the obligations of all States under international law, the Charter of the United Nations, the human rights principles and the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949,

Noting further that under the aforementioned resolution crimes against humanity are committed when enslavement, deportation and other inhuman acts are enforced against any civilian population on political, racial or religious grounds,

Noting that many African communities have been uprooted and that large numbers of Africans have been forcibly removed from their homes in pursuance of the policies of apartheid,

Considering that the establishment of Bantustans and other measures adopted by the Government of South Africa in pursuance of apartheid are designed to consolidate and perpetuate domination by a white minority and the dispossession and exploitation of the African and other non-white people of South Africa, as well as of Namibia,

1. Again condemns the establishment by the Government of South Africa of Bantu homelands (Bantustans) and the forcible removal of the African people of South Africa and Namibia to those areas as a violation of their inalienable rights, contrary to the principle of self-determination and prejudicial to the territorial integrity of the countries and the unity of their peoples;

2. Declares that the United Nations will continue to encourage and promote a solution to the situation in South Africa through the full application of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including political rights, to all inhabitants of the territory of South Africa as a whole, regardless of race, colour or creed;

3. Decides to keep the situation in South Africa constantly under review.

A/8388. Report of Secretary-General (transmitting consensus adopted on 13 September 1971 by joint meeting of Special Committee on Apartheid, Special Committee on Situation with regard to Implementation of Declaration on Granting Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and United Nations Council for Namibia).

A/SPC/L.214. Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guinea, India, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Mali, Mauritania, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Uganda, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia: draft resolution.

A/SPC/L.214/Rev.1. Revised draft resolution, sponsored by above 26 powers and by United Republic of Tanzania, as orally amended by Lebanon, approved by Special Political Committee on 15 November 1971, meeting 779, by roll-call vote of 76 to 6, with 21 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, France, Portugal, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Canada, Central African Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, Guatemala, Honduras, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Spain, Sweden.

A/SPC/L.220. Sierra Leone: amendments to 26-power draft resolution, A/SPC/L.214.

A/SPC/L.221. Cameroon: amendment to 26-power draft resolution, A/SPC/L.214.

A/8504/Add.1. Report of Special Political Committee (part II), draft resolution II F.

RESOLUTION 2775 F (XXVI), as recommended by Special Political Committee, A/8504/Add.1, adopted by Assembly on 29 November 1971, meeting 1997, by recorded vote of 86 to 6, with 22 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bahrain, Barbados, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Australia, France, Portugal, South Africa, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Central African Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, Guatemala, Honduras, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden.

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions and those of the Security Council on the question of apartheid,

Taking note of the report of the Special Committee on Apartheid,

Taking note of Economic and Social Council resolution 1591(L) of 21 May 1971,

Taking note also of the report of the Secretary-General on the joint meeting of the Special Committee on Apartheid, the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the United Nations Council for Namibia, convened by him in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 2671 F (XXV) of 8 December 1970, and the consensus

adopted by the joint meeting, which is annexed to that report,

Considering that the United Nations organs concerned should adopt a concerted and co-ordinated approach to the interrelated problems of southern Africa,

Gravely concerned over the explosive situation in South Africa and in southern Africa as a whole resulting from the inhuman and aggressive policies of apartheid pursued by the Government of South Africa,

Considering that the United Nations and Member States should intensify their efforts to solve the situation in South Africa in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

1. Reaffirms its resolution 2671 (XXV);

2. Commends all States, organizations and individuals struggling against apartheid and racial discrimination, especially in South Africa;

3. Declares that the present tactics of the racist Government of South Africa in pursuance of its so-called "outward policy" are designed primarily to obtain acquiescence in its racial policies, to confuse world public opinion, to counter international isolation, to hinder assistance to the liberation movements by the international community and to consolidate white minority rule in southern Africa;

4. Condemns the continued and increasing co-operation of certain States and foreign economic interests with South Africa in the military, economic, political and other fields, as such co-operation encourages the Government of South Africa in the pursuit of its inhuman policies;

5. Reaffirms the legitimacy of the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa to eliminate, by all means at their disposal, apartheid, racial discrimination and similar ideologies and to attain majority rule in the country as a whole, based on universal adult suffrage;

6. Appeals to Governments, the specialized agencies, national and international organizations and individuals to provide every assistance, directly or through the Assistance Fund for the Struggle against Colonialism and Apartheid of the Organization of African Unity, to the national movement of the oppressed people of South Africa in their legitimate struggle;

7. Reaffirms the determination of the United Nations to intensify its efforts to remedy the grave situation in southern Africa and to ensure the achievement of the legitimate rights of all the inhabitants of that area, irrespective of race, colour or creed;

8. Requests all States to take more effective action for the elimination of apartheid in the light of the recommendations contained in the previous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council;

9. Requests all States to take steps to dissuade their nationals from emigrating to South Africa so long as the Government of South Africa pursues the policies of apartheid;

10. Commends the activities of States, organizations and individuals engaged in dissuading economic interests from increasing collaboration with South Africa and profiting from racial discrimination and exploitation of African and other non-white workers;

11. Requests the Special Committee on Apartheid to arrange, in consultation with the Secretary-General, for the preparation of special studies on apartheid and its international repercussions and for the publication of a periodic bulletin on the collaboration of Governments and private enterprises with the South African régime and South African companies;

12. Requests the Special Committee on Apartheid to continue its close co-operation with other United Nations bodies concerned with apartheid, racial discrimination and colonialism in southern Africa with a view to co-ordinated action to find ways and means of eliminating those evils;

13. Again recommends that the Security Council should consider urgently the situation in South Africa and in southern Africa as a whole with a view to the adoption of effective measures against South Africa, including those under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations;

14. Requests the Secretary-General to submit a report on the

implementation of the present resolution to the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session.

A/SPC/L.213. Afghanistan, Algeria, Congo, Cyprus, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Philippines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zambia: draft resolution, as amended by Sierra Leone, A/SPC/L.219, approved by Special Political Committee on 16 November 1971, meeting 780, by 82 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

A/SPC/L.219. Sierra Leone: amendment to 36-power draft resolution, A/SPC/L.213.

A/SPC/L.224. Administrative and financial implications of 36-power draft resolution, A/SPC/L.213.

A/C.5/1403, A/8408/Add.12, A/8534. Administrative and financial implications of draft resolutions II C, II G and II H recommended by Special Political Committee in A/8504/Add.1. Statement by Secretary-General and reports of ACABQ and Fifth Committee.

A/8504/Add.1. Report of Special Political Committee (part II), draft resolution II G.

RESOLUTION 2775 G (XXVI), as recommended by Special Political Committee, A/8504/Add.1, adopted by Assembly on 29 November 1971, meeting 1997, by recorded vote of 108 to 2, with 6 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Portugal, South Africa.

Abstaining: Canada, France, Malawi, Netherlands, United Kingdom, United States.

The General Assembly,

Considering that the United Nations has a vital role in promoting national and international action for the elimination of apartheid,

Recognizing the importance of the widest dissemination of information on the evils and dangers of apartheid, and of United Nations efforts for the elimination of apartheid, in order to secure increasing support of world public opinion for such action,

Noting the report of the Secretary-General on the review and reappraisal of United Nations information policies and activities, analysing the relationship of United Nations public information activities to the achievement of the substantive goals of the United Nations, including the elimination of apartheid, racial discrimination and colonialism, and stressing the need, within the principles of universality and objectivity, of a United Nations information programme more directly geared to the support of these goals,

Recalling its resolution 2671 C (XXV) of 8 December 1970,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General and the recommendations contained in the report of the Special Commit-

tee on Apartheid concerning the dissemination of information on apartheid,

Taking note also of the consensus adopted by the joint meeting of the Special Committee on Apartheid, the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the United Nations Council for Namibia, in particular the request that the Secretary-General consider appropriate arrangements for intensifying and co-ordinating research, information and publicity on southern Africa and the recommendation that the presiding officers of the three bodies or their representatives should advise the Secretary-General from time to time,

Welcoming the increasing co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity in disseminating information on apartheid,

1. Requests the Secretary-General, in conformity with the conclusions set forth in paragraphs 52 and 57 of his report on the review and reappraisal of United Nations information policies and activities, and in compliance with the recommendations contained in paragraphs 274 to 278, 289 and 290 of the report of the Special Committee on Apartheid, to intensify information activities with a view to promoting national and international action for the elimination of apartheid;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to ascertain the needs and to take into account the recommendations of the General Assembly bodies concerned with the problems of southern Africa in intensifying information activities on those problems;

3. Invites Governments, specialized agencies and regional organizations, as well as non-governmental organizations, information media and educational institutions, to co-operate with the United Nations in disseminating information on apartheid;

4. Invites the specialized agencies to contribute to the campaign against apartheid in the light of the recommendations contained in paragraphs 282 to 284 of the report of the Special Committee on Apartheid;

5. Requests the Special Committee on Apartheid, in consultation with non-governmental organizations concerned with the campaign against apartheid, to take appropriate steps, where necessary, to promote the establishment of national committees against apartheid;

6. Appeals to Governments and organizations to make voluntary contributions to enable the Organization of African Unity to acquire equipment for recording and distributing information on apartheid through various broadcasting facilities and to lend their co-operation to the Organization of African Unity in preparing and disseminating radio broadcasts on apartheid;

7. Requests the Secretary-General to submit a detailed report to the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session on the implementation of the present resolution and on means of ensuring adequate publicity for United Nations efforts against apartheid in the light of recommendations by the General Assembly bodies concerned.

A/8515/Rev.1. Ways and means of promoting concerted action against apartheid by trade union movement. Report of Special Committee on Apartheid.

A/SPC/L.222. Algeria, Chile, Congo, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia: draft resolution, approved by Special Political Committee on 16 November 1971, meeting 780, by roll-call vote of 92 to 0, with 10 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia,

Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Greece, Malawi, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom.

A/SPC/L.223. Administrative and financial implication of 24-power draft resolution, A/SPC/L.222. Statement by Secretary-General.

A/C.5/1403, A/8408/Add.12, A/8534. Administrative and financial implications of draft resolutions II C, II G and II H recommended by Special Political Committee in A/8504/Add.1. Statement by Secretary-General and reports of ACABQ and Fifth Committee.

A/8504/Add.1. Report of Special Political Committee (part II), draft resolution II H.

RESOLUTION 2775 H (XXVI), as recommended by Special Political Committee, A/8504/Add.1. adopted by Assembly on 29 November 1971, meeting 1997, by recorded vote of 104 to 1, with 9 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: South Africa.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Canada, France, Greece, Malawi, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom.

The General Assembly,  
Recalling its resolution 2671 D (XXV) of 8 December 1970,  
Noting the opposition of the international trade union movement to apartheid and racial discrimination,

Convinced of the need to promote concerted action by the trade union movement at the national and international levels in the campaign against apartheid,

Noting that the question of apartheid will be before the International Labour Conference at its fifty-seventh session, to be held at Geneva in June 1972,

Taking note of the report of the Special Committee on Apartheid concerning ways and means of promoting concerted action against apartheid by the trade union movements,

1. Appeals to all national and international trade union organizations to intensify their action against apartheid, in particular by:

(a) Discouraging the emigration of skilled workers to South Africa;

(b) Taking appropriate action in connexion with the infringements of trade union rights and the persecution of trade unionists in South Africa;

(c) Exerting maximum pressure on foreign economic and financial interests which are profiting from racial discrimination against non-white workers in South Africa, in order to persuade them to cease such exploitation;

(d) Co-operating with other organizations engaged in the international campaign against apartheid;

2. Decides to give further consideration to the proposed international trade union conference at its twenty-seventh session;

3. Requests and authorizes the Special Committee on Apartheid to send a mission to hold consultative meetings, if possible, with the workers' representatives to the fifty-seventh session of the International Labour Conference, to consider lines of action which the trade union movement may take against apartheid, including the holding of the international trade union conference, and to invite representatives of international and regional trade union federations to those consultative meetings;

4. Requests the International Labour Organisation and invites the workers' representatives to lend their co-operation to the Special Committee on Apartheid in preparing and holding the consultative meetings.

## Credentials

General Assembly—26th session  
Credentials Committee, meeting 56.  
Plenary meetings 1934, 2025, 2027.

A/8625. Report of Credentials Committee, containing draft resolution suggested by Chairman and adopted by Committee on 17 December 1971, meeting 56, by 5 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

A/L.666. Somalia: Amendment to draft resolution submitted by Credentials Committee in A/8625, adopted by Assembly on 20 December 1971, meeting 2027, by recorded vote of 60 to 36, with 22 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, France, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Abstaining: Argentina,\* Barbados, Botswana, Burma, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chile, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Guatemala, Ivory Coast, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Nepal, Panama, Peru, Singapore, Thailand, Turkey.

\*Subsequently Argentina advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote against.

RESOLUTION 2862 (XXVI), as recommended by Credentials Committee, A/8625, and as amended by Somalia, A/L.666, adopted by Assembly on 20 December 1971, meeting 2027, by recorded vote of 103 to 1, with 16 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Guinea,

Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: South Africa.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Barbados, Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Fiji, Greece, Honduras, Ireland, Lesotho, Malawi, Nepal, Portugal, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Venezuela.

The General Assembly

Approves the report of the Credentials Committee, except with regard to the credentials of the representatives of South Africa.

Other documents

Basic Facts on the Republic of South Africa and the Policy of Apartheid. U.N.P. Sales No.: E.72.II.K.10.

## United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa

### Reports of Secretary-General and Committee of Trustees

In a report to the General Assembly on 15 October 1971, the Secretary-General and the Committee of Trustees of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa said that in the year since the last report, the Fund had received contributions from 19 Governments totalling \$287,518. Pledges from five Governments were outstanding.

In accordance with decisions of the Committee of Trustees, four grants—totalling \$280,000—were made from the Fund during the period under review. Total contributions to the Trust Fund since its inception in 1965 amounted to \$1,369,263 and the total of grants made from it was \$1,280,400. The Fund—which is made up of voluntary contributions from States, organizations and individuals—is used for grants to voluntary organizations, Governments of host countries of refugees from South Africa, and other bodies. The grants provide: (a) legal assistance to persons persecuted under the repressive and discriminatory legislation of South Africa; (b) relief to such persons and their dependants; (c) education of such persons and their dependants; and (d) relief for refugees from South Africa.

On 8 December 1970, the General Assembly authorized the Committee of Trustees of the Fund to decide on grants from the Fund to voluntary organizations engaged in providing relief and assistance to persons persecuted under repressive and discriminatory legislation in Namibia and Southern Rhodesia and to their families, to the extent that additional voluntary contributions were received for that purpose.<sup>13</sup> The Committee of Trustees reported that France, Ireland and Sweden had specifically indicated that their contributions could be used for grants for the above-mentioned purpose.

The Committee of Trustees also noted with concern that during the year a large number of persons had been detained in South Africa, and a number of trials had been conducted, under

repressive legislation such as the Terrorism Act and the Suppression of Communism Act. The needs for legal assistance and relief to families—within the Trust Fund's terms of reference—had greatly increased.

The Committee hoped that generous contributions would be forthcoming to meet the pressing needs. It also hoped that efforts would be redoubled to persuade the South African Government to refrain from hindering humanitarian assistance to victims of repressive legislation. It stressed the importance of intensifying the dissemination of information on the continued repression of opponents of apartheid and the increasing hardships faced by the victims of repression and their families. The dissemination of such information would—taking into account the expanded mandate of the Trust Fund—help to encourage Governments, organizations and individuals to contribute to the Fund and to voluntary organizations engaged in assistance to victims of apartheid.

### Consideration by General Assembly

At the General Assembly's 1971 session, the report of the Secretary-General and the Committee of Trustees of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa was discussed mainly in the Assembly's Special Political Committee.

The Chairman of the Committee of Trustees told the Special Political Committee that the Trust Fund had enjoyed virtually unanimous support in the General Assembly and had been commended by the Organization of African Unity and by numerous non-governmental organizations concerned with the situation in South Africa. Fifty-five Member States had so far contributed to the Fund. During 1971—which had special significance as the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination—the Trust Fund had received somewhat greater contributions. While expressing appreciation to the donor

<sup>13</sup> See Y.U.N., 1970, p. 156, text of resolution 2671 E (XXV).

Governments for their generous contributions, the Chairman appealed for a substantial increase in the number of contributing Governments. The Committee of Trustees hoped that all Governments would consider making annual contributions even if, for economic or other reasons, they were able to contribute only a token amount.

The Chairman stressed that the present level of contributions was still far below the minimum needs because the scope of the Trust Fund had been expanded to cover Namibia and Southern Rhodesia and because of recent developments in South Africa. A large number of persons had been detained in February and March 1971 under the Terrorism Act, and several trials had taken place under that Act and other legislation during the year. People released after serving long terms of imprisonment had been subjected to banning orders or removed to "resettlement camps" and continued to require assistance. The South African Government, moreover, appeared to be intent on hindering humanitarian assistance to the victims of repression.

On 29 November 1971, the General Assembly among other things expressed its appreciation to the Governments, organizations and individuals that had contributed to the Trust Fund and again appealed to all States, to governmental or non-governmental organizations and to individuals for generous contributions to the Trust Fund to enable it to meet the increasing needs. The Assembly further appealed for generous direct contributions to voluntary organizations engaged in providing relief and assistance to persons persecuted under repressive legislation in South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia.

The Assembly authorized the Committee of Trustees to send a representative away from Headquarters (in New York) to hold informative discussions, as necessary, with the voluntary organizations concerned, particularly those receiving grants from the Trust Fund. The Secretary-General was asked to take appropriate steps to

intensify the dissemination of information on the need for relief and assistance to persons persecuted under repressive and discriminatory legislation in South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia.

The Assembly took these decisions when it adopted resolution 2774(XXVI) by a recorded vote of 110 to 1, with 1 abstention. The text was adopted on the recommendation of the Special Political Committee, which approved it, as revised, on 11 November, by 102 votes to 0, with 1 abstention.

The text was sponsored in the Special Political Committee by Austria, Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, the Congo, Cyprus, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jamaica, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Rwanda, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

(For text of resolution 2774(XXVI), see DOCUMENTARYREFERENCES below.)

Total contributions from Governments in 1971 were as follows:

Country	Amount (in U.S. dollars)
Austria	5,000
Belgium	20,149
Bulgaria	1,000
Cyprus	242
Denmark	66,796
Finland	25,000
France	20,000
Ghana	1,000
Ireland	2,750
Jamaica	840
Japan	20,000
Khmer Republic	1,000
Liberia	1,000
Morocco	3,972
Norway	35,000
Pakistan	3,000
Saudi Arabia	2,400
Sweden	77,369
Yugoslavia	1,000

#### DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES

General Assembly—26th session  
Special Political Committee, meetings 757-776.  
Plenary meeting 1997.

A/8468. Report of Secretary-General. (Annex: Report of Committee of Trustees of United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa.)  
A/SPC/L.206. Austria, Ceylon, Chile, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, Ghana, Iceland, India, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Morocco, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Somalia, Sweden, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zambia: draft resolution.

A/SPC/L.206/Rev.1. Austria, Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Cyprus, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jamaica, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Rwanda, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania,

Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia: revised draft resolution, approved by Special Political Committee on 11 November 1971, meeting 776, by 102 votes to 0, with 1 abstention.

A/SPC/L.207. Administrative and financial implications of 22-power draft resolution, A/SPC/L.206.

A/8504/Add.1. Report of Special Political Committee (part II), draft resolution I.

RESOLUTION 2774(XXVI), as recommended by Special Political Committee, A/8504/Add.1, adopted by Assembly on 29 November 1971, meeting 1997, by recorded vote of 110 to 1, with 1 abstention, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon,

Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: South Africa.

Abstaining: Portugal.

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 2671 E (XXV) of 8 December 1970 concerning the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa,

Taking note with appreciation of the report of the Secretary-General, to which is annexed the report of the Committee of Trustees of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa,

Conscious of the continuing need for humanitarian assistance to

persons persecuted under repressive and discriminatory legislation in South Africa, as well as in Namibia and Southern Rhodesia, and to their families,

Concerned at the actions of the South African Government in persecuting persons engaged in providing humanitarian assistance to victims of apartheid,

1. Expresses its appreciation to the Governments, organizations and individuals that have contributed to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa;

2. Again appeals to all States, to governmental or non-governmental organizations and to individuals for generous contributions to the Trust Fund in order to enable it to meet the increasing needs;

3. Further appeals for generous direct contributions to voluntary organizations engaged in providing relief and assistance to persons persecuted under repressive and discriminatory legislation in South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia;

4. Authorizes the Committee of Trustees of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa to send a representative away from Headquarters to hold informative discussions, as necessary, with the voluntary organizations concerned, particularly those receiving grants from the Trust Fund;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to take appropriate steps to intensify the dissemination of information on the need for relief and assistance to persons persecuted under repressive and discriminatory legislation in South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia.

## The situation in Southern Rhodesia

The situation in Southern Rhodesia continued to receive consideration in 1971 by the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Assembly's Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, as well as by the Commission on Human Rights and the Economic and Social Council.

These bodies were concerned with bringing to an end the illegal white minority régime of Ian Smith—which had unilaterally declared its independence from the United Kingdom on 11 November 1965—and with enabling the African people of the territory to exercise their basic human rights, particularly their inalienable right to freedom and independence in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted by the General Assembly in 1960.<sup>14</sup>

Also under consideration was the implementation of the various decisions of the Security Council calling for sanctions against the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia, particularly Security Council resolution 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968,<sup>15</sup> by which the Council had, among other things, imposed more extensive mandatory economic sanctions against the illegal régime and emphasized the need for withdrawal of all consular and trade representation in Southern Rhodesia.

The Security Council met in November and December to consider the question of Southern Rhodesia in the light of the proposals for a

settlement agreed upon between the illegal régime and the United Kingdom Government; a draft resolution sponsored by four African and Asian States failed to be adopted owing to the negative vote of the United Kingdom, a permanent member of the Council.

The General Assembly's Special Committee on the implementation of the Declaration on granting independence to colonial countries and peoples adopted, on 30 April, a resolution concerning Southern Rhodesia's participation in the XXth Olympic Games. On 2 July, it adopted a resolution concerning the continuation of talks between the United Kingdom and the illegal régime and, on 24 August, it adopted a resolution on aspects of the question of Southern Rhodesia as a whole.

The General Assembly, at its twenty-sixth session later in 1971, adopted four resolutions on the question. By the first, adopted on 16 November, it called on the United States to prevent the importation of chrome into the United States from Southern Rhodesia. By the second, adopted on 22 November, among other things it reaffirmed the principle that there should be no independence before majority rule in Southern Rhodesia and affirmed that any settlement must be worked out with the participation of the nationalist leaders of Zimbabwe (Southern Rhodesia) and endorsed freely by the people.

A third resolution, adopted by the Assembly on

<sup>14</sup> See Y.U.N., 1960, pp. 49-50, resolution 1514(XV), containing text of Declaration.

<sup>15</sup> See Y.U.N., 1968, pp. 152-54, text of resolution 253(1968).

10 December, laid down a number of provisions on the general aspects of the situation in Southern Rhodesia.

On 20 December, the Assembly adopted a fourth resolution by which, among other things, it rejected the proposals for a settlement agreed upon by the United Kingdom and the racist minority régime as constituting a flagrant violation of the inalienable right of the Zimbabwe people to self-determination and independence.

Details of these and other related decisions on Southern Rhodesia are described in the sections below.

#### **Communications and reports to Security Council (January-November 1971)**

On 16 June 1971, the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253(1968) of 29 May 1968<sup>16</sup> submitted its fourth report to the Council, covering its work since the submission of its third report on 15 June 1970.

The report said that, as a result of consultations, it had been agreed that as of 1 October 1970 the Committee would be enlarged to include all members of the Security Council. Since then, the Committee had held 29 meetings at which it had continued examination of 36 cases of suspected violations of the provisions of the resolution of 29 May 1968, listed in its previous report, and considered 40 new cases brought to the Committee's attention, as well as information about attempts to evade the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. The Committee had also considered certain procedural issues in connexion with its future work, as well as other questions such as: consular and other representation in Southern Rhodesia; representation of the illegal régime in other countries; delegations and groups entering or leaving Southern Rhodesia; airlines operating to and from Southern Rhodesia; and immigration to and tourism in that territory.

Annexes attached to the report contained factual accounts of the cases carried over from previous reports, as well as new cases, of transactions conducted with or without the knowledge of reporting Governments, and two studies—one on the automobile industry in Southern Rhodesia and the other on imports of ammonia into Southern Rhodesia as a basic element for fertilizers.

In an addendum to the report, issued on 13 July, further annexes were published showing statistics of imports of all commodities from Southern Rhodesia, exports of all commodities to Southern Rhodesia and trade in commodities.

The Committee said it had noted that there were several commodities in which there appeared to be considerable trade with Southern Rhodesia in contravention of the resolution of 29 May 1968, in spite of the efforts being made by reporting

Governments. Certain goods apparently destined for Southern Rhodesia were being declared as destined for neighbouring countries in southern and eastern Africa, and goods exported from Southern Rhodesia were being imported into or allowed transit through countries on the basis of fraudulent or accommodation documents.

The Committee drew the Council's attention to four specific cases in which it had found that commercial transactions had been conducted with Southern Rhodesia. In one such case, concerning the sale of an aircraft to Air Rhodesia by the Middle East Airlines via an intermediary in Mozambique, the Government of Lebanon had informed the Committee that the transaction had been conducted without its knowledge. In the three other cases, which concerned imports of Southern Rhodesian graphite into the Federal Republic of Germany, meat into Switzerland and exports of wheat from Australia to Southern Rhodesia, the Governments concerned had acknowledged that those operations had been conducted with their knowledge and consent. Australia had explained that because wheat was a basic foodstuff of the people of Southern Rhodesia, its export thereto was a humanitarian action permitted under the provisions of the resolution of 29 May 1968.

In four letters between 2 July and 6 October, the Chairman or Acting Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples transmitted the texts of three resolutions concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia adopted by the Special Committee at meetings on 2 July, 24 August, 9 September, and two consensus adopted on 6 October. (For further details, see below.)

On 8 November, the Chairman of the African group of States at the United Nations transmitted the text of a statement by the group concerning action taken by the United States Congress on 4 November to allow Southern Rhodesian chrome ore to be imported into the United States in contravention of the Security Council's resolution of 29 May 1968. The African group said the decision, if implemented, would undermine the basis for State responsibility for mandatory sanctions imposed by the Security Council, and it asked the Secretary-General to use his good offices to draw the attention of the United States Government to the effect of such violation.

#### **Consideration by Special Committee**

The General Assembly's Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples considered the question of Southern Rhodesia at meetings held between 4 March and 6 October 1971.

The Special Committee heard one petitioner, Abdul S. Minty, Honorary Secretary of the Anti-Apartheid Movement in the United Kingdom, whose statement concerned territories in southern Africa in general. During May 1971, an ad hoc group of the Special Committee—established for the purpose of maintaining contact with representatives of national liberation movements from colonial territories in Africa—also heard the views of two representatives of national liberation movements of Southern Rhodesia: N.M. Shamuyarira, Secretary of External Affairs of the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU), and G.B. Nyandoro, National Secretary of the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU).

Mr. Minty said that Southern Rhodesia had become a virtual colony of South Africa, which provided it with both financial and military support. Armed units from South Africa had been operating in Southern Rhodesia for some years. South Africa was also providing military and economic assistance to the Portuguese authorities in Angola and Mozambique, resulting in a military alliance between the three white régimes against African freedom. Mr. Minty said that many Western countries with increasing economic investments in southern Africa were committed to maintaining this alliance to protect their investments and were therefore largely responsible for the perpetuation of the iniquitous situation in the area.

The petitioner also said that the commitment of Western Governments to peaceful change in southern Africa was a distortion of that noble idea in order to maintain the status quo.

The representatives of the liberation movements from Southern Rhodesia told the ad hoc group that economic sanctions against the illegal régime would never achieve the desired results unless they were extended to cover South Africa and Portugal, backed by the use of force and strictly enforced. The petitioners said that although the policy of sanctions had failed so far to achieve its chief purpose, it had nevertheless succeeded in increasing the political and moral isolation of the illegal régime.

The petitioners also expressed their opposition to the holding of discussions between the United Kingdom Government and the illegal régime. Discussions concerning the future political status of the territory should, they said, be held between the United Kingdom Government and the representatives of political parties in Zimbabwe favouring majority rule. The petitioners also expressed disapproval of the five principles

formulated by the United Kingdom as a basis for settlement which, they said, did not envisage the establishment of majority rule on the basis of "one man, one vote" prior to independence.

On 4 March 1971, the Special Committee adopted a consensus by which, among other things, it deplored the decision of the United Kingdom Government to proceed with the sale to South Africa of a number of helicopters and spare parts for military equipment despite the provisions of Security Council resolutions. The consensus further stated that because of the close co-operation existing between South Africa, Portugal and the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia, the decision of the United Kingdom Government would inevitably increase the capacity and efforts of those authorities to suppress the struggle of the peoples of southern Africa for freedom and independence. The Special Committee urged all States, without exception, to desist forthwith from such sales or supplies.

During the debate, members expressed deep concern over new developments in the territory, including: the eviction of the Tangwena people from their traditional home; the coming into force of the so-called Republican Constitution; and the steps taken by the illegal régime to entrench further an apartheid system by means of the "Property Owners (Residential Protection) Bill."

Committee members agreed that the situation in Southern Rhodesia had continued to deteriorate; it was pointed out that despite international condemnation and efforts by the United Nations the illegal régime had consolidated its position. Sweden noted that in spite of the failure to oust the illegal régime, some positive results of United Nations efforts could be seen, namely, that no Member State had accorded recognition to the illegal régime, thus leaving it in political isolation.

Most speakers—including Ethiopia, Iran, the USSR and the United Republic of Tanzania—agreed that the United Kingdom had the primary responsibility for bringing an end to the illegal situation in Southern Rhodesia and had failed to take effective action to end the rebellion and hand over political power to the African majority. They said that the original decision of the United Kingdom Government not to use force to overthrow the illegal régime was the principal cause of the present situation.

Most members of the Special Committee held that the sanctions imposed by the Security Council had so far been ineffective. Afghanistan, Ethiopia, India, Iran, Iraq, the Syrian Arab Republic and the United Republic of Tanzania, among others, felt that the refusal of South Africa and Portugal to comply with the sanctions imposed by the United Nations and their continuing support of and aid to the illegal régime were the main factors

accounting for the regime's economic survival. Poland and the USSR, among others, felt that many Western countries, including the United Kingdom, were also guilty of undermining sanctions by continuing to invest in Southern Rhodesia. Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Ethiopia, India, Trinidad and Tobago, and the United Republic of Tanzania called for the tightening of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and the extension of mandatory sanctions to Portugal and South Africa.

Ecuador and Venezuela felt that the Special Committee should urge the Security Council to adopt stronger sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and that Member States should practise strict compliance with those sanctions in force. Sweden felt that the sanctions already imposed against Southern Rhodesia had had a noticeable effect on the territory's economy and should not be regarded as a total failure.

The representatives of Bulgaria, Ethiopia, India and Venezuela held that moral and material assistance to the Zimbabwe national liberation movements should be increased to enable those groups to wage their legitimate struggle for freedom and independence.

The United Republic of Tanzania, supported by Bulgaria and the Syrian Arab Republic among others, proposed that the Special Committee should establish a sub-committee to study ways and means by which the specialized agencies could give assistance to liberation movements and cease all collaboration with those States that hindered the process of decolonization. The same sub-committee could also consult with the liberation movements for this purpose.

Many members—including Bulgaria, Ecuador, Ethiopia, India, Iraq, Poland and the United Republic of Tanzania—agreed that the United Kingdom Government should discontinue all negotiations with the minority régime and instead deal directly with representatives of the African people.

On 30 April, the Special Committee unanimously adopted a resolution concerning the XXth Olympic Games scheduled for 1972. It was sponsored by Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, India, Iran, Iraq, Madagascar, Mali, Poland, Sierra Leone, Sweden, the Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, the USSR, the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

By this, the Special Committee among other things deplored the International Olympic Committee's continued recognition of the so-called National Olympic Committee of Rhodesia and the invitation extended to the national Committee to participate in the Olympic Games at Munich, Federal Republic of Germany; it also urged the International Olympic Committee to suspend the

so-called National Olympic Committee from its membership, asked the Organizing Committee of the XXth Olympic Games to annul its invitation and called upon all States to comply fully with the relevant Security Council resolutions and to work for the full implementation of the present resolution.

In a consensus concerning the same subject adopted on 6 October, the Special Committee noted with deep regret the decision of the International Olympic Committee to permit the participation in the XXth Olympic Games of the so-called National Olympic Committee of Rhodesia; having considered that this decision contravened the aims and purposes of the relevant Security Council decisions, the Special Committee requested all States to take steps ensuring the exclusion of the so-called National Olympic Committee of Rhodesia from participation in the Games and to refrain from any action which might confer a semblance of legitimacy on the illegal racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia.

On 21 June, the Special Committee, at the suggestion of Ethiopia, considered the question of Southern Rhodesia in the light of the dispatch by the United Kingdom Government of a special envoy to continue consultations with the illegal racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia. On 2 July, the Special Committee adopted a resolution on this aspect of the question, sponsored by Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Ethiopia, India, Poland, Sierra Leone, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, and Yugoslavia. The vote, by roll call, was 18 to 0, with 2 abstentions (Fiji and Sweden).

By this resolution, the Special Committee: condemned the continued failure and refusal of the United Kingdom Government to take effective measures to put an end to the illegal régime and called on that Government to take such measures without further delay; reaffirmed that any attempt to negotiate the future of Zimbabwe with the illegal racist minority régime on the basis of independence without majority rule would be contrary to the provisions of the General Assembly's resolution of 14 December 1960<sup>17</sup> (containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples); and called once again on the United Kingdom to enter into consultations without further delay with the representatives of political parties of Zimbabwe favouring majority rule, in order to transfer power to the Zimbabwe people on the basis of free elections by universal adult suffrage and of majority rule, in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions. The Special Committee also recommended that the Security Council

<sup>17</sup> See footnote 14.

urgently consider the possibility of taking further measures under the United Nations Charter, as envisaged in the relevant resolutions adopted by the General Assembly during its twenty-fifth (1970) session.

In explanation of vote, Fiji said it could neither condemn nor deplore the talks in advance, and it hoped that they might result in some satisfactory solution. It regretted, however, that the United Kingdom Government was not in simultaneous consultation with the leaders of the African majority. For these reasons, Fiji, although agreeing with a substantial portion of the resolution, abstained from voting.

On 24 August, the Special Committee—by a roll-call vote of 18 to 0, with 2 abstentions (Fiji and Sweden)—adopted a third resolution on the question of Southern Rhodesia, sponsored by Afghanistan, Ethiopia, India, Iraq, Sierra Leone, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, and Yugoslavia.

By this, the Special Committee among other things:

(1) reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of Zimbabwe to freedom and independence in conformity with the provisions of the General Assembly's resolution of 14 December 1960 (containing the Declaration on the granting of independence), and the legitimacy of their struggle by all necessary means at their disposal to attain that right;

(2) condemned the failure and refusal of the United Kingdom to take effective measures to bring down the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia and to transfer power to the people of Zimbabwe on the basis of universal adult suffrage and majority rule, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, and called upon the United Kingdom to take such measures, including the use of force, without further delay in fulfilling its responsibility as administering power;

(3) deplored the failure of the United Kingdom to co-operate with the Special Committee by rejecting the Special Committee's invitation to participate in its consideration of the question of Southern Rhodesia, and called upon the United Kingdom Government to co-operate with and assist the Special Committee in the discharge of its mandate;

(4) condemned the policies of South Africa, Portugal and other Governments which continued to have political, economic, military or other relations with the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia in defiance of the relevant United Nations resolutions and contrary to their Charter obligations, and called on them to cease forthwith all such relations and, in particular, to interrupt any existing means of transportation to and from Southern Rhodesia;

(5) condemned the continued presence and intervention of South African forces in Southern Rhodesia in violation of the Security Council's resolution of 18 March 1970,<sup>18</sup> and called upon the administering power to ensure the immediate expulsion of all such forces and the release of freedom fighters detained by the illegal régime;

(6) called upon the United Kingdom Government, in view of the armed conflict in the territory and the inhuman treatment of prisoners, to ensure the application to that situation of the 1949 Geneva Conventions relative to the treatment of prisoners of war and to the protection of civilian persons in time of war;

(7) called upon all States, the specialized agencies and other international organizations within the United Nations system to extend, with the co-operation of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), all moral and material assistance to the people of Zimbabwe in their struggle to attain freedom and independence;

(8) strongly urged all States to comply with the sanctions adopted by the Security Council in order to bring about the isolation of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia in all aspects; and

(9) drew the Security Council's attention to the urgent need to widen the scope of the sanctions against the illegal régime by declaring mandatory all the measures envisaged under Article 41 of the United Nations Charter,<sup>19</sup> as well as to the need to consider imposing sanctions against South Africa and Portugal in view of their refusal to implement the relevant Security Council resolutions.

On 9 September, the Special Committee—by a roll-call vote of 17 to 0, with 1 abstention (Sweden)—adopted a resolution covering aspects of the situation in common in Southern Rhodesia, Namibia and the territories under Portuguese administration. The resolution was sponsored by Afghanistan, Ethiopia, India, Iraq, Mali, Sierra Leone, the Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, the United Republic of Tanzania, and Yugoslavia.

By this, the Special Committee among other things:

(1) reaffirmed the legitimate right of the peoples in Southern Rhodesia, Namibia and territories under Portuguese domination to struggle by all necessary means at their disposal against colonial authorities, and the obligation of Member States to render all necessary moral and material assistance to those peoples;

(2) condemned the increasing collaboration between Portugal, South Africa and the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia;

<sup>18</sup> See Y.U.N., 1970, pp. 181-83, text of resolution 277(1970).

<sup>19</sup> For text of Article 41 of the Charter, see APPENDIX II.

(3) urged all States, in consultation with OAU, to increase their financial and material assistance to the peoples of those territories;

(4) requested all States to discontinue all collaboration with the Governments of Portugal and South Africa, as well as with the illegal régime; and

(5) drew the Security Council's attention to the urgent need to take effective measures to put an end to the grave situation created by the continued defiance of their Charter obligations by the Governments concerned.

By a consensus adopted on 6 October, the Special Committee noted with concern the decision of the United States Senate which would permit the importation of chrome into the United States from Southern Rhodesia and thus violate the sanctions being applied by the Security Council. The Committee urged the United States Government to take the necessary measures to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

#### **Decisions of Human Rights Commission and of Economic and Social Council**

At its meetings in February and March 1971, the Commission on Human Rights again considered the 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.

On 8 March, it endorsed the observations, conclusions and recommendations of its Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts, which had conducted an investigation into, among other things, the question of capital punishment in southern Africa; the treatment of political prisoners and captured freedom fighters in southern Africa; the condition of Africans in the so-called native reserves and transit camps in South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia; and grave manifestations of colonialism and racial discrimination in Namibia, Southern Rhodesia and the African territories under Portuguese administration.

The Human Rights Commission decided that the Ad Hoc Working Group should continue to survey developments in those areas, with particular reference to grave manifestations of colonialism and racial discrimination present in the situation prevailing in Namibia, Southern Rhodesia, Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), resulting from the actions of the illegal South African régime in Namibia, the illegal minority régime in Southern Rhodesia and the Portuguese régime in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). The Commission asked the Group to remain active and vigilant in its observation of colonial and racially discriminatory practices in Africa and bring to the Commission's attention

any new developments in the field. (See also pp. 405-6.)

The Economic and Social Council, at its session in April-May 1971, acting on a recommendation of the Human Rights Commission, approved a resolution (1592(L)) by which it recommended that the General Assembly adopt a resolution relating to the right of peoples under colonial and alien domination to self-determination. The text was adopted later in 1971 by the Assembly as its resolution 2787(XXVI). (For details, see pp. 420-22.)

The Council also adopted a resolution (1599(L)) concerning allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights in southern Africa by which, among other things, it called on the United Kingdom to fulfil its responsibility to put an immediate end to discrimination and repression against African workers and trade unionists in Southern Rhodesia. It also asked the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts established by the Human Rights Commission to investigate thoroughly the system of recruitment of African workers in Namibia, Southern Rhodesia and the territories under Portuguese domination. (For details, see pp. 434-36.)

#### **Consideration by Security Council (November-December 1971)**

In a letter dated 24 November 1971, the United Kingdom representative requested—in connexion with the situation in Southern Rhodesia—that a meeting of the Security Council be convened on 25 November so that he could inform the Council about the recent discussions his Government's Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs had had in Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia.

The question was considered by the Council at meetings held between 25 November and 30 December, during which the representatives of Algeria, Ghana, India, Kenya, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, and Zambia were invited, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

At the Council's meeting on 25 November, the United Kingdom representative said that while the settlement of the problem of Southern Rhodesia was primarily a matter for the United Kingdom Government, it had always been recognized that the question was one of legitimate and continuing concern to the world community. For that reason, his Government considered it right to inform the Security Council that agreement had been reached between the United Kingdom Foreign Secretary, Sir Alec Douglas-Home, and Ian Smith in Salisbury, on 24 November, on proposals for a settlement of the Southern Rhodesian problem. He emphasized that the fact that agreement had

been reached on certain proposals did not in itself represent any change in the existing situation; it was a first step only. Finality would not be reached until the people of Rhodesia as a whole had had a full and free opportunity to demonstrate whether the proposals were acceptable to them.

The United Kingdom representative went on to say that the proposals—which had been accepted by the British Cabinet—were based upon the five principles to which the United Kingdom had consistently adhered. These were that in any settlement: (i) the principle and intention of unimpeded progress to majority rule would have to be maintained and guaranteed; (ii) there would also have to be guarantees against retrogressive amendment of the Constitution; (iii) there would have to be immediate improvement in the political status of the African population; (iv) there would have to be progress towards ending racial discrimination; and (v) the British Government would need to be satisfied that any basis proposed for independence was acceptable to the people of Rhodesia as a whole.

The proposals, he stressed, would depend for their implementation on their acceptance by the people of Southern Rhodesia as a whole. The United Kingdom Government would appoint a commission, headed by Lord Pearce, to ascertain from all sections of the population their views on the acceptability of the proposals and to report thereon to the British Government. The commission would, among other things, visit the main centres of population, councils in the rural areas and traditional meeting places in the tribal trust lands. The test of acceptability would be a full, free and fair ascertainment—under the direct control of the British Government, not of the Rhodesians.

The United Kingdom representative then turned to the central part of the proposals—the constitutional arrangements—which he described in detail and termed as vital in connexion with the principle of unimpeded progress towards majority rule. They constituted, he said, a real and substantial change in direction away from the existing state of affairs as embodied in the 1969 Constitution.

An important element in the proposals, he went on, was the new Declaration of Rights, which would afford protection to the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual and confer, for any person who claimed that its provisions had been contravened, a right of access to the High Court to obtain redress.

Other main constitutional provisions, the United Kingdom representative continued, related to amendment of the Constitution. Also provided for was a review of existing legislation through an independent commission to examine the problem of racial discrimination. Other provisions would

have a direct bearing on the status and rights of the Africans concerning land and development, which would include a development programme assisted by the British Government to increase significantly education and job opportunities for Africans.

The main thrust of the agreed proposals was to be the advancement of the Africans in education and in social, economic and political matters. Acceptance of the proposals by the people of Southern Rhodesia as a whole was a *sine qua non* of the whole exercise, the United Kingdom representative stressed.

He said that the proposals presented an acceptable alternative to the status quo and a healthy reversal of an unhealthy trend. The cloud of growing racial discrimination was creeping northwards and seemed bound to turn Southern Rhodesia into a satellite of the apartheid system unless it was halted and reversed.

In conclusion, the representative of the United Kingdom said that only if the Rhodesian people accepted the proposals, and if the British Government was fully satisfied that the Rhodesian Government had enacted the necessary legislation and taken the necessary steps to give effect to the proposals, would the final section of the proposals—which envisaged the conferring of legal independence on Southern Rhodesia and the lifting of sanctions—come into effect. Until that stage was reached, the situation would remain unchanged and all existing measures would remain in force.

The USSR representative asserted that the talks had been conducted with an illegal racist régime, already universally condemned as such by the United Nations, and had resulted in an agreement concluded without the knowledge or participation of the people of Zimbabwe. The talks were conducted contrary to the direct appeals of the General Assembly and contrary to appeals not to have anything to do with the unlawful régime and not to have talks with it concerning the future of the Zimbabwe people.

It was clear, he went on to say, that the purpose of the proposals was to maintain for an indefinitely long time the existing racist order prevailing in Southern Rhodesia. The United Kingdom promised a long-term educational programme for Africans to prepare them for more rapid political progress. But, he said, this was a further manifestation of the colonialist thesis that Africans were not ready for independence, a thesis that had long ago been condemned. The attainment of independence by many African countries and the presence of their representatives in the United Nations had amply refuted it. Zimbabwe, too, had capable political leaders who were well prepared to manage the affairs of their country by themselves;

however, they were imprisoned, without trial, for many years, including Joshua Nkomo, the leader of the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) and the Reverend Ndabaningi Sithole, the leader of the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU).

The USSR representative said the Security Council could not overlook the fact that the visit of the United Kingdom Foreign Secretary to the Southern Rhodesian racists had coincided with the action by the United States Congress to repeal the embargo on the purchase by United States monopolies of chrome from Southern Rhodesia. It was clear that attempts were being made to rescue the unlawful régime in Southern Rhodesia, to support the Portuguese colonial system and the racist system of South Africa, with a view to strengthening and maintaining in southern Africa a bastion of imperialism, colonialism and racism. This was required, he said, to prevent at all costs the progress of the national liberation movement in southern Africa and the implementation there of the 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

The USSR representative proposed that the leaders of ZAPU and ZANU, Mr. Nkomo and Mr. Sithole, be invited to appear before the Security Council and give it their appraisal of the proposals. At a meeting on 2 December, acting on this USSR proposal, which was supported by Somalia, the Security Council decided without objection to invite Messrs. Nkomo and Sithole to participate in the discussion. Subsequently, in a note dated 23 December, the President of the Council said he had addressed a letter to the United Kingdom representative on 2 December expressing the hope that the United Kingdom, as administering authority of the territory, would take the appropriate steps to ensure compliance with the Council's decision. In a reply dated 21 December, the United Kingdom representative informed him that Mr. Nkomo was in detention and Mr. Sithole was serving a prison sentence in Southern Rhodesia. His Government regretted that in the circumstances it was not in a position to require the Rhodesian authorities to allow either Mr. Nkomo or Mr. Sithole to come to New York.

Commenting on the note from the President, several Council members expressed their disappointment at the United Kingdom reply; the USSR representative in particular said that the reply was not even an argument but a simple declaration of the refusal on the part of the United Kingdom to implement a decision of the Security Council, to which the Council should not reconcile itself.

On the question of the importation of chrome ore from Southern Rhodesia, the United States representative denied that there had been any connivance between the United States and the

United Kingdom concerning Southern Rhodesia, adding that the action of the United States Congress was not supported by the United States Government but reflected concern about the ineffectiveness of the sanctions. The United States was not currently buying chrome ore from Southern Rhodesia but someone else was doing so, he said. The United States had not violated the sanctions.

The representative of Burundi wondered whether the proposed electoral system might not be too complicated for the people of Southern Rhodesia to pronounce themselves on, since they had always been denied accession to independence on the ground that they lacked the necessary scholastic training to participate in a referendum. He also asked why the leader of the rebel régime sought discretionary powers with regard to the release of political detainees or the return of exiles; Burundi considered that all who had sought to lead Southern Rhodesia to independence should be freed, and all political exiles should be unconditionally repatriated.

Burundi's representative also asked for clarification as to what assurance there was that the development aid promised by the United Kingdom would not be diverted to other purposes. He also wanted to know what the duration of the rebel régime and of the transitional system under the agreement would be.

The Syrian Arab Republic's representative asked about the length of time it would take for parity to be achieved. If the test of acceptability should prove negative, how did the United Kingdom intend to discharge its responsibility as administering power, he asked. Would it leave the Smith régime full freedom of action by saying that the proposals had been rejected?

The representative of the United Republic of Tanzania stressed that the United Kingdom bore ultimate responsibility for Southern Rhodesia and for the actions of the Southern Rhodesian Government. The United Kingdom had now decided to legalize the usurpation of power by the Smith régime and its interpretation of events was, at best, an apology for its own inaction and, at worst, a clumsy justification for its treachery, double standards and perhaps pre-planned impotence to control those events.

The Africans of Zimbabwe, he continued, had rejected in advance any settlement outside the principle of majority rule. Neither his Government, nor Africa, nor the rest of the international community had ever accepted the so-called five principles as the basis of a settlement. He charged that the so-called settlement favoured white oppression and domination in Southern Rhodesia and was in flagrant negation of the principles of freedom, human equality, justice and democracy.

The representative of Somalia asked whether the United Kingdom intended to publish the texts of representations made to the British Foreign Secretary by African political leaders during the Salisbury talks, and whether the United Kingdom, if it intended to go ahead with the test of acceptability, would ensure a full, free and fair conduct of the test by removing the apparatus of the police State which existed in the territory, tyrannizing the African people and depriving them of their liberty. He also suggested that the proposed Declaration of Rights should be examined and evaluated by United Nations legal experts.

On 1 December, the United Kingdom transmitted the text of a White Paper entitled "Rhodesia: Proposals for a Settlement," containing the proposals he had described on 25 November.

The representative of Somalia said that neither the goals nor the special involvement of the United Nations with regard to Southern Rhodesia had been taken into account in the negotiations preceding the proposals or in the proposals themselves. The United Nations should be closely associated with any initiative aimed at a settlement of the problem, not after but before the fact. Instead, it was being asked to accept a bilateral proposal worked out not with all the people of the territory but with the rebel régime. Furthermore, it was a proposal drawn up within the existing framework of minority privilege and racial discrimination against the African population—a framework long ago rejected by the United Nations.

In the proposals, he pointed out, progress towards majority rule was impeded at every stage; the guarantees against retrogressive amendment of the Constitution were completely unsatisfactory; improvement in the political status of the African population, far from being immediate, depended on an incalculable factor—the economic progress of the African majority; there were no firm guarantees of progress towards ending racial discrimination; and the modalities for determining the acceptability of the proposals by the people as a whole left much to be desired.

The representative of Somalia also noted that the new proposals were to be set within the framework of the blatantly racist Constitution of 1969, to which not only the United Nations but the United Kingdom had refused to accord legal recognition. Voter rolls were to remain segregated. Qualifications of candidates remained unchanged—a significant omission considering that the existing Constitution provided that anyone who had been detained or restricted for six months could not be a candidate for five years thereafter. The result of this would be that the majority of the African leaders would be eliminat-

ed from political life at a time when their experience and dedication were most needed. The infamous Land Tenure Act had been retained—a giant step towards the South African model of apartheid.

Somalia felt strongly, he said, that the proposals did not represent sufficient grounds for the United Kingdom to claim that it had done everything possible to fulfil its responsibilities towards the people of Southern Rhodesia. To grant independence while a white racist minority regime still held all the reins of power was to betray the African majority and give, finally, the powerful minority the opportunity to entrench its power, privileges and prejudices. Consequently, he urged the United Kingdom to continue to act in concert with the world community and on the basis of the objectives set and established by the United Nations.

However, since the agreement had already been signed and since the United Kingdom intended at all costs to set in motion the machinery for a test of acceptability, he put forward, as a second line of approach, proposals to ensure that the consultation with the people of Southern Rhodesia was valid and fully understood.

He suggested, first, that the period of the test should be long enough to enable a largely illiterate and rural African population to understand the proposals by means of a thorough educational campaign; second, that during that critical period the apparatus of the police State should be removed, maintenance of public order taken over by the United Kingdom and normal political activity, including activity by African political parties, permitted; third, that all political prisoners, detainees and restrictees should be released in order to participate in the educational campaign for their people; fourth, that the initial contribution of the United Kingdom to African education be applied immediately and specifically to adult education on the political issues involved in the settlement; and, last, that the United Kingdom arrange for a team of United Nations observers to observe preparations for and the actual exercise of the test of acceptability.

The Saudi Arabian spokesman suggested that the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization might institute an educational programme on human rights for all the inhabitants of Southern Rhodesia or that the United Nations might set up a fund to encourage a programme of civil disobedience and boycott in the territory.

The Zambian representative said his Government had concluded that the proposals would indefinitely postpone African majority rule in Southern Rhodesia. Messages smuggled out of the territory from Mr. Nkomo and Mr. Sithole had, he

said, requested the Zambian delegation to report to the Security Council those leaders' total rejection of the agreement.

Ghana's representative disputed the United Kingdom's claim that it was unable to use force against the rebel régime, a method it had employed in several of its former colonies. Ghana feared that the new proposals would not only diminish the hopes of the Zimbabwe people but lead to frustration and despair and thus constitute an invitation to violence and revolution. Ghana appealed to the United Nations to maintain and strengthen the sanctions, extend them to Portugal and South Africa and reject any independence for Southern Rhodesia not based on majority rule. Otherwise, the United Nations would be faced with yet another apartheid-ridden minority régime within its ranks.

The representative of Kenya said that the new proposals were totally unacceptable and constituted a shameful betrayal of the Zimbabwe people and a flagrant violation of United Nations resolutions and the United Nations Charter. The United Kingdom's negotiations with the rebel régime had been held in total disregard of the principles laid down in resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

The United Kingdom representative, responding to some of the questions put to him during the debate and saying that he awaited instructions regarding others, confirmed his Government's intention to go ahead with the conduct of the test of acceptability, but said it was impossible to answer the hypothetical question as to what the United Kingdom would do if the proposals were rejected. He said that 97 African representatives, including Mr. Nkomo, had had consultations with the United Kingdom Foreign Secretary during his stay in Salisbury. As for the written or other communications received during those contacts, he said they were confidential and could not be made available to the Council without the consent of those who had submitted them.

With regard to guarantees concerning the development funds to be provided by his Government, he said that comprehensive discussions would be undertaken with the Rhodesians about the programme before any projects were selected or money disbursed. As to the suggestion that United Nations legal experts compare the proposed new Declaration of Rights with relevant United Nations instruments, he said that that would depend on the outcome of the usual consultations among the members and on further instructions from his Government; in his view, it would be more meaningful for such an examination, if carried out, to include a comparison with the provisions for the protection of human rights embodied in the legal systems of Member

States—a comparison with what actually existed elsewhere and not just with an ideal situation.

The spokesman for China said that the essence of the question of Southern Rhodesia was the Zimbabwe people's struggle against foreign colonialist rule and for national independence. The colonialist authorities of Southern Rhodesia, with the connivance and support of imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, had become unbridled in enforcing their fascist rule of the South African type over the people of Zimbabwe and had intensified their suppression of the struggle of the Zimbabwe people for national independence.

These colonialist authorities, he went on, had stepped up their military, economic and political collusion with the South African and Portuguese colonialists in carrying out threats and plotting various schemes of subversion and aggression against African countries, thus posing a grave menace to the independent African States and peoples. The so-called proposal for a settlement of the question of Southern Rhodesia which the British Government had contrived with the Smith régime behind the backs of the African people was, in fact, "a big fraud."

The Chinese representative maintained that as a result of the prolonged, brutal rule and plunder by foreign colonialists, the Zimbabwe people were poor and backward economically. The experience of the African and Asian countries proved, he said, that without political independence it was impossible to achieve economic independence. As long as colonialist rule and plunder existed, development of the national economy was impossible. How many people in Zimbabwe could possibly meet the economic and educational qualifications as stipulated in the proposals, he asked.

The proposals were aimed at legalizing fascist and racist rule over the Zimbabwe people, he added, and at enabling the colonialists and neo-colonialists openly to cancel the sanctions against the colonialist authorities of Southern Rhodesia. The Chinese Government and people totally rejected this fraud devised by the British Government and the colonialist authorities of Southern Rhodesia, and firmly supported the Zimbabwe people and other African countries and peoples in their just struggle against colonialist rule in Southern Rhodesia and for national independence.

Sierra Leone deplored the fact that the proposed constitutional arrangements were based on the illegal 1969 Constitution. It was apprehensive about the sincerity of the rebel régime's intentions to implement the terms of the proposals—in particular, the promised educational advancement of the Africans, changes in the Land Tenure Act, the ending of racial discrimination, and guaran-

tees against retrogressive amendment of the Constitution. Sierra Leone also regretted that the proposals had been negotiated without the active participation of the African leaders of Zimbabwe.

Argentina noted that the responsibility of the United Kingdom for Southern Rhodesia had repeatedly been emphasized by the General Assembly and the Security Council and believed that the burden of that responsibility had motivated the United Kingdom to seek a negotiated solution to the difficult and reprehensible situation created by the Ian Smith régime. It was clear that the United Kingdom had taken a decision not to impose an agreement on the population of Southern Rhodesia. However, Argentina had fundamental objections about the system of voting and representation and about the long and indefinite period required to fulfil the terms of the agreement.

Nicaragua expressed the hope that the United Kingdom would continue its efforts to contribute to a solution consistent with the principles of the Charter and with the will of the people of Southern Rhodesia.

The Japanese representative said his Government recognized the primary responsibility and obligation of the United Kingdom to restore constitutional government in Southern Rhodesia and to ensure that the African majority enjoyed all political and economic rights. Japan, he said, had consistently supported the principle of majority rule in Southern Rhodesia on the basis of universal suffrage, though it did not subscribe to the view that the United Kingdom should use force to bring down the Smith régime and establish majority rule.

In Japan's view, he continued, the proposals did not seem to guarantee majority rule in the near future, and assumed the good faith of the current régime or a similar successor régime as the only guarantee for implementation. The proposals, if implemented in full, might help to improve the status of the African people and help to halt the deteriorating trend. But it was vitally important that the test of acceptability was conducted justly and fairly and the genuine will of the African population ascertained. Japan therefore strongly supported the suggestion that United Nations observers participate in carrying out the test of acceptability.

The spokesman for Poland said the question of Southern Rhodesia involved fundamental principles and decisions of the United Nations, but the administering power had consistently and deliberately pursued a course contrary to them and to the interests of the Zimbabwe people. First, there was the principle of the right to self-determination and independence contained in the Charter, developed by the General Assembly and reaffirmed by

the Security Council; but the proposals elaborated by the United Kingdom and the Smith régime had already been rejected as a violation of that right of the Zimbabwe people by the Assembly, by the representatives of the African States in the Council and by the African leaders of Zimbabwe themselves. Instead of conducting talks with representatives of 5 million people, the United Kingdom had consulted only with the rebel régime, openly aiming at the recognition of its independent status.

The Polish representative went on to say that the United Nations sanctions had not been effective because of large-scale and wilful violations—the violators being protected in the Security Council by some of its permanent members. The erosion of sanctions was now being adduced as justification for the possible lifting of those sanctions.

Finally, he emphasized that the United Kingdom bore the primary responsibility for enabling the people of Southern Rhodesia to achieve self-determination and independence; the proposals for a settlement certainly did not provide for that. The United Nations and the Security Council could not become a party to an act of colonial and racist entrenchment, to a "deal" that was dooming an African people to many years of racist enslavement.

Italy's representative observed that the process of decolonization had halted at the borders of Southern Rhodesia, where a handful of settlers—defying the metropolitan power—had established their domination over millions of Africans. Italy, he said, had unconditionally supported the Security Council's measures to bring the Salisbury régime to an end, but even though the sanctions had had some results, they had not, unfortunately, brought the régime to its knees. Indeed, the sanctions were perhaps slowing down progress towards nationhood and self-determination for the territory when they cut off the people mainly concerned from all contacts with the outside world.

The Italian representative felt that the proposals, whatever their shortcomings, had been submitted to try to overcome the present deadlock and create conditions that might help improve the situation of the Africans and lead them towards self-determination. However unsatisfactory it might seem, the test of acceptability was the first concrete approach to the real problems involved. The test must be performed under fair and democratic conditions, and Italy felt, further, that the United Kingdom should try to associate the United Nations more closely with the conduct of the test.

The French representative said that the new proposals, whatever their inadequacies, had the merit of ending the status quo and offering the people of Southern Rhodesia the possibility of

setting in motion a machinery that could and must transform their institutions. France did not want to prejudice the test of acceptability but to await its results.

Uganda's spokesman said he found the proposals for a settlement to be unworkable, meaningless, inadequate as to guarantees and otherwise prejudicial to the interests of the majority of the people of Southern Rhodesia. The only test of acceptability in the colonial history of the United Kingdom had been by universal franchise, through an electoral process tested for almost 350 years; he did not understand why Southern Rhodesia should be exempted from that process.

He went on to say that the same régime that had violated the Constitution and passed discriminatory laws was to sit in judgement on the application of the Declaration of Rights; there was no assurance that those provisions would be faithfully implemented. Moreover, he said, Uganda could not understand why the United Kingdom declined to use force against Southern Rhodesia, after having done so in several of its former colonies. He urged the United Kingdom to listen to members of its own Parliament, to public opinion and to the Security Council, and accept modifications to the proposals that would not allow the legitimization of a rebellion.

Nigeria's representative said that the proposals for an agreement were tantamount to an endorsement by the United Kingdom Government of the perpetual subjugation of the black people of Southern Rhodesia by the white minority.

The United Nations, he said, should not be an accomplice to this attempt at abandoning the Zimbabwe people to bondage. If the United Kingdom would not use force to meet a situation which was currently out of hand, at least it should not put obstacles in the way of the Zimbabwe people by aiding and abetting the illegal régime of Ian Smith.

India said that over the years discussion in the Council had been characterized by a number of fictions: first, that the United Kingdom was responsible for the administration, defence and external relations of Southern Rhodesia but had neither the administrative machinery nor the power to enforce any decision on Southern Rhodesia or its rebel régime; second, that no British Government could be expected to use force against its kith and kin; and, third, that sanctions could bring down the Smith régime without being extended to South Africa, South West Africa [Namibia] and the Portuguese colonies. It would be of great advantage for a British Government to have the United Nations underwrite its decisions, but those decisions seemed to have been taken without regard for what the Security Council and the United Nations might or might not have

recommended or decided about the territory.

In India's view, the Pearce commission would have an impossible task in ascertaining the genuine wishes of the people of Southern Rhodesia under a state of emergency: the police State intact, recognized political leaders detained, the major political parties banned, and all channels of communication—radio and television included—available only to the parties in Parliament. India felt that for the United Nations to be associated with such an exercise would give respectability to the suppression and oppression of the black people of Southern Rhodesia and was therefore not appropriate. Sanctions should be strengthened and compulsorily applied; this would neither bring down the Smith régime nor introduce majority rule, but it would prove that international opinion would in no way be a party to giving respectability or recognition to that régime.

The representative of Algeria, who said he was speaking as one of three African countries carrying a mandate from the Organization of African Unity to follow the Security Council's debates on Southern Rhodesia, urged the Council to reject the proposals for an agreement as not complying with the principles laid down by the Council for a solution of the problem of Southern Rhodesia.

The spokesman for Belgium said that scrupulous implementation of sanctions had resulted for Belgium in the loss of important traditional markets. Belgium appreciated the initiative taken by the United Kingdom, which would introduce a thaw in the political situation in the territory. The state of stagnation and paralysis there was becoming more and more dangerous, since it led towards the creation of a new citadel of racism and intolerance. It was for the Security Council to take note of the United Kingdom's programme of action; it would be dangerous for the Council to arrogate to itself the right to dictate or impose a political settlement behind the back of the administering power. It should follow closely the implementation of the test of acceptability and the results and possible recommendations of the Pearce commission.

The representative of the United Kingdom said that some Council members sought an ideal solution of the problem; his Government had to take account of the harsh realities of the situation and the limitations on its effective power. He suggested six propositions by which the Council should be guided: first, that the position of the Africans in Southern Rhodesia was not yet as bleak as in South Africa but it had deteriorated in the past six years and might well lead to the degradation and misery of apartheid; second, that barring military intervention, the United King-

dom—even with the support of the United Nations—could not physically impose its will; third, that an agreed settlement was therefore the only way to avert the danger; fourth, that some details of the agreed proposals might be open to criticism and were not ideal; fifth, the proposals, however, if accepted, would bring about a change of direction and could lead towards majority rule in a multiracial society and a prosperous and expanding economy; and, sixth, the final word on the proposals must rest with the Rhodesians themselves—their views would be ascertained in an open, impartial and painstaking process of consultation.

On 30 December, the representative of Somalia formally introduced the text of a draft resolution which he had previously circulated as a working paper. The draft was sponsored also by Burundi, Sierra Leone and the Syrian Arab Republic.

By the preambular parts of this draft text, the Security Council—having considered the proposals for a settlement—would among other things note that the proposals, agreed upon by the United Kingdom and the rebel régime in Southern Rhodesia on the political and constitutional future of the territory, had not been negotiated in consultation with the accredited political leaders of the majority of the people of Southern Rhodesia.

The Council would then take note of the General Assembly's resolution of 20 December 1971 (2877(XXVI); for text, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below) and reaffirm its own resolution of 17 November 1970<sup>20</sup> by which the Council called upon the United Kingdom, as administering power in the discharge of its responsibility, to take urgent and effective measures to bring to an end the illegal rebellion in Southern Rhodesia and enable the people to exercise their right to self-determination, in accordance with the Charter and in conformity with the objectives of the Assembly's resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960.<sup>21</sup>

Mindful of the conditions necessary to permit the free expression of the right to self-determination, the Council would then recall its resolution of 6 May 1965<sup>22</sup> by which it endorsed the General Assembly's request to the United Kingdom to obtain: (a) the release of all political prisoners, detainees and restrictees; (b) the repeal of all repressive and discriminatory legislation, and in particular the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act and the Land Apportionment Act; and (c) the removal of all restrictions on political activity and the establishment of full democratic freedom and equality of political rights.

By the final preambular part of the draft text, the Council would recognize, without prejudice to the primary role of the administering power, the special responsibilities of the United Nations

towards the people of Southern Rhodesia in securing their inalienable rights.

By the operative parts of the draft resolution, the Security Council would:

(1) decide that the terms of these proposals did not fulfil the conditions necessary to ensure that all the people of Southern Rhodesia would be able to exercise freely and equally their right to self-determination;

(2) reject the "proposals for a settlement," as they did not guarantee the inalienable rights of the majority of the people of Southern Rhodesia;

(3) consider that the principle of universal adult suffrage for the people of Southern Rhodesia, without regard to colour or race, must be the basis for any constitutional and political arrangements for the territory;

(4) urge the United Kingdom, pursuant to paragraph (3) above, not to accord any form of recognition to an independent State of Southern Rhodesia which was not based on majority rule or on the will of the majority as determined by universal adult suffrage;

(5) call on the United Kingdom to ensure that in any exercise to ascertain the wishes of the people of Southern Rhodesia as to their political future, the procedure to be followed would be by secret referendum on the basis of one man, one vote, without regard to race or colour or to educational, property or income considerations;

(6) further call on the United Kingdom, after having ensured the establishment of conditions under which all the people of Southern Rhodesia would be able to exercise freely and equally their right to self-determination on the basis of paragraphs (3) and (5) above, to facilitate the participation of a United Nations team of observers during the preparation for, and in the actual conduct of, any exercise to ascertain the wishes of the people of Southern Rhodesia as to their political future;

(7) decide to continue with the imposition of political, diplomatic and economic sanctions on Southern Rhodesia until the rebellious régime in that territory was brought to an end; and

(8) request the United Kingdom Government not to transfer under any circumstances to its colony of Southern Rhodesia, as at present governed, any of the powers or attributes of sovereignty, but to promote the country's attainment of independence by a democratic system of government in accordance with the aspirations of the majority of the population.

When voting took place, on the same day, Somalia asked for separate votes on certain paragraphs.

The second preambular paragraph—by which

<sup>20</sup> See Y.U.N., 1970, pp. 183-84, text of resolution 288(1970).

<sup>21</sup> See footnote 14.

<sup>22</sup> See Y.U.N., 1965, pp. 128-29, text of resolution 202(1965).

the Council would note that the proposals for a settlement had not been negotiated in consultation with the accredited political leaders of the majority of the people of Southern Rhodesia—was adopted by 10 votes to 0, with 5 abstentions (Belgium, France, Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States).

The preambular paragraph by which the Council would state it was mindful of the conditions necessary to permit the free expression of the right to self-determination was adopted by 14 votes to 0, with 1 abstention (the United Kingdom).

The third operative paragraph—dealing with the principle of universal adult suffrage as the only basis for any constitutional and political arrangements for the territory—was adopted by 14 votes to 0, with 1 abstention (the United Kingdom).

The fourth operative paragraph—by which the Council would urge the United Kingdom not to accord recognition which was not based on majority rule or the will of the majority as determined by universal adult suffrage—was adopted by 10 votes to 0, with 5 abstentions (Belgium, France, Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States).

The fifth operative paragraph—by which the Council would call on the United Kingdom to ensure that the procedure to be followed in ascertaining the wishes of the people of the territory would be by secret referendum on the basis of one man, one vote, without regard to considerations of race, colour, education, property or income—was adopted by 10 votes to 0, with 5 abstentions (Belgium, France, Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States).

The draft resolution as a whole received 9 votes in favour to 1 against (the United Kingdom), with 5 abstentions (Belgium, France, Italy, Japan and the United States), and was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Security Council.

#### **Communications (December 1971)**

By a letter of 6 December 1971 to the Secretary-General, the representative of the USSR transmitted the text of a statement of the Telegraphic Agency of the Soviet Union (TASS), dated 3 December, concerning the United Kingdom announcement that an agreement had been reached between London and Salisbury on "settling the constitutional conflict." This action, the statement said, was a direct infringement of the Zimbabwe people's inalienable rights and an open challenge to the African peoples and world public opinion.

By a letter of 29 December 1971 to the Secretary-General, the Nigerian representative transmitted the text of a statement made on 23

December by the Nigerian Commissioner for External Affairs rejecting the agreed proposals for a settlement in Southern Rhodesia and, among other things, urging: (a) effective United Nations intervention in Zimbabwe; (b) the immediate introduction of a constitution providing for majority rule under the supervision of a United Nations commission; (c) arrangement for massive international aid for economic reconstruction and educational development of Zimbabwe's African population; and (d) a United Nations guarantee of the territorial integrity of the new independent Zimbabwe.

#### **Consideration by General Assembly**

At its twenty-sixth session, which opened on 21 September 1971, the General Assembly referred the question of Southern Rhodesia to its Fourth Committee, which decided to consider the item together with the questions of Namibia and the territories under Portuguese administration. It decided to hold a general debate covering all three items, it being understood that individual draft resolutions on the items would be considered separately after the conclusion of the general debate and the hearing of petitioners. On this basis, the Fourth Committee considered the question of Southern Rhodesia at meetings held between 11 October and 16 December 1971. The General Assembly eventually adopted four resolutions on the question.

During its meetings, the Fourth Committee heard statements by Romesh Chandra, Lucio Luzzatto, Emilson Randriamihasinoro and Nicolai Voshinin of the World Peace Council; I. B. Tabata, President of the Unity Movement of South Africa; and the Reverend Michael Scott, International League for the Rights of Man.

In the course of the general debate on the question of colonial territories in southern Africa, Members agreed that the situation in Southern Rhodesia was deteriorating and that the illegal régime was persisting in its oppression of the people of Zimbabwe. The majority of speakers expressed the belief that the situation in Southern Rhodesia remained unsolved principally because of the failure of the United Kingdom, which as the administering power had the primary responsibility for bringing the rebellion to an end, to take effective action to bring down the illegal régime. This lack of action on the part of the United Kingdom was giving the illegal régime time to entrench itself and to increase its oppression of the African people.

Also stressed by many speakers was the failure of the sanctions policy imposed by the United Nations to bring down the illegal régime. This was felt to be a result of the open breach of sanctions by South Africa and Portugal, as well as the failure

of other States, in particular the Western powers, to comply strictly with the provisions of Security Council resolutions governing sanctions. Therefore, it was said, although the sanctions policy was now in its sixth year, Southern Rhodesian trade continued to increase.

Trinidad and Tobago pointed out that, by maintaining normal trading relations with Southern Rhodesia, South Africa and Portugal had made it possible for the illegal regime to continue to export minerals and tobacco, either by buying the goods themselves and re-exporting them or by providing misleading certificates of origin. This "unholy alliance" between the three white régimes of southern Africa was being further consolidated by extensive military and police co-operation. Collaboration was reported between South African police forces and the security police of Southern Rhodesia against African freedom fighters. It was clear that this military bloc, which was being established to ensure the survival of white minority rule, could not have been created without the support of certain Western business interests and international finance corporations.

The representative of the Byelorussian SSR said that the sanctions were being ignored by Western powers, including the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, the United Kingdom and the United States, which were carrying on trade with Southern Rhodesia through South Africa and Portugal.

The USSR—among others—felt that the support given by the Western powers to the illegal régime, as well as to Portugal and South Africa, was dictated by economic interests which had enormous investments in southern Africa and derived fabulous profits from the exploitation of its natural and human resources. The only way of rendering sanctions fully effective would be by extending them to South Africa and Portugal, to bring about their total political and economic isolation and to cut off all sources of assistance and supplies of weapons. Unfortunately, the United Kingdom and the United States—which had economic interests in southern Africa—had vetoed such proposals in the Security Council.

Sweden said that no matter how frustrating the results of sanctions had been so far, they had kept the illegal régime in political isolation and should not only be continued but strengthened. The means enumerated in Article 41 of the United Nations Charter<sup>23</sup> had not been exhausted and the sanctions could be widened to comprise further measures provided for in that Article.

Support for strengthening the sanctions policy and its scrupulous application was also expressed by Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Ghana, Jamaica, Mauritania, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Sudan and Turkey.

Iran said that sanctions could not be regarded as

a substitute for the administering power's responsibility to introduce constitutional government in Southern Rhodesia on the basis of majority rule.

In Ghana's view, sanctions would be effective only if they were comprehensive, mandatory, properly supervised and extended to cover South Africa and Portugal. Since such sanctions were not being instituted, it would seem that the use of force or the threat of force should be reconsidered. Support for the use of force was also expressed by Egypt, Nepal, Pakistan, Sudan and Uganda, among others.

Brazil and Japan considered that the immediate problem of the United Nations was to find a solution to the problem of Southern Rhodesia without the use of force.

The representatives of Cameroon, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Mongolia, Morocco, Pakistan, Sierra Leone and Yugoslavia, among others, expressed the fear that, in view of the illegal régime's outspoken opposition to majority rule, any settlement arrived at between the illegal régime and the administering power would continue to deny the Africans of Southern Rhodesia their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

India stressed that any negotiations undertaken by the administering power should be with the true representatives of the people of Zimbabwe and not with the illegal régime, which had shown no intention of instituting majority rule in Southern Rhodesia.

Jamaica, Nepal, Sierra Leone and Uganda, among others, said they could not accept independence for Southern Rhodesia under the present régime, and would condemn any settlement which granted independence before majority rule was established.

Ecuador and others said that any talks between the United Kingdom and the illegal régime were in violation of General Assembly resolutions on Southern Rhodesia which called for a severance of all relationships with that régime. India, Indonesia, Iran and Morocco held that negotiations between the United Kingdom and the illegal régime on any basis other than the principle of majority rule prior to independence gave the impression of tacit recognition of that régime and should be rejected.

Chile, Iceland, India, Mali, Nigeria, and the Syrian Arab Republic stressed the need for all Member States to give material and moral assistance to the national liberation movements of Zimbabwe to enable the African people themselves to achieve their legitimate rights.

On 10 November, the United Kingdom representative drew attention to a statement by the

<sup>23</sup> For text of Article 41 of the Charter, see APPENDIX II

United Kingdom Foreign Secretary on 9 November in which he announced his intention to hold talks in Southern Rhodesia. In that statement, he had said that any basis for settlement would have to be consistent with the five principles to which the United Kingdom adhered (see p. 94) and that, if agreement was reached, the United Kingdom Government would have to satisfy itself that the terms were fully understood by the Southern Rhodesian people as a whole and acceptable to them. The United Kingdom Government was firmly convinced that a settlement based on the five principles would offer the means of enabling Southern Rhodesia to embark peacefully on a new phase of its development which would be in the best interests of all the people of Southern Rhodesia.

The United Republic of Tanzania, supported by Egypt, Somalia, Sudan and Zambia, rejected the five principles as being a formula that would satisfy the interests of the white minority and betray the Zimbabwe people. The real intention of the United Kingdom Government, he said, was to make peace with the rebels by disregarding the rights of the Zimbabwe people and thereby to save face on the international scene. He made a final appeal to the administering power to give up negotiating with the illegal régime and to recognize the right of the African majority to self-determination.

Following the general debate, a draft resolution was put forward in the Fourth Committee, eventually sponsored by the following 23 Member States: Burundi, Cameroon, the Congo, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Liberia, Mali, Mongolia, Nigeria, Pakistan, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the Philippines, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

On 11 November, the draft resolution, as revised by the sponsors, was approved by the Fourth Committee by a roll-call vote of 93 to 2, with 12 abstentions. On 16 November, the General Assembly adopted the text—as amended by Ghana on behalf of the sponsors—by a roll-call vote of 106 to 2, with 13 abstentions, as resolution 2765(XXVI).

By the preambular paragraphs to this text, the Assembly—after recalling previous resolutions adopted on the question of Southern Rhodesia—expressed its grave concern at the recent decision of the United States Congress which, if confirmed, would permit the importation of chrome into the United States from Southern Rhodesia and thus constitute a serious violation of the Security Council resolutions imposing sanctions against the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia.

By the operative part of this text, the Assembly:

(1) called upon the United States Government to take the necessary measures—in compliance with Security Council resolutions concerning sanctions and bearing in mind its obligations under Article 25 of the Charter<sup>24</sup>—to prevent the importation of chrome into the United States from Southern Rhodesia;

(2) asked the United States to inform the Assembly at its current session of the action taken or envisaged in implementing the present resolution;

(3) asked the President of the Assembly to draw the attention of the United States Government to the urgent need for implementing the resolution;

(4) reminded all Member States of their obligations under the Charter to comply fully with the Security Council's decisions on mandatory sanctions against the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia; and

(5) decided to keep this and other aspects of the question under continuous review.

(For text of resolution 2765(XXVI), see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

Prior to the vote on the 23-power draft resolution in the Fourth Committee, the representative of the United States categorically rejected the allegation that his Government had been guilty of sanction-breaking. Except for one instance—which had occurred before the imposition of sanctions—the United States had not imported any chrome from Southern Rhodesia since 1965. However, the latest report of the Security Council's Committee on sanctions indicated that Southern Rhodesia was exporting more chrome than in 1965, which meant that other countries whose names were not mentioned in the draft resolution must certainly have violated sanctions. His Government would continue to adhere to the sanctions and report to the Committee on sanctions in due course on legislation adopted by the United States and its possible effect on the sanctions programme. Since Congress had not completed its examination of the bill referred to in the draft resolution, the United States would not take part in the vote.

The spokesmen for Austria, Belgium, Brazil, France, Greece and the United Kingdom said that adoption of the draft resolution would be an encroachment on the responsibilities and competence of the Security Council and its Committee on sanctions, which were the proper bodies to consider alleged violations of sanctions. They would therefore abstain from voting. The representative of Italy said the draft resolution amounted to interference in the law-making processes of a Member State and was thus contrary

<sup>24</sup> For text of Article 25 of the Charter, see APPENDIX II.

to the Charter. The Netherlands representative said it was not the Fourth Committee's place to exert pressure on the United States Government, which thus far had always supported the sanctions programme.

A second resolution on the question of Southern Rhodesia was approved by the Fourth Committee on 19 November by a roll-call vote of 99 to 3, with 10 abstentions. It was sponsored by the following 31 Member States: Algeria, Barbados, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, the Congo, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zaire and Zambia.

The General Assembly adopted the text on 22 November by a roll-call vote of 102 to 3, with 9 abstentions, as resolution 2769(XXVI).

By the preambular part of this resolution, the General Assembly among other things noted the statement made in the House of Commons on 9 November 1971 by the United Kingdom Foreign Secretary announcing his Government's decision to hold the talks that were currently under way in Salisbury with the illegal racist minority régime.

By the operative paragraphs, the General Assembly: (1) reaffirmed the principle that there should be no independence before majority rule in Southern Rhodesia; (2) affirmed that any settlement relating to the future of that territory must be worked out with the fullest participation of all nationalist leaders representing the majority of the people of Zimbabwe and must be endorsed freely by the people; and (3) decided to keep the situation in the territory under review.

(For text of resolution 2769(XXVI), see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

On 24 November, a third draft resolution was approved by the Fourth Committee by a roll-call vote of 89 to 10, with 13 abstentions. It was sponsored by the following 34 Member States: Afghanistan, Algeria, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, the Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, the Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya, the Khmer Republic, the Libyan Arab Republic, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Somalia, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zaire and Zambia.

The General Assembly adopted the text on 10 December by a recorded vote of 91 to 9, with 12 abstentions, as resolution 2796(XXVI).

By the preambular part of this text, the General Assembly among other things expressed its grave concern at the further deterioration of the situation in Southern Rhodesia—which the Security

Council had reaffirmed as constituting a threat to international peace and security—resulting from the failure and refusal of the United Kingdom to put an end to the illegal racist minority régime, and from the racist and repressive policies pursued by that régime in violation of the relevant United Nations resolutions.

It also expressed deep concern about the continued presence of South African forces in the territory, which constituted a threat to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of neighbouring African States, and deplored the continued collaboration of certain States—in particular South Africa and Portugal—with the illegal régime, thereby seriously obstructing the efforts of the international community to put an end to that régime.

It also noted that the United Kingdom, as the administering power, had the primary responsibility for putting an end to the rebellion of the British settlers who organized the illegal régime and for transferring effective power to the people of Zimbabwe on the basis of the principle of majority rule.

It further deplored the intransigent attitude of the United Kingdom, which persisted in refusing to co-operate with the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in the discharge of the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly, and noted with deep regret the decision of the International Olympic Committee to permit the so-called National Olympic Committee of Rhodesia to participate in the XXth Olympic Games.

By the operative paragraphs of the resolution, the General Assembly:

(1) reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of Zimbabwe to self-determination, freedom and independence and the legitimacy of their struggle to secure by all the means at their disposal the enjoyment of that right as set forth in the Charter and in conformity with the General Assembly's resolution of 14 December 1960;<sup>25</sup>

(2) strongly deplored the continued refusal of the United Kingdom to take effective measures to bring down the illegal racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia and to transfer power without any delay to the people of Zimbabwe on the basis of majority rule, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, and called upon that Government to take such measures without further delay;

(3) condemned the continued intervention and presence of South African armed forces in

<sup>25</sup> See Y.U.N., 1960, pp. 49-50, text of resolution 1514(XV).

Southern Rhodesia in violation of Security Council resolutions, and called upon the administering power to ensure the immediate expulsion of all such forces;

(4) condemned the policies of those Governments—particularly South Africa and Portugal—which continued to maintain political, economic, military and other relations with the illegal régime, in contravention of the relevant United Nations resolutions and contrary to their obligations under the Charter, and called upon those Governments to cease forthwith all such relations;

(5) reaffirmed its conviction that the sanctions would not put an end to the illegal régime unless they were comprehensive, mandatory, effectively supervised, enforced and complied with by all States, particularly by South Africa and Portugal;

(6) strongly urged all States to take more stringent measures to prevent any circumvention by individuals and corporate bodies of the sanctions prescribed by the Security Council, and to refrain from any action which might confer a semblance of legitimacy on the illegal régime;

(7) strongly deplored the imprisonment and detention of Zimbabwe freedom fighters by the illegal régime, and called upon the administering power to effect their immediate and unconditional release;

(8) called upon all States to take all appropriate steps to ensure the exclusion of the so-called National Olympic Committee of Rhodesia from participating in the XXth Olympic Games;

(9) called upon all States, the specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system—in consultation with the Organization of African Unity—to extend all moral and material assistance to the people of Zimbabwe;

(10) called upon the United Kingdom—in view of the armed conflict in the territory and the inhuman treatment of prisoners—to ensure the application to that situation of the 1949 Geneva Conventions relative to the treatment of prisoners of war and to the protection of civilian persons in time of war;

(11) called upon the United Kingdom to report on the implementation of the present resolution to the Special Committee and to the twenty-seventh (1972) session of the General Assembly;

(12) drew the attention of the Security Council—in view of the gravity of the situation arising from the further intensification of repressive activities against the Zimbabwe people—to the urgent necessity of taking further steps to ensure the full and strict compliance by all States with the Council's decisions, in accordance with Article 25 of the Charter, and to the need to widen the scope of the sanctions against the illegal racist minority

régime and to impose sanctions against South Africa and Portugal, whose Governments persisted in their refusal to carry out the mandatory decisions of the Council;

(13) asked the Secretary-General to report to the Assembly in 1972 on the implementation of the present resolution; and

(14) asked the Special Committee to keep the situation in the territory under review.

(For text of resolution 2796(XXVI), see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

On 16 December, the Fourth Committee approved—by a roll-call vote of 78 to 8, with 21 abstentions—a fourth draft resolution on the question of Southern Rhodesia, sponsored by the following 34 Member States: Afghanistan, Algeria, Barbados, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, the Congo, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, the Gambia, Guinea, Guyana, Jamaica, Kenya, the Libyan Arab Republic, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nigeria, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zaire and Zambia.

On 20 December, the General Assembly, by a roll-call vote of 94 to 8, with 22 abstentions, adopted the text as resolution 2877(XXVI).

By the preambular part of this text, the Assembly among other things expressed its grave concern at the "proposals for a settlement" which, if implemented, would entrench the rule of the racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia and perpetuate the enslavement of the African people of Zimbabwe. After observing that the proposals had been agreed upon without the participation of the representatives of the African people of Zimbabwe, the Assembly, by the operative paragraphs of the text:

(1) rejected the "proposals for a settlement" agreed upon by the United Kingdom and the racist minority régime in Salisbury as constituting a flagrant violation of the inalienable right of the African people of Zimbabwe to self-determination and independence;

(2) reaffirmed that no settlement which did not conform strictly to the principle of "no independence before majority rule" on the basis of one man, one vote, would be acceptable;

(3) invited the Security Council, when examining the question of Southern Rhodesia, to consider taking appropriate measures—in accordance with relevant Charter provisions—to enable the Zimbabwe people to exercise freely and without further delay their inalienable right to self-determination and independence;

(4) welcomed the Security Council's decision of 2 December 1971 to invite Messrs. Nkomo and Sithole, the leaders of ZAPU and ZANU, to appear

before the Council to express their views about the future status of the territory, and called on the United Kingdom, as the administering power, to comply with that decision; and

(5) called upon all States to adhere strictly to the relevant provisions of resolutions of the Assembly and the Security Council on the question of Southern Rhodesia, and in particular to observe the Council's resolutions imposing sanctions against the racist minority régime.

(For text of resolution 2877(XXVI), see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

#### Other General Assembly decisions

At its twenty-sixth session, the General Assembly took a number of other decisions bearing upon general and specific aspects of the situation in Southern Rhodesia. These are described briefly below.

#### DECLARATION ON GRANTING INDEPENDENCE

On 20 December, the General Assembly adopted two resolutions on the implementation of the 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

By one of these (2878(XXVI)), the Assembly among other things reaffirmed that the continuation of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations—including racism, apartheid and activities of foreign economic and other interests, as well as the waging of colonial wars to suppress national liberation movements in southern Africa—was incompatible with the Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the granting of independence and posed a threat to international peace and security.

The Assembly also reaffirmed its recognition of the legitimacy of the struggle of colonial peoples to exercise their right to self-determination and independence by all the necessary means at their disposal, and noted with satisfaction the progress made by national liberation movements, both through their struggle and through reconstruction programmes.

All States and the specialized agencies and other organizations were urged by the Assembly to provide moral and material assistance to all peoples struggling for their freedom and independence in the colonial territories. States were asked to withhold assistance of any kind from Portugal, from South Africa and from the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia until they renounced their policy of colonial domination and racial discrimination; the colonial powers were asked to withdraw their military bases and installations immediately from colonial territories.

The Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial

Countries and Peoples was asked by the Assembly to make concrete suggestions which might assist the Security Council in considering appropriate measures regarding developments in colonial territories likely to threaten international peace and security, and to undertake a special study on the compliance of Member States with the Declaration and other relevant resolutions on decolonization, particularly those relating to the territories under Portuguese domination, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia. (See also pp. 518-20.)

By another resolution (2874(XXVI)), on implementation of the Declaration on granting independence by the specialized agencies and international institutions associated with the United Nations, the General Assembly among other things reaffirmed that recognition by United Nations bodies of the legitimacy of the struggle of colonial peoples to achieve freedom and independence entailed the extension of all necessary moral and material assistance to national liberation movements, and reiterated its appeal to the specialized agencies and other United Nations organizations to render all such assistance possible to the peoples in Africa struggling for their liberation from colonial rule and to work out—with the co-operation of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and, through it, of the national liberation movements—concrete programmes for assisting the peoples of Southern Rhodesia, Namibia and the territories under Portuguese administration.

The Assembly also asked the specialized agencies and other organizations to discontinue all collaboration with Portugal and South Africa, as well as with the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia, and invited those organizations to continue to examine, in consultation with OAU, the participation of representatives of the national liberation movements in conferences, seminars and other regional meetings. (See also pp. 526-27.)

#### IMPORTANCE OF THE RIGHT TO SELF-DETERMINATION

On 6 December, the General Assembly adopted a resolution (2787(XXVI)) on the importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination, which had been recommended by the Commission on Human Rights and the Economic and Social Council.

By this text, the Assembly among other things: confirmed the legality of the peoples' struggle for self-determination and liberation from colonial and foreign domination and alien subjugation, notably in southern Africa, and in particular that of the peoples of Zimbabwe and other territories; called upon all States to give political, moral and material assistance to peoples struggling for liberation, self-determination and independence;

and condemned the colonial and usurping powers that were suppressing the right of peoples to self-determination and hampering the liquidation of the last hotbeds of colonialism and racism. The Assembly also resolved to devote constant attention to the question of flagrant large-scale violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms resulting from the denial to peoples under colonial and foreign domination of their right to self-determination. (See also pp. 420-22.)

#### FOREIGN ECONOMIC INTERESTS

On 20 December, the General Assembly adopted a resolution (2873(XXVI)) on the activities of foreign economic and other interests impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Southern Rhodesia, Namibia and territories under Portuguese domination and in all other territories under colonial domination, and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa.

By this, the Assembly among other things reaffirmed the inalienable right of the peoples of dependent territories to self-determination and independence and to the enjoyment of the natural resources of their territories, as well as their right to dispose of those resources in their best interests, and affirmed that foreign economic, financial and other interests operating in the colonial territories of Southern Rhodesia, Namibia and those under Portuguese domination constituted a major obstacle to political independence and to the enjoyment of the natural resources of those territories by the indigenous inhabitants.

Further, the Assembly reiterated its declaration that any administering power, by depriving colonial peoples of the exercise of their rights or by subordinating them to foreign economic and financial interests, violated the obligations it had assumed under the United Nations Charter. It also condemned the current activities and operating methods of those foreign economic and other interests which were designed to perpetuate the subjugation of dependent peoples, and deplored the support given by colonial powers and other States to those foreign economic and other interests engaged in exploiting the natural and human resources of the territories without regard to the welfare of the indigenous peoples, thus violating their political, economic and social rights.

The Assembly also called upon administering powers to abolish every discriminatory and unjust wage system which prevailed in the territories under their administration and to apply a uniform system of wages to all inhabitants. It called upon the colonial powers and States concerned whose companies and nationals were engaged in enterprises detrimental to the interests of the inhabi-

tants of those territories to take measures to put an end to such enterprises and to prevent new investments which ran counter to the interests of the inhabitants. All States were asked to take effective measures to end the supply of funds and other forms of assistance, including military equipment, to those régimes which used such assistance to repress the national liberation movements. (See also pp. 532-34.)

#### ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

On 6 December, the General Assembly adopted a four-part resolution (2784(XXVI)) on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination.

By this text, the Assembly among other things called upon all trading partners of South Africa to abstain from encouraging South Africa and the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia to continue to violate the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and to use their influence to eradicate apartheid and racial discrimination in Namibia and Southern Rhodesia. The Assembly also called upon the United Kingdom, as the administering power, to adopt all necessary measures, including the use of force, to end the racist and illegal régime of Ian Smith.

Annexed to the resolution was a message from the President of the General Assembly to the heads of State or Government, which made the following points, among others:

(a) the racist Government of South Africa and the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia had blatantly continued to pursue policies of racial discrimination and apartheid;

(b) the racist Government of South Africa continued to effect an extensive arms build-up, threatening the independent African States opposed to its racist policies, as well as those peoples struggling against the racial and inhuman policies in southern Africa;

(c) racist policies in southern Africa had been permitted to expand through the continued existence and operation of the white racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia because of the deliberate ineffectiveness of measures so far taken by the United Kingdom;

(d) the racist Governments in southern Africa had been further strengthened through the maintenance by many States of political, commercial, military, economic, social and other relations with them, and through an unholy alliance between South Africa, Portugal and Southern Rhodesia established to suppress the struggle of the peoples of that region and to silence the cry of Africa against racism, apartheid, economic exploitation and colonial domination.

It was recommended in the message that the following measures be taken, among others, in

connexion with and as a continuation of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination: continuation of open moral support and the increasing of material aid to the peoples struggling against racial discrimination and apartheid; termination of all relations with the South African Government and all other racist régimes; and the repeal of all laws and regulations contributing to the maintenance and propagation of racial discrimination. (See also pp. 398-400.)

#### HUMAN RIGHTS IN ARMED CONFLICTS

In a resolution (2852(XXVI)) adopted on 20 December, on respect for human rights in armed conflicts, the General Assembly among other things reaffirmed that persons participating in resistance movements and freedom fighters in southern Africa and in territories under colonial and alien domination and foreign occupation struggling for their liberation and self-determination should, in case of arrest, be treated as prisoners of war in accordance with the principles of the Hague Convention of 1907 and the Geneva Conventions of 1949. The Assembly also drew attention to the need to evolve norms designed to increase the protection of persons struggling

against colonial and alien domination, foreign occupation and racist régimes. (See also pp. 424-26.)

#### Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa

Under the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa, established by the General Assembly in 1967, 454 applications from Southern Rhodesia were received during the period from 1 November 1970 to 8 October 1971. Fifty-six new awards were made and 55 were extended. There were 111 Southern Rhodesians studying abroad in 14 countries.

On 20 December 1971, the General Assembly adopted a resolution (2875(XXVI)) by which, among other things, it decided to appropriate \$100,000 from the United Nations regular budget for the financial year 1972 to ensure continuity of the Programme, pending receipt of adequate voluntary contributions.

(For additional information about the Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa, see pp. 123-25.)

### DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES

#### Communications and reports to Security Council (January-November 1971)

S/10229 and Add.1 and 2 and Corr.1. Fourth report, dated 16 June 1971, of Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253(1968) of 29 May 1968, and addenda dated 16 June and 13 July 1971.

S/10229 Add.2, Annex III. Table on trade in commodities annexed to 4th report.

S/10249 and Corr.1, S/10298, S/10312. Letters of 2 July, 25 August and 10 September 1971 from Chairman of Special Committee on Situation with regard to Implementation of Declaration on Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (transmitting text of resolutions adopted by Special Committee on 2 July, 24 August and 9 September 1971, respectively).

S/10355. Letter of 6 October 1971 from Acting Chairman of Special Committee on Situation with regard to Implementation of Declaration on Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (transmitting text of two consensuses adopted by Special Committee on 6 October 1971).

S/10385. Letter of 8 November 1971 from Upper Volta (transmitting statement adopted on 5 November 1971 by African group).

#### Consideration by Special Committee

Special Committee on Situation with regard to Implementation of Declaration on Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, meetings 782, 784-791, 793, 795, 796, 802-803, 806, 807, 813, 814, 817-820, 824, 825, 828.

A/8423/Rev.1, Vol. II. Report of Special Committee (covering its work during 1971), Chapter VI. (Section B: Decisions of Special Committee; Section D: Further decisions of Special Committee.)

A/8423/Rev.1, Vol. II, Chapter V. Meetings in Africa of Ad Hoc Group of Special Committee. (Section B: Decisions of Special Committee.)

#### Consideration by Security Council (November-December 1971)

Security Council, meetings 1601-1605, 1609, 1622, 1623.

S/10229 and Add.1.2. Fourth report, dated 16 June 1971, of Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253(1968) of 29 May 1968, and addenda dated 16 June and 13 July 1971.

S/10396. Letter of 24 November 1971 from United Kingdom (request to convene Council).

S/10398-S/10400, S/10404. Letters of 25, 29 and 30 November 1971 from Saudi Arabia, United Republic of Tanzania, Kenya and Zambia (requests to participate in Council's discussion).

S/10405. Letter of 1 December 1971 from United Kingdom (transmitting text of White Paper entitled: "Rhodesia: Proposals for a Settlement").

S/10407. Letter of 2 December 1971 from Ghana (request to participate in Council's discussion).

S/10408. Interim report dated 3 December 1971 of Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253(1968) of 29 May 1968.

S/10427 (A/8551). Letter of 6 December 1971 from USSR (transmitting TASS statement of 3 December 1971).

S/10470. Note of 23 December 1971 by President of Security Council.

S/10478. Letter of 29 December 1971 from Uganda (request to participate in Council's discussion).

S/10481 (A/8650). Letter of 29 December 1971 from Nigeria (transmitting statement of 23 December 1971 by Nigerian Commissioner for External Affairs).

S/10482-S/10484. Letters of 29 and 30 December 1971 from Nigeria, Algeria and India (requests to participate in Council's discussion).

S/10489. Burundi, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic: draft resolution, rejected by Council on 30 December 1971, meeting 1623, by vote of 9 in favour (Argentina, Burundi, China,

Nicaragua, Poland, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, USSR) to 1 against (United Kingdom), with 5 abstentions (Belgium, France, Italy, Japan, United States).

Consideration by General Assembly

General Assembly—26th session  
Fourth Committee, meetings 1923-1926, 1928-1949, 1951-1959.  
1963, 1965, 1970-1972.  
Plenary meetings 1984, 1991, 2012, 2028.

A/8401. Report of Secretary-General on work of the Organization, 16 June 1970-15 June 1971: Part One, Chapter IV G; Part Two, Chapter IB 1.

A/8401 Add.1. Introduction to report of Secretary-General, September 1971: Part One, Chapter V, para. 60; Part Two, Chapter VIII, para. 300.

A/8402. Report of Security Council, 16 June 1970-15 June 1971, Chapter 4.

A/8423/Rev.1, Vol. II. Report of Special Committee on Situation with regard to Implementation of Declaration on Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (covering its work during 1971), Chapters V and VI.

A/8551 (S/10427). Letter of 6 December 1971 from USSR (transmitting TASS statement of 3 December 1971).

A/8650 (S/10481). Letter of 29 December 1971 from Nigeria (transmitting statement of 23 December 1971 by Nigerian Commissioner for External Affairs).

A/C.4/736 and Add.1. Questions of Namibia, territories under Portuguese administration and Southern Rhodesia: requests for hearing.

A/C.4/741. Question of Southern Rhodesia: request for hearing.

A/C.4/L.988. Burundi, Cameroon, Congo, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Liberia, Mali, Mongolia, Nigeria, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Philippines, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, Zambia: draft resolution.

A/C.4/L.988/Rev.1. Revised draft resolution, sponsored by above 22 powers and Togo, approved by Fourth Committee on 11 November 1971, meeting 1948, by roll-call vote of 93 to 2, with 12 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Barbados, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Portugal, South Africa.

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Dominican Republic, France, Greece, Guatemala, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom.

A/C.4/L.989. Draft report of Fourth Committee (part I).

A/L.643. Ghana: amendment to draft resolution recommended by Fourth Committee in A/8518.

A/8518. Report of Fourth Committee (part I).

RESOLUTION 2765(XXVI), as recommended by Fourth Committee, A/8518, and as amended by Ghana, A/L.643, adopted by Assembly on 16 November 1971, meeting 1984, by roll-call vote of 106 to 2, with 13 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Portugal, South Africa.

Abstaining: Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Italy, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, United Kingdom.

The General Assembly,

Having considered the question of Southern Rhodesia,

Recalling its resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960, containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and its resolution 2621 (XXV) of 12 October 1970, containing the programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration,

Recalling also the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, particularly its resolution 232(1966) of 16 December 1966, 253(1968) of 29 May 1968, 277(1970) of 18 March 1970 and 288(1970) of 17 November 1970,

Recalling further all previous resolutions concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia adopted by the General Assembly and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and also the consensus adopted by the Special Committee at its 828th meeting, on 6 October 1971,

Expressing its grave concern at the recent decision taken by the Congress of the United States of America which, if confirmed, would permit the importation of chrome into the United States from Southern Rhodesia and thus would constitute a serious violation of the above-mentioned Security Council resolutions imposing sanctions against the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia,

1. Calls upon the Government of the United States of America to take the necessary measures, in compliance with the relevant provisions of Security Council resolutions 253(1968), 277(1970) and 288(1970) and bearing in mind its obligations under Article 25 of the Charter of the United Nations, to prevent the importation of chrome into the United States from Southern Rhodesia;

2. Requests the Government of the United States to inform the General Assembly at its current session of the action taken or envisaged in the implementation of the present resolution;

3. Requests the President of the General Assembly to draw the attention of the Government of the United States to the urgent need for the implementation of the present resolution;

4. Reminds all Member States of their obligations under the Charter to comply fully with the decisions of the Security Council on mandatory sanctions against the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia;

5. Decides to keep this and other aspects of the question under continuous review.

A/C.4/L.990. Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Congo, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Senegal, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia: draft resolution.

A/C.4/L.990/Rev.1. Algeria, Barbados, Burundi, Cameroon,

Chad, Congo, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia: revised draft resolution, approved by Fourth Committee on 19 November 1971, meeting 1952, by roll-call vote of 99 to 3, with 10 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Portugal, South Africa, United Kingdom.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Italy, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, United States.

A/8518/Add.1. Report of Fourth Committee (part II).

RESOLUTION 2769(XXVI), as recommended by Fourth Committee, A/8518/Add.1, adopted by Assembly on 22 November 1971, meeting 1991, by roll-call vote of 102 to 3, with 9 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Portugal, South Africa, United Kingdom.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, United States.

The General Assembly,

Having considered the question of Southern Rhodesia,

Recalling its resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960 and all other relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on the question of Southern Rhodesia,

Having noted the statement made in the House of Commons on Tuesday, 9 November 1971, by the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, announcing his Government's decision to hold the talks that are currently under way in Salisbury with the illegal racist minority régime,

1. Reaffirms the principle that there should be no independence before majority rule in Southern Rhodesia;

2. Affirms that any settlement relating to the future of that Territory must be worked out with the fullest participation of all nationalist leaders representing the majority of the people of Zimbabwe and must be endorsed freely by the people;

3. Decides to keep the situation in the Territory under review.

A/C.4/736/Add.1. Questions of Namibia, Territories under Portuguese administration and Southern Rhodesia: request for hearing.

A/C.4/L.991. Afghanistan, Algeria, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Libyan Arab Republic, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia: draft resolution, approved by Fourth Committee on 24 November 1971, meeting 1955, by roll-call vote of 89 to 10, with 13 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Barbados, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, France, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, South Africa, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Austria, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Lesotho, Malawi, Norway, Spain, Sweden.

A/8518/Add.2. Report of Fourth Committee (part III).

RESOLUTION 2796(XXVI), as recommended by Fourth Committee, A/8518/Add.2, adopted by Assembly on 10 December 1971, meeting 2012, by recorded vote of 91 to 9, with 12 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Barbados, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland,\* Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, France, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, South Africa, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Austria, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, Ireland, Italy, Lesotho, Malawi, Norway, Spain, Sweden.

\*Subsequently, Finland advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.

The General Assembly,  
Having considered the question of Southern Rhodesia,  
Having examined the relevant chapters of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

Bearing in mind the views expressed by representatives of national liberation movements,

Having heard the statement of the petitioner,

Recalling its resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960, containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and its resolution 2621(XXV) of 12 October 1970, containing the programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration,

Recalling further all previous resolutions concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia adopted by the General Assembly and the Special Committee,

Recalling also the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, particularly its resolutions 232(1966) of 16 December 1966, 253(1968) of 29 May 1968, 277(1970) of 18 March 1970 and 288(1970) of 17 November 1970,

Gravely concerned at the further deterioration of the situation in Southern Rhodesia, which the Security Council has reaffirmed as constituting a threat to international peace and security, resulting from the failure and refusal of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to put an end to the illegal racist minority régime in that Territory and from the racialist and repressive policies pursued by that régime in violation of the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations,

Deeply concerned at the continued presence of South African forces in the Territory, which constitutes a threat to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of neighbouring African States,

Deploping that certain States, in particular South Africa and Portugal, continue to collaborate with the illegal racist minority régime in violation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, contrary to their specific obligation under Article 25 of the Charter of the United Nations, thereby seriously obstructing the efforts of the international community to put an end to that régime,

Bearing in mind that the Government of the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, has the primary responsibility for putting an end to the rebellion of British settlers who organized the illegal racist régime and for transferring effective power to the people of Zimbabwe on the basis of the principle of majority rule,

Deploping the intransigent attitude of the Government of the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, which, in contravention of the provisions of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Special Committee, persists in its refusal to co-operate with the Special Committee in the discharge of the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly,

Noting with deep regret the decision of the International Olympic Committee to permit the participation in the XXth Olympic Games of the so-called National Olympic Committee of Rhodesia,

1. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of Zimbabwe to self-determination, freedom and independence and the legitimacy of their struggle to secure by all the means at their disposal the enjoyment of that right as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and in conformity with the objectives of General Assembly resolution 1514(XV);

2. Strongly deplores the continued refusal of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to take effective measures to bring down the illegal racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia and to transfer power without any delay to the people of Zimbabwe on the basis of the principle of majority rule, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, and calls upon that Government to take such measures without further delay in fulfilment of its responsibility as the administering Power;

3. Condemns the continued intervention and presence of South African armed forces in Southern Rhodesia in violation of Security Council resolutions 277(1970) and 288(1970), and calls upon the administering Power to ensure the immediate expulsion of all such forces;

4. Condemns the policies of those Governments, particularly the Governments of South Africa and Portugal, which continue to maintain political, economic, military and other relations with the illegal racist minority régime, in contravention of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and contrary to their obligations under the Charter, and calls upon those Governments to cease forthwith all such relations;

5. Reaffirms its conviction that the sanctions will not put an end to the illegal racist minority régime unless they are comprehensive, mandatory, effectively supervised, enforced and complied with by all States, particularly by South Africa and Portugal;

6. Strongly urges all States to take more stringent measures in order to prevent any circumvention by all individuals and bodies corporate of their nationality, or under their jurisdiction, of the sanctions prescribed by the Security Council, and to refrain from any action which might confer a semblance of legitimacy on the illegal racist minority régime;

7. Strongly deplores the imprisonment and detention of freedom fighters of Zimbabwe by the illegal racist minority régime and calls upon the administering Power to effect the immediate and unconditional release of those persons;

8. Calls upon all States to take all appropriate steps to ensure the exclusion of the so-called National Olympic Committee of Rhodesia from participating in the XXth Olympic Games and requests the Secretary-General to draw the attention of the President of the International Olympic Committee to the relevant provisions of Security Council resolution 253(1968) for appropriate action;

9. Calls upon all States, the specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system, in consultation with the Organization of African Unity, to extend all moral and material assistance to the people of Zimbabwe;

10. Calls upon the Government of the United Kingdom, in view of the armed conflict in the Territory and the inhuman treatment of prisoners, to ensure the application to that situation of the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War and the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, both dated 12 August 1949;

11. Calls upon the Government of the United Kingdom to report on the implementation of the present resolution to the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and to the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session;

12. Draws the attention of the Security Council, in view of the gravity of the situation arising from the further intensification of repressive activities against the people of Zimbabwe, to the urgent necessity of taking further steps to ensure the full and strict compliance by all States with the decisions of the Council, in accordance with Article 25 of the Charter, and to the need to widen the scope of the sanctions against the illegal racist minority régime and to impose sanctions against South Africa and Portugal, whose Governments persist in their refusal to carry out the mandatory decisions of the Council;

13. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session on the implementation of the present resolution;

14. Requests the Special Committee to keep the situation in the Territory under review.

A/C.4/L.1012. Afghanistan, Algeria, Barbados, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Congo, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guinea, Guyana, Jamaica, Kenya, Libyan Arab Republic, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nigeria, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia: draft resolution, approved by Fourth Committee on 16 December 1971, meeting 1971, by roll-call vote of 78 to 8, with 21 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Barbados, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon,

Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, France, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, South Africa, United Kingdom.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malawi, Nicaragua, Norway, Sweden, United States, Uruguay.

A/8518/Add.3. Report of Fourth Committee (part IV).

RESOLUTION 2877(XXVI), as recommended by Fourth Committee, A/8518/Add.3, adopted by Assembly on 20 December 1971, meeting 2028, by roll-call vote of 94 to 8, with 22 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bahrain, Barbados, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, France, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, South Africa, United Kingdom.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malawi, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Sweden, United States, Uruguay.

The General Assembly,  
Having heard the statement by the representative of the

Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland concerning the "proposals for a settlement" agreed upon between that Government and the racist minority régime in Salisbury,

Recalling its resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960, containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and its resolution 2621 (XXV) of 12 October 1970, containing the programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration,

Recalling further all previous resolutions concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia adopted by the General Assembly and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

Recalling also its resolution 2769(XXVI) of 22 November 1971, in particular paragraphs 1 and 2 thereof,

Gravely concerned at the "proposals for a settlement" which, if implemented, will entrench the rule of the racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia and will perpetuate the enslavement of the African people of Zimbabwe,

Deeply conscious that the "proposals for a settlement" were agreed upon without the participation of the representatives of the African people of Zimbabwe,

1. Rejects the "proposals for a settlement" agreed upon by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the racist minority régime in Salisbury as constituting a flagrant violation of the inalienable right of the African people of Zimbabwe to self-determination and independence as provided for in General Assembly resolution 1514(XV);

2. Reaffirms that no settlement which does not conform strictly to the principle of "no independence before majority rule" on the basis of one man, one vote, will be acceptable;

3. Invites the Security Council, when examining the question of Southern Rhodesia, to consider taking appropriate measures, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, in order to enable the people of Zimbabwe to exercise freely and without further delay their inalienable right to self-determination and independence;

4. Welcomes the decision by the Security Council on 2 December 1971 to invite Mr. Joshua Nkomo and the Reverend Ndabaningi Sithole, the respective leaders of the Zimbabwe African People's Union and the Zimbabwe African National Union, to appear before the Council to express their views concerning the future status of the Territory, and calls upon the Government of the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, to comply with that decision;

5. Calls upon all States to adhere strictly to the relevant provisions of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on the question of Southern Rhodesia, and in particular to observe the resolutions of the Council imposing sanctions against the racist minority régime.

## The question of Namibia

During 1971, United Nations bodies again considered the question of Namibia. The International Court of Justice delivered an advisory opinion on the question in response to a 1970 Security Council request for an opinion as to the legal consequences for States of South Africa's continued presence in Namibia. Decisions on the territory were also taken by the Council, the General Assembly and the Assembly's Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the [1960] Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The United Nations Council for

Namibia reported to the General Assembly on its activities, and aspects of the question were again taken up by the Commission on Human Rights and the Economic and Social Council.

The International Court of Justice delivered its advisory opinion on 21 June 1971 and stated among other things that, the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia being illegal, South Africa was under obligation to withdraw its administration immediately and thus put an end to its occupation of the territory. United Nations Member States were under obligation to recognize the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia

and the invalidity of its acts on behalf of or concerning the territory. States were under obligation to refrain from any acts or dealings with South Africa implying recognition of the legality of or support for South Africa's presence or administration. The Court also said it was incumbent upon States not Members of the United Nations to give assistance in the action taken by the United Nations with regard to Namibia.

On 20 October, the Security Council adopted a four-power resolution by which, among other things, it agreed with the Court's opinion and called on States to refrain from actions pertaining to Namibia contrary to the views expressed by the Court. The Council called once again on South Africa to withdraw from the territory and declared that any further refusal to do so could create conditions detrimental to the maintenance of peace and security in the region.

The Security Council's Ad Hoc Sub-Committee on Namibia, set up by the Council in 1970, was asked to continue its work and to study appropriate measures for fulfilling the responsibilities of the United Nations towards Namibia. It was also asked to review all treaties and agreements which were contrary to the present resolution in order to ascertain whether States had entered into agreements which recognized South Africa's authority over Namibia.

The Special Committee on implementation of the Declaration on granting independence, in a consensus adopted on 2 September, noted among other things that South Africa had not only continued its illegal occupation of Namibia but had persisted in the application of the criminal policies of apartheid. The Special Committee condemned the support South Africa received from its allies in pursuit of its policies of economic exploitation of the Namibians, and called on the Governments concerned to withdraw such support. By a resolution adopted on 9 September, the Special Committee asked all States to increase their

assistance to the peoples of Namibia, Southern Rhodesia and the territories under Portuguese administration and to discontinue collaboration with the Governments of Portugal and South Africa.

The United Nations Council for Namibia, in its sixth report to the General Assembly, described its activities during the year and said that South Africa had continued to defy the United Nations with regard to Namibia and that the situation had further deteriorated. South Africa had increasingly applied its apartheid policy to the territory, had continued its military repression and had pursued policies aimed at fragmenting and annexing the territory.

At its twenty-sixth session later in 1971, the General Assembly on 20 December adopted a resolution by which among other things it reaffirmed the legitimacy of the struggle of the Namibian people, condemned South Africa for its refusal to withdraw and welcomed the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice. States were called upon, among other things, to refrain from all relations, economic or otherwise, with South Africa, where those relations concerned Namibia. The United Nations Council for Namibia was asked to represent Namibia whenever that was required and to assume responsibility for the urgent establishment of a co-ordinated programme of technical and financial assistance to Namibia.

In another resolution adopted on 20 December, the Assembly decided among other things to allocate \$50,000 to the United Nations Fund for Namibia from the United Nations regular budget for 1972, and authorized the Secretary-General to appeal to Governments for voluntary contributions to the Fund.

(For details about these and other decisions taken during 1971 concerning Namibia, see pp. 546-64.)

## Complaint by Zambia against South Africa

By a letter dated 6 October 1971, addressed to the President of the Security Council, Zambia requested a meeting of the Council to consider a series of incidents and violations of the sovereignty, air space and territorial integrity of Zambia by South Africa, including, on 5 October 1971, an alleged crossing by South African forces into Zambian territory from the Caprivi Strip of Namibia.

Forty-eight United Nations Member States supported Zambia's request. In doing so, they declared that the latest armed incursion by South African military authorities constituted a serious threat not only to the sovereignty and territorial

integrity of Zambia but to the peace and security of the region.

The Council met to consider the complaint by Zambia on 8, 11 and 12 October 1971.

At their request, Zambia and South Africa, as well as Guinea, India, Kenya, Nigeria, Pakistan, the United Republic of Tanzania, and Yugoslavia, participated in the Security Council debate without the right to vote.

The representative of Zambia stated that on 5 October 1971, units of the South African army had entered Zambia illegally at Katima Mulilo, allegedly pursuing freedom fighters operating in

the Caprivi Strip. The South African forces spent some time inside Zambia before retreating to their military base at the Caprivi Strip, he said.

The representative of Zambia then cited 23 other occasions since 1968 on which, he said, South Africa had violated Zambia's territorial integrity. These violations had occurred because Zambia bordered Namibia, believed in a policy of non-racialism, opposed the so-called dialogue with South Africa, rejected white supremacy and supported the right to self-determination of the peoples of southern Africa and Guinea (Bissau).

South Africa was feeling the pressure of the liberation movements and was letting off steam on Zambia, the representative continued. Zambia, however, accepted no responsibility for the activities of the Namibian freedom fighters inside Namibia. Zambia considered that it was in a state of undeclared war with South Africa and other white minority régimes, which formed an unholy alliance. The root cause of Zambia's deep-seated differences with South Africa was apartheid. Furthermore, Zambia had consistently opposed South Africa's policy of creating client States.

After unsuccessful attempts to destroy the unity of Zambia by financing reactionary opposition parties inside the country, South Africa had initiated direct military action. The Security Council must take appropriate measures to prevent a racial war and guarantee the freedom, independence and security of small and weak States, the Zambian representative held.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa, replying to the charges by Zambia, said that incidents had indeed occurred in the Caprivi Strip on 4 and 5 October 1971. On 4 October, four members of the South African police force were injured by a landmine explosion; on the following day, a landmine killed a South African police officer investigating the earlier incident. The trail of four persons had been found leading from the direction of the Zambian border to the location of the landmines and back.

The Prime Minister of South Africa, who had repeatedly and publicly warned that his country would not tolerate attacks on its people or the people of South West Africa, had stated that steps were being taken to pursue the culprits and that the pursuers would defend themselves if attacked. In fact, however, South African police had not crossed the Zambian border but had followed the trail to where it disappeared within the area of the Caprivi Strip. At no time was the Zambian border violated, South Africa's Foreign Minister stated.

Instances of unauthorized border crossings had occurred in the past, but both sides had been responsible, he added. Between November 1969 and July 1971, Zambia had violated South West African air space on 12 occasions. More serious

was the infiltration of armed bands across the border from Zambia into the Caprivi Strip to cause violence. These bands operated from camps situated in Zambia and received the support of the Zambian Government, which had not responded to South Africa's request that it take measures to prevent such incursions.

South Africa wanted to avoid border incidents, the Foreign Minister said, but in cases of incursions by terrorists it did not compromise, for it had a duty to protect its citizens and would do everything in its power to prevent such acts or to apprehend the culprits.

During the debate, some Council members held that South Africa had not provided evidence against Zambia's charges but instead had confirmed South Africa's militant intentions.

South Africa had admitted violating the territorial integrity of Zambia, Sierra Leone said; it only denied having done so on the date specified by Zambia.

India and Pakistan commented that South Africa had invoked the right of pursuit into foreign territory.

South Africa had no evidence that Zambia had anything to do with the laying of mines, the Nigerian representative held; the incident had been used as a pretext for terrorizing the Zambian population in the hope that Zambia would change its anti-apartheid policy.

Somalia stated that news of the illegal incursion by South African forces had been widely reported in the international press. South Africa had established a large military presence in Namibia, employing arms supplied by some Member States despite an embargo, and was attempting to force Zambia to give up its support of the principle of self-determination.

The USSR said that South Africa was using the international territory of Namibia as a platform for launching aggression; it had constructed bases, air strips and a missile system in the Caprivi area, from which it organized subversive activities against Zambia.

A number of Council members expressed the view that acts of aggression by South Africa represented a challenge to the United Nations, and specifically to the Security Council. They held that conciliatory attitudes of some permanent members of the Council contributed to South Africa's position. Among those holding this view were Guinea, Kenya, Nigeria, the USSR, the United Republic of Tanzania, and Yugoslavia.

Guinea, Pakistan, Poland, the United Republic of Tanzania, and Yugoslavia, among others, stated that there was a co-ordinated plan by South Africa and Portugal against Zambia and other independent African States.

Some members—among them Burundi, India,

Nigeria, Somalia and the United Republic of Tanzania—raised the question of the Namibian resistance and the African freedom fighters. They held that since South Africa continued to occupy Namibia, its population had no choice but to resort to armed struggle. India felt that the Council should declare that the struggle for liberation from colonialism and against a racist, minority régime was legitimate.

On 8 October 1971, Burundi, Sierra Leone, Somalia and the Syrian Arab Republic introduced a draft resolution by which the Council would, among other things, condemn the violations of the sovereignty, air space and territorial integrity of Zambia by South Africa, and call upon South Africa to respect fully the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Zambia and to desist forthwith from any violation thereof.

On 12 October, the representative of Somalia introduced a revised version of the draft—co-sponsored by Burundi and Sierra Leone—which, he said, took into account the various positions of Council members. This text was adopted unanimously on the same date as resolution 300(1971).

By this resolution, the Council (a) bearing in mind that all Member States must refrain in their relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, (b) conscious that the Council had the responsibility to take efficient collective measures to prevent and eliminate threats to peace and security, and (c) concerned at the situation on the Zambia-Namibia border, in the vicinity of the Caprivi Strip, took the following action.

It (1) reiterated that any violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a Member State was contrary to the United Nations Charter; (2) called upon South Africa to respect fully the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Zambia; and (3) declared that, in the event that South

Africa violated the sovereignty or territorial integrity of Zambia, the Security Council would meet again to examine the situation further in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter.

Following adoption of the resolution, the United States representative said that the statements made to the Council by Zambia and South Africa were not fully consistent and had left some questions open. However, it was clear that there was concern that similar incidents might occur in future. The United States had supported the resolution in the hope that it would encourage the parties concerned to exercise restraint. The representative also reaffirmed United States support for the General Assembly's decision of 27 October 1966<sup>26</sup> as well as the advisory opinion by the International Court of Justice that South Africa's presence in Namibia was illegal.

Italy noted that although it had voted for the resolution because of the tension prevailing in the area, it would have preferred a more concise, sober resolution adhering more closely to the information provided to the Council.

France felt that the resolution was firm and measured and had achieved the desired objective: the Council had stressed its determination to preserve the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a Member State, which constituted an assurance for Zambia.

The representative of Zambia said that in giving South Africa such a mild reprimand, the Security Council had set a dangerous precedent which would not give comfort to Zambia or to other small and weak States in Africa and the rest of the world. However, Zambia welcomed the resolution in a spirit of compromise as the minimum action the Council could take under the circumstances.

<sup>26</sup> See Y.U.N., 1966, pp. 605-6, text of resolution 2145(XXI).

## DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES

Security Council, meetings 1590-1592.

S/10352. Letter of 6 October 1971 from Zambia (request to convene Council).

S/10357-S/10361, S/10363. Letters of 7 and 8 October 1971 from United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Nigeria, South Africa, Kenya, Guinea (requests to participate in Council's discussion).

S/10364. Letter of 7 October 1971 from Algeria, Barbados, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Dahomey, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, India, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

S/10365. Burundi, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic: draft resolution.

S/10365/Rev.1. Burundi, Sierra Leone, Somalia: revised draft resolution.

S/10367. Letter of 8 October 1971 from Yugoslavia (request to participate in Council's discussion).

S/10368. Letter of 11 October from Lesotho (supporting request to convene Council).

S/10370, S/10371. Letters of 11 October 1971 from India and Pakistan (request to participate in Council's discussion).

RESOLUTION 300(1971), as submitted by 3 powers, S/10365/Rev.1, adopted unanimously by Council on 12 October 1971, meeting 1592.

The Security Council,

Having received the letter of the Permanent Representative of Zambia contained in document S/10352 and also the letter from forty-seven Member States contained in document S/10364,

Taking note of the statement of the Permanent Representative of Zambia concerning violations of the sovereignty, air space and territorial integrity of Zambia by South Africa,

Taking note of the statement of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of South Africa,

Bearing in mind that all Member States must refrain in their relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State,

Conscious that it has the responsibility to take efficient collective measures to prevent and eliminate threats to peace and security,

Concerned by the situation on the borders of Zambia and Namibia, in the vicinity of the Caprivi Strip,

1. Reiterates that any violation of the sovereignty and territorial

integrity of a Member State is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations;

2. Calls upon South Africa to respect fully the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Zambia;

3. Further declares that, in the event of South Africa violating the sovereignty or territorial integrity of Zambia, the Security Council will meet again to examine the situation further in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter.

## Relations between African States and Portugal

### Complaints by Senegal against Portugal

By three letters to the President of the Security Council, dated 27 April, 16 June and 6 July 1971, the representative of Senegal charged Portuguese armed forces stationed in Guinea (Bissau) with attacking Senegalese frontier villages, laying mines and explosive devices in Senegalese territory and violating Senegalese air space. In the last of these letters, Senegal requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council.

By a letter dated 10 July 1971, addressed to the President of the Council, Portugal rejected the Senegalese charges; expressed regret that Senegal had requested a meeting of the Council without first seeking to ascertain, through direct contact with Portugal, the truth of the charges; and asserted that Senegal had not presented sufficient evidence to substantiate them.

Both Portugal and Senegal were suffering from the terrorist activities of the Partido Africano da Independencia de Guiné e Cabo Verde (PAIGC), a subversive group which enjoyed special privileges from the Government of Senegal and which was responsible for all the problems in the frontier areas, Portugal said. Senegal should seek its remedy by maintaining order within its own territory.

By a letter dated 12 July 1971, addressed to the President of the Security Council, 37 African States supported Senegal's request for a meeting of the Council; they called on the Council to take measures to ensure that Portugal halt its flagrant acts of aggression and grant self-determination and independence to its colonies, in accordance with the 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.<sup>27</sup>

The Council considered the Senegalese complaint at four meetings held from 12 to 15 July. At their request, Senegal, Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Sudan, Togo and Zambia participated in the debate, without the right to vote.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Senegal stated that the latest acts of Portuguese aggression were part of a long series of violations of the territorial integrity of Senegal and were closely linked with Portuguese repression of the nationalist movements in Guinea (Bissau). Portuguese

violence had recently escalated and taken a new form in the laying of anti-tank and anti-personnel mines on Senegalese territory. Senegal was asking the Council to take effective measures against Portugal in terms of its resolution of 9 December 1969, which declared that, in the event of failure by Portugal to desist forthwith from violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Senegal, the Council would meet to consider other measures.<sup>28</sup>

Representatives of African countries drew attention to a resolution adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity on 8 December 1970, which declared that the presence of Portuguese colonialism on the African continent was a serious threat to the peace and security of independent African States. Stating that it was no longer sufficient merely to condemn Portugal, they called for vigorous measures by the Security Council.

The representative of Somalia said that the Security Council should use to the full its investigative powers under Article 34 of the United Nations Charter,<sup>29</sup> so that any action it deemed necessary might be undertaken on a sound and informed basis.

A draft resolution sponsored by Burundi, Japan, Sierra Leone, Somalia and the Syrian Arab Republic was placed before the Council. By its operative part, the Security Council would: (1) demand that Portugal stop immediately any acts of violence and destruction in Senegalese territory and respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity and security of Senegal; (2) condemn Portuguese acts of violence and destruction perpetrated against Senegal since 1963; (3) condemn the unlawful laying of anti-tank and anti-personnel mines in Senegalese territory; and (4) request the President of the Security Council and the Secretary-General to send to the spot, as a matter of urgency, a special mission of members of the Security Council, assisted by their military experts, to carry out an inquiry into the facts of which the Council had been informed, to examine the situation along the border between Guinea (Bis-

<sup>27</sup> See Y.U.N., 1960, pp. 49-50, text of resolution 1514(XV), containing the Declaration.

<sup>28</sup> See Y.U.N., 1969, p. 144, text of resolution 273(1969).

<sup>29</sup> Fortext of Article 34 of the Charter, see APPENDIX II.

sau) and Senegal and to report to the Council, making any recommendations aimed at guaranteeing peace and security in that region.

At the request of the United States representative, a separate vote was taken on the operative paragraph dealing with the special mission. The United States said that while it strongly regretted the continuing acts of violence complained of, the draft contained certain determinations of guilt before the proposed special mission embarked on its inquiry. Therefore, while supporting the proposal to send a special mission to the region, the United States would abstain from voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

The paragraph was put to the vote and adopted unanimously.

The draft resolution as a whole was then adopted by a vote of 13 to 0, with 2 abstentions, as resolution 294(1971). (For text of resolution, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

In explanation of vote, the United Kingdom stated that it had abstained because Portugal had denied responsibility for the incidents, and therefore, in the absence of an investigation, some parts of the resolution went too far in condemning Portugal.

On 21 July 1971, the President of the Security Council and the Secretary-General announced that the Special Mission of the Security Council would be composed of Nicaragua (Chairman), Belgium, Burundi, Japan, Poland and the Syrian Arab Republic.

On 24 July, in response to a request by the Chairman of the Special Mission to the Governments of Senegal and Portugal to extend to the Mission all necessary facilities, Portugal stated that it had been unjustifiably condemned by the Security Council without any evidence having been advanced in support of Senegal's charges. It could not collaborate with the Mission, as that would presuppose an acceptance of a condemnation which it had repudiated. As proof of its goodwill, however, it was renewing its proposal that a commission for controlling the Luso-Senegalese frontier be set up, consisting of Portuguese and Senegalese representatives and presided over by an impartial person.

On 16 September 1971, the Special Mission submitted its report to the Security Council. The report described the inquiries which the Mission had conducted in the frontier area, its consultations with the Senegalese authorities and its interview with the Secretary-General of PAIGC. The Mission deplored the Portuguese Government's lack of co-operation, which had prevented it from implementing fully its mandate.

The Special Mission concluded that it was clear that Senegalese foreign policy was aimed at avoiding any engagement with Portuguese forces

other than for reasons of defence, and that the recurrent armed attacks against Senegal had caused considerable loss of life and material damage and created a climate of insecurity and instability which posed a threat to peace and security in the region.

Since the Special Mission had been refused access to Guinea (Bissau), some information was lacking. But all the evidence of acts of violence and destruction found by the Mission had been along the frontier between Senegal and Guinea (Bissau), an area in which PAIGC was not engaged in any military activity. The indications were such as to designate the Portuguese authorities in Guinea (Bissau) as responsible, the report concluded.

The Special Mission recommended that the Security Council should ensure the prerequisites for eliminating the causes of tension in the region and creating an atmosphere of peace and security, namely (a) respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Senegal; (b) the immediate cessation of acts of violence and destruction against Senegal; (c) as regards Guinea (Bissau), respect for the principle of self-determination and independence and the exercise of the right deriving from that principle without further delay.

The Mission recommended that the Council take all necessary steps to ensure that Portugal respect and fully implement these recommendations.

The Special Mission further recommended that the Council remain informed of the matter and that its President and the Secretary-General keep the situation under review. Finally, it recommended that the Secretary-General report to the Council on the question within six months.

The report of the Special Mission was considered at four meetings of the Security Council held between 29 September and 24 November 1971.

Also before the Council was a letter dated 29 September 1971 to the President of the Security Council by which Portugal categorically rejected the conclusions of the Special Mission as wholly in contradiction with the facts and with the words of PAIGC's Secretary-General, who made no secret of the fact that PAIGC was engaged in warlike acts of violence.

The authorities in Portuguese Guinea were only exercising their right of legitimate self-defence under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter,<sup>30</sup> Portugal stated. Nevertheless, Portugal asserted that it remained ready to seek a formula capable of establishing a climate of detente. In this context, it reported that an accord had been reached between the Foreign Ministers of Portugal and Senegal regarding the setting up of a control commission for the frontier, but that Senegal had failed to

<sup>30</sup> For text of Article 51 of the Charter, see APPENDIX II.

implement the measures that had been agreed upon.

Also before the Council was a letter of 15 November 1971, addressed to the Council President, by which Senegal asserted that further incidents had occurred on the frontier between Senegal and Guinea (Bissau) on 30 October and on the night of 3-4 November 1971.

Senegal, Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Sudan, Togo and Zambia were invited once again to participate, without vote, in the Council's deliberations.

Several representatives commended the Special Mission for the manner in which it had performed its task.

The USSR expressed the hope that the Council would continue the practice of sending Security Council missions to carry out investigations on the spot which would mark a return to the practical working methods envisaged for the Council in the Charter and in the Council's rules of procedure.

Senegal expressed its gratitude to the members of the Special Mission for the objectivity and impartiality with which they had approached their task.

Portugal's letter of 29 September 1971, the Senegalese representative said, was designed to create a diversion by suggesting that Senegal had informed the Council of the dispute after having come to an agreement with Portugal. There had been a meeting in May 1971 between the Foreign Ministers of Senegal and Portugal, at the latter's request, but no positive decision had been reached; nor had Senegal accepted the establishment of a joint control commission, the representative stated. He felt that the Council could not consider measures against Portugal without taking into account the deep-rooted causes underlying the climate of chronic insecurity in the region.

Some members of the Council—including Poland, Sierra Leone, Somalia, the Syrian Arab Republic and the USSR—held that the report of the Special Mission had clearly established the responsibility of the Portuguese authorities in Guinea (Bissau) for the attacks on Senegal, and were the consequence of Portugal's denial to the people of Guinea (Bissau) of their right to self-determination and independence; these States called for the Council to take effective measures to end Portugal's aggressive actions, which threatened the independence and sovereignty of Senegal and other African States.

Somalia said that another round of condemnations and appeals would have no effect unless Portugal was convinced that the Council would take coercive action; he suggested that it call for an arms embargo against Portugal so long as colonial wars continued in Africa.

The USSR said that the security and indepen-

dence of African States could be strengthened only if a speedy end was put to colonial wars in Africa and all peoples were granted independence in accordance with the United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

France noted that the Special Mission had attempted to prepare a report that was as accurate, complete and objective as possible. The report had indicated that the various incidents described originated in Guinea (Bissau). Since Portugal was responsible for peace and order in that territory, it was to Portugal that the Council must turn to put an end to the acts of violence and destruction.

Japan said that the recommendations of the report were well balanced and if implemented fully would eliminate the causes of tension in the region.

On 24 November 1971, the Council proceeded to vote on a draft resolution sponsored by Burundi, Sierra Leone and Somalia. The text had been revised by the sponsors to incorporate changes resulting from consultations with other members of the Council.

By a vote of 14 to 0, with 1 abstention, the Council adopted the text as its resolution 302(1971).

The Council thereby: expressed its appreciation for the work of the Special Mission and noted with satisfaction its recommendations; reaffirmed the provisions of its resolution (294(1971)) of 15 July 1971; and strongly deplored the Portuguese Government's lack of co-operation with the Mission.

The Council then called upon Portugal: to take immediate effective measures (a) so that the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Senegal be fully respected, and (b) to prevent acts of violence and destruction against the territory and people of Senegal; to respect fully the inalienable right to self-determination and independence of the people of Guinea (Bissau); and to take without further delay the necessary measures so that this inalienable right could be exercised.

The President of the Security Council and the Secretary-General were asked to keep the question under review and to report on the implementation of the present resolution to the Council within six months.

In the event of failure by Portugal to comply with the provisions of the resolution, the Council would meet to consider necessary initiatives and steps.

(For text of resolution, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

Before the adoption of the resolution, the United States deplored Portugal's lack of co-operation with the Special Mission, which made it impossible for the Mission to implement fully its

mandate. The Mission had carefully pointed out the hearsay nature of much of the evidence and had not determined responsibility for the mine-laying incidents, the United States noted. The draft resolution, however, made no effort to reflect those aspects of the report, nor did it take into account the role which the use of sanctuaries by insurgent groups played in creating border tensions. The United States therefore abstained in the vote.

The United Kingdom said that it supported the resolution since it was along the same lines as the report and its recommendations.

Speaking after the vote, China said that, in view of the defiant attitude of the Portuguese colonialists, the Council should harbour no illusions as to the actual result of the resolution just adopted. China resolutely supported the just struggle of the peoples of Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique for national independence and sovereignty.

The USSR said that in its view the resolution adopted was a weak and ineffective one.

### Complaints by Guinea and Portugal

#### Communications

In a series of letters addressed to the President of the Security Council between 16 February and 12 March 1971, Portugal and Guinea exchanged charges regarding an overflight of Guinea (Bissau), armed attacks against the frontiers of Guinea, and terrorist attacks against Portuguese populations.

#### Consideration by Security Council

On 3 August 1971, the Permanent Representative of Guinea to the United Nations addressed a letter to the President of the Security Council stating that on 2 August the Intelligence Service of Guinea had intercepted conversations between overseas marine units and two other headquarters units of the Portuguese colonial army discussing an imminent military aggression by Portugal against Guinea. The letter requested an immediate meeting of the Security Council to consider this imminent threat to international peace and security.

The Security Council met on the same day to consider the complaint by Guinea.

Guinea was invited to participate in the Council's deliberations, without the right to vote.

The representative of Guinea stated that for 12 years Guinea had been the victim of daily and permanent acts of aggression, which had been brought to the attention of the Security Council. He recalled that the Special Mission dispatched to Guinea by the Security Council in connexion with the Portuguese attack on 22 November 1970 had found incontrovertible evidence of Portuguese

acts of aggression; on the basis of the Mission's report, the Council, on 8 December 1970, had strongly condemned Portugal for its invasion of Guinea.<sup>31</sup>

Portugal, however, had continued its aggressive policies against Guinea, the representative held. It was Guinea's fate that its borders were contiguous with those of the colonial enclave Guinea (Bissau), which Portugal was determined to keep under its colonial domination in spite of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,<sup>32</sup> which was designed to put an end to colonialism. Guinea had come before the Security Council out of an awareness that the peace, security and territorial integrity of every country had to be safeguarded by the Council. It had confidence in the Council with respect to all decisions it might consider appropriate and effective to safeguard Guinea's territorial integrity, peace and security.

During discussion, the representatives of Somalia and the Syrian Arab Republic held that the threat of imminent attack by Portugal against Guinea should be taken seriously by the Security Council because of the history of continued aggression by Portugal against Guinea.

The USSR said that in its view the Council was obliged to take urgent measures to avert the implementation of the aggressive plans of the Portuguese colonists, who enjoyed the support of the imperialist forces in their fight against the African States and the national liberation movements.

Burundi, Sierra Leone, Somalia and the Syrian Arab Republic introduced a draft resolution, which was unanimously adopted by the Security Council as its resolution 295(1971).

The Council thereby: (1) affirmed that the territorial integrity and political independence of Guinea must be respected; (2) decided to send a special mission of three members of the Security Council to Guinea to consult with the authorities and report on the situation immediately; (3) decided that the special mission be appointed after consultation between the Council President and the Secretary-General; and (4) decided to maintain the matter on its agenda.

On 26 August 1971, the Council approved a consensus statement by which it agreed that the Special Mission be composed of two members instead of three, and that it proceed to Conakry, Guinea, to consult the Government of Guinea on its complaint and report back to the Council as soon as possible. It was subsequently announced that the Special Mission would be composed of the representatives of Argentina and the Syrian Arab

<sup>31</sup> See Y.U.N., 1970, p. 193, text of resolution 290(1970).

<sup>32</sup> See footnote 27.

Republic, who would be accompanied by a staff from the Secretariat.

On 29 August 1971, the mission left New York for Conakry; it remained in Guinea from 30 August to 2 September 1971.

On 29 September 1971, the Security Council met to consider the report of the Special Mission.

The Special Mission reported that it had held meetings with the President of Guinea and with a government delegation and had visited various localities in Guinea. As evidence of the alleged planned Portuguese invasion of Guinea, the Mission had been shown: a map containing a plan of attack on Guinea, together with an explanatory note; the depositions of prisoners accused of plotting against the State in collusion with foreign powers; the text of a telegraphic message between two dissident elements which had been intercepted by the Guinean authorities; and a collection of military uniforms identical to those of the Guinean army, made in Guinea (Bissau) but bearing the inscription of the Partido Africano da Independencia da Guiné e Cabo Verde (PAIGC), which, it was said, were to be used by the attackers in order to create confusion in the Guinean ranks.

The Council also had before it a letter dated 29 September 1971 from Portugal, stating that a perusal of the report of the Special Mission made it clear that the Mission had found no evidence to support Guinea's charges.

During discussion, the representative of Guinea stated that the report was a faithful record of observed facts which clearly indicated the continuing threat Portugal posed to a small African country.

The representatives of Somalia held that the report was a factual one, containing neither an assessment of the facts or charges made nor any recommendations. However, the evidence of the report bore out the contention that unless the United Nations resolved to do something about the Portuguese colonial territories in Africa, the peace and security of certain parts of Africa would always be threatened.

Sierra Leone said that it was clear from the report that there was a planned invasion of Guinea, and that it was essential that the Council try once and for all to eliminate the root cause of the disease: Portugal's belief that it could continue to be an imperialistic nation.

The USSR held that the Security Council should pay due attention to the report and seriously ponder what specific practical measures it should take to ensure peace and security in Africa.

It was agreed that the Council would consider the question further after members had had time to study the report of the Special Mission.

On 19 November 1971, the Permanent Representative of the Ivory Coast to the United

Nations addressed a letter to the President of the Security Council by which the Ivory Coast categorically denied any allegations or inferences made by Guinean authorities in their statements to members of the Special Mission to the effect that the Ivory Coast might be implicated in plotting to overthrow the Guinean régime, through such acts as allowing the establishment on its territory of training camps for subversion and bases of operation for commandos and mercenary forces.

On 30 November 1971, the Council approved the text of a consensus among members regarding the question. The Council thereby agreed that it was evident from the report of the Special Mission that there was continuing concern in Guinea regarding the possibility of renewed acts against the country's territorial integrity and political independence, similar to those which led to the events of November 1970. In this respect, the view had been expressed by Guinea that action should be taken by the Security Council to prevent Portugal from violating the territorial integrity and political independence of Guinea.

The Council further agreed that it was clear that the failure by Portugal to apply the principle of self-determination, including the right to independence, in Guinea (Bissau) was having an unsettling effect on conditions in the area.

The Security Council, having taken note with appreciation of the report of the Special Mission and of the representations made by Guinea, reiterated the affirmation expressed in its resolution of 3 August 1971 (295(1971)) that the territorial integrity and political independence of Guinea must be respected.

During the discussion on 30 November, the representative of Somalia expressed the view that the consensus did not go as far as it should have; nonetheless, Somalia supported it because it reflected basic agreement among Council members that Guinea was under threat of aggression from Portugal and reaffirmed that Guinea's territorial integrity and political independence must be respected.

The United Kingdom commented that while it fully endorsed the principle of self-determination, including the right to independence, for all non-self-governing territories, it considered that responsibility for its implementation and timing rested with the administering power.

The representative of China stated that countless facts showed that the colonialist policies followed by Portugal were aimed not only at subverting the Government of Guinea but at suppressing the national liberation movement in Africa. The Guinean people were fighting not only for their own independence but for that of other African States.

In the opinion of Poland and the USSR, the

aggressive imperialist policies of Portugal towards Guinea clearly demonstrated that so long as colonialist régimes, with their military forces and bases, remained in Africa, the political independence and security of African States would always be threatened. The USSR said that the Council should adopt all possible measures to protect the political independence and territorial integrity of Guinea and other African States from the aggressive acts of Portuguese colonizers.

Burundi and Sierra Leone held that the Council should take appropriate action to prevent Portugal from carrying out acts which threatened the sovereignty and independence of Guinea.

#### Complaint by Zambia against Portugal

On 15 June 1971, Zambia addressed a letter to the Secretary-General seeking, through his good offices, to apprise members of the Security Council of the serious situation that had arisen from actions of the Portuguese authorities, who since January 1971 had virtually blockaded the flow of all categories of Zambian imports and were holding them in the Portuguese-controlled seaports of Beira, Nacala and Lourenço Marques in Mozambique and Lobito in Angola.

Among the blockaded imports was maize, the

main staple diet of the people of Zambia. Owing to adverse weather conditions, the importation of slightly over 2 million bags was required for the period July 1970-June 1971. In view of the situation, Zambia had had to import from various countries an additional quantity of maize to replace the stocks held by Portuguese port authorities, incurring even greater costs in having it transported via non-traditional routes. For the 1971-1972 period, Zambia needed to import 1.5 million bags.

Zambia stated that it could not afford the unnecessary loss of foreign exchange through actions taken against its imports in traditional ports and countries of transit.

In seeking to apprise members of the Security Council of the situation, Zambia wished to draw their attention to the special circumstances affecting its geographical position, as duly recognized by the Council by its resolutions of 29 May 1968 and 18 March 1970.<sup>33</sup> Zambia deeply regretted that notwithstanding those resolutions, it had not received any assistance of the nature envisaged by the Security Council.

<sup>33</sup> See Y.U.N., 1968, p. 153, text of resolution 253(1968), operative para. 15; and Y.U.N., 1970, p. 182, text of resolution 277(1970), operative para. 16.

### DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES

#### Complaints by Senegal against Portugal

Security Council, meetings 1569-1572.

S/10182. Letter of 27 April 1971 from Senegal.

S/10191. Letter of 10 May 1971 from Guinea.

S/10227. Letter of 16 June 1971 from Senegal.

S/10251. Letter of 6 July 1971 from Senegal (containing, inter alia, request to convene Council and to participate in Council's discussion).

S/10255. Letter of 10 July 1971 from Portugal.

S/10258. Letter of 12 July 1971 from Guinea (request to participate in Council's discussion).

S/10259 and Add.1.2. Letter of 12 July 1971 from Algeria, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Zaire and Zambia (supporting request to convene Council).

S/10260-S/10265. Letters of 12 and 13 July 1971 from Mali, Mauritania, Sudan, Togo, Mauritius and Zambia (requests to participate in Council's discussion).

S/10266. Burundi, Japan, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic: draft resolution.

RESOLUTION 294(1971), as proposed by 5 powers, S/10266, adopted by Council on 15 July 1971, meeting 1572, by 13 votes to 0, with 2 abstentions (United Kingdom, United States).

The Security Council,  
Taking note of the complaints by Senegal against Portugal contained in documents S/10182 and S/10251,  
Taking note of the letter of the Chargé d'affaires ad interim of

Portugal,

Having heard the statement of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Senegal,

Bearing in mind that all States Members of the United Nations must refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purpose of the United Nations,

Conscious of its duty to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to international peace and security and for the suppression of acts of aggression,

Disturbed by the increasingly serious situation created by acts of violence perpetrated by the Portuguese armed forces against Senegal since the adoption of Security Council resolution 273(1969) of 9 December 1969,

Deeply distressed by the repeated laying of mines in Senegalese territory,

Gravely concerned that incidents of this nature, by threatening the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Senegal, might endanger international peace and security,

Bearing in mind its resolutions 178(1963) of 24 April 1963, 204(1965) of 19 May 1965 and 273(1969) of 9 December 1969,

Having taken note of the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts of the Commission on Human Rights concerning Portuguese acts of violence in Senegalese territory,

Noting that Portugal has not complied with the provisions of paragraph 2 of resolution 273(1969),

1. Demands that the Government of Portugal should stop immediately any acts of violence and destruction in Senegalese territory and respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity and security of Senegal;

2. Condemns the acts of violence and destruction perpetrated since 1963 by the Portuguese armed forces of Guinea (Bissau) against the population and villages of Senegal;

3. Condemns the unlawful laying of anti-tank and anti-personnel mines in Senegalese territory;

4. Requests the President of the Security Council and the Secretary-General to send to the spot, as a matter of urgency, a special mission of members of the Council assisted by their military experts to carry out an inquiry into the facts of which the Council has been informed, to examine the situation along the border between Guinea (Bissau) and Senegal and to report to the Council, making any recommendations aimed at guaranteeing peace and security in this region.

S/10274. Report of 21 July 1971 by President of Security Council and Secretary-General.

S/10284. Letter of 6 August 1971 from Portugal (transmitting letter of 24 July 1971 from Portugal to Chairman of Special Mission established under Security Council resolution 294(1971)).

Security Council, meetings 1586, 1599-1601.

S/10308 and Corr.1. Report of 16 September 1971 of Special Mission of Security Council established under resolution 294(1971).

S/10342. Letter of 28 September 1971 from Senegal (request to participate in Council's discussion).

S/10343. Letter of 29 September 1971 from Portugal.

S/10388 and Corr.1. Letter of 15 November 1971 from Senegal.

S/10395. Burundi, Sierra Leone, Somalia: draft resolution.

RESOLUTION 302(1971), as proposed by 3 powers, S/10395, as orally amended by sponsors and by Argentina, adopted by Council on 24 November 1971, meeting 1601, by 14 votes to 0, with 1 abstention (United States).

The Security Council,

Considering the complaints by Senegal against Portugal contained in documents S/10182 and S/10251,

Recalling its resolutions 178(1963) of 24 April 1963, 204(1965) of 19 May 1965 and 273(1969) of 9 December 1969,

Having considered the report of the Special Mission of the Security Council established in accordance with resolution 294(1971) of 15 July 1971,

Deeply concerned at the climate of insecurity and instability, fraught with a threat to peace and security in the region,

Affirming the need to ensure the prerequisites for eliminating the causes of tension in the region and creating an atmosphere of trust, peace and security, as recommended by the Special Mission in its report,

1. Expresses its appreciation for the work accomplished by the Special Mission of the Security Council established under resolution 294(1971);

2. Takes note with satisfaction of the recommendations of the Special Mission contained in paragraph 128 of its report;

3. Reaffirms the provisions of its resolution 294(1971) condemning the acts of violence and destruction perpetrated since 1963 by the Portuguese armed forces of Guinea (Bissau) against the population and villages of Senegal;

4. Strongly deplores the lack of co-operation with the Special Mission on the part of the Portuguese Government, which prevented the Special Mission from implementing fully the mandate given to it under paragraph 4 of resolution 294(1971);

5. Calls upon the Government of Portugal to take immediate effective measures:

(a) So that the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Senegal shall be fully respected;

(b) To prevent acts of violence and destruction against the territory and the people of Senegal, in order to contribute to the safeguarding of peace and security in the region;

6. Calls upon the Government of Portugal to respect fully the inalienable right to self-determination and independence of the people of Guinea (Bissau);

7. Calls upon the Government of Portugal to take without further delay the necessary measures, so that this inalienable right of the people of Guinea (Bissau) shall be exercised;

8. Requests the President of the Security Council and the Secretary-General to keep this question under review and report on the implementation of the present resolution to the Council within an appropriate period and at the latest within six months;

9. Declares that, in the event of failure by Portugal to comply with the provisions of the present resolution, the Security Council will meet to consider the initiatives and steps that the situation requires;

10. Decides to remain seized of the question.

A/8402. Report of Security Council, 16 June 1970-15 June 1971, Chapter 12.

### Complaints by Guinea and Portugal

Security Council, meetings 1573, 1576.

S/10118. Letter of 16 February 1971 from Portugal.

S/10125, S/10145. Letters of 17 February and 4 March 1971 from Guinea.

S/10156. Letter of 12 March 1971 from Portugal.

S/10180 and Add.1. Replies of Governments to Secretary-General's note verbale of 18 December 1970 transmitting text of Security Council resolution 290(1970). Note by Secretary-General.

S/10280. Letter of 3 August 1971 from Guinea (request to convene Council).

S/10281. Burundi, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic: draft resolution.

S/10282. Letter of 3 August 1971 from Guinea (request to participate in Council's discussion).

RESOLUTION 295(1971), as submitted by 4 powers, S/10281, as orally revised by sponsors in consultation with Council members, adopted unanimously by Council on 3 August 1971, meeting 1573.

The Security Council,

Taking note of the letter addressed to the President of the Security Council by the Permanent Representative of Guinea,

Having heard the statement of the Permanent Representative of Guinea,

Bearing in mind that all States Members of the United Nations must refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations,

1. Affirms that the territorial integrity and political independence of the Republic of Guinea must be respected;

2. Decides to send a special mission of three members of the Security Council to Guinea to consult with the authorities and to report on the situation immediately;

3. Decides that this special mission be appointed after consultation between the President of the Security Council and the Secretary-General;

4. Decides to maintain the matter on its agenda.

S/10283, S/10287. Letters of 4 and 12 August 1971 from Guinea.

S/10299. Note of 26 August 1971 by President of Security Council and Secretary-General.

S/INF/27. Resolutions and decisions of Security Council, 1971. Decision, p. 4: consensus, approved by Council on 26 August 1971, meeting 1576.

"It is the consensus of the Security Council that the Special Mission called for in resolution 295(1971) should be composed of two members of the Council instead of three. The Special Mission will proceed to Conakry to consult the Government of the Republic of Guinea on its complaint and will report back to the Council as soon as possible."

Security Council, meetings 1586, 1603.

S/10309/Rev.1. Report of Security Council Special Mission to Republic of Guinea established under resolution 295(1971).  
S/10344. Letter of 29 September 1971 from Portugal.  
S/10393. Letter of 19 November 1971 from Ivory Coast.  
S/INF/27. Resolutions and decisions of Security Council, 1971. Decision, p. 5: consensus, approved by Council on 30 November 1971, meeting 1603.

"It will be recalled that on 3 August the Security Council decided to dispatch a Special Mission to the Republic of Guinea. The Special Mission, consisting of the representative of Syria, Ambassador George J. Tomeh, and the deputy representative of Argentina, Minister Julio César Carasales, visited Guinea from 30 August to 2 September 1971 and held extensive consultations with officials of the Government of Guinea.

"In those consultations, the Guinean authorities co-operated fully with the Special Mission and extended to it all the facilities necessary for the successful achievement of its task.

"Upon its return to New York and in accordance with its terms of reference, the Special Mission submitted its report to the Security Council, circulated as document S/10309. The Council began its first examination of the report of the Special Mission at its 1586th meeting on 29 September 1971.

"It is evident from this report that there is continuing concern in

Guinea regarding the possibility of renewed acts against that country's territorial integrity and political independence similar to those which led to the events of November 1970. In this respect, the view has been expressed by the Government of Guinea that action should be taken by the Security Council to prevent Portugal from violating the territorial integrity and political independence of Guinea.

"It is also clear that the failure by Portugal to apply the principle of self-determination, including the right to independence, in Guinea (Bissau) is having an unsettling effect on conditions in the area.

"The Security Council, having taken note with appreciation of the report of the Special Mission and the representations made by the Government of Guinea, reiterates paragraph 1 of resolution 295(1971) which 'affirms that the territorial integrity and political independence of the Republic of Guinea must be respected'."

A/8401. Report of Secretary-General on work of the Organization, 16 June 1970-15 June 1971, Part One, Chapter IV H.

A/8402. Report of Security Council, 16 June 1970-15 June 1971, Chapter 7.

Complaint by Zambia against Portugal

S/10225. Letter of 15 June 1971 from Zambia.

A/8402. Report of Security Council, 16 June 1970-15 June 1971, Chapter 14.

## United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa

The United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa continued during 1970-1971 to grant scholarships for education and training to persons from Namibia, South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and the territories under Portuguese administration.

Reporting to the General Assembly at its 1971 session on the progress of the Programme, the Secretary-General stated that during the period from 1 November 1970 to 8 December 1971, 25 States had pledged \$689,036. Total contributions to the Programme since its establishment in 1967 had amounted to \$1,937,282 as at 8 December 1971. (The target originally envisaged for the period 1968-1970 was \$3 million.)

During 1970-1971, 938 applications for training were received, 175 new awards were granted, and 381 awards were renewed. The majority of those who held scholarships were at educational institutions in Africa. Also during the year, 13 States offered scholarships.

The Advisory Committee on the Programme, established by the General Assembly in 1968, held four meetings in 1971 at which it discussed ways of expanding and strengthening the Programme and questions concerning the United Nations Fund for Namibia. (See pp. 556-57.)

On 20 December 1971, the General Assembly, noting that the voluntary contributions received in the period from 1968 to 1971 had fallen far short of the original three-year target, urgently ap-

pealed to all States, organizations and individuals to make generous contributions to the trust fund for the Programme so that it might not only be continued but also strengthened and expanded.

The Assembly decided that, as a transitional measure, provision should be made under the regular budget of the United Nations for the financial year 1972 for an amount of \$100,000 to ensure continuity of the Programme pending the receipt of adequate voluntary contributions.

The Assembly also took note with approval of the efforts made to strengthen co-operation between the Programme and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the specialized agencies and the Organization of African Unity, and hoped that those efforts would be continued with a view to further co-ordination of their activities in the field of education and training for persons from the territories concerned.

These decisions were set forth in resolution 2875(XXVI), adopted by a recorded vote of 121 to 2, on the recommendation of the Assembly's Fourth Committee, which had approved the text on 14 December 1971, by 90 votes to 2, on a proposal by Cameroon, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Ghana, India, the Ivory Coast, Kenya, Liberia, Nigeria, Norway, Senegal, Sweden, Tunisia, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia and Zambia. (For text of resolution, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

Table I. United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa: applications and awards

(1 November 1970-8 October 1971)

	Applications received	awards	Awards extended	Current scholarship holders
Namibia	31	14	53	67
South Africa	248	47	144	191
Southern Rhodesia	454	56	55	111
Territories under Portuguese administration	205	58	129	187
Total	938	175	381	556

Table II. Contributions pledged to the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa

(1 November 1970-8 December 1971)

Country	Pledge (in U.S. dollars)
Barbados	500
Burma	1,000
Total	689,036

Country	Pledge (in U.S. dollars)
Canada	50,000
Cyprus	478
Denmark	99,906
Federal Republic of Germany	85,000
Finland	30,000
France	100,000
Ghana	1,530
Greece	3,500
India	1,500
Indonesia	1,000
Iran	3,000
Iraq	1,500
Ireland	5,000
Japan	20,000
Kenya	2,002
Khmer Republic	1,000
Malaysia	1,000
Norway	75,000
Philippines	1,000
Sierra Leone	120
Sweden	80,000
United Kingdom	120,000
Yugoslavia	5,000
Total	689,036

## DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES

General Assembly—26th session

Fourth Committee, meetings 1953, 1956-1958, 1960, 1962-1968.

Fifth Committee, meeting 1487.

Plenary meeting 2028.

A/8401. Report of Secretary-General on work of the Organization, 16 June 1970-15 June 1971, Part Two, Chapter I C 6.

A/8485 and Add.1,2. Report of Secretary-General (covering period 1 November 1970-8 December 1971).

A/C.4/L.1001. Cameroon, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Ghana, India, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Liberia, Nigeria, Norway, Senegal, Sweden, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zambia: draft resolution, approved by Fourth Committee on 14 December 1971, meeting 1968, by 90 votes to 2.

A/C.4/L.1003, A/C.5/1424, A/8634. Administrative and financial implications of draft resolution recommended by Fourth Committee in A/8621. Statements by Secretary-General and report of Fifth Committee.

A/8621. Report of Fourth Committee.

RESOLUTION 2875(XXVI), as recommended by Fourth Committee, A/8621, adopted by Assembly on 20 December 1971, meeting 2028, by recorded vote of 121 to 2, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia,

Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Portugal, South Africa.

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 2349(XXII) of 19 December 1967, whereby it established an integrated educational and training programme for Namibians, South Africans, Southern Rhodesians and persons from Territories under Portuguese administration,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa,

Recalling its decision, contained in paragraph 7 of resolution 2349(XXII), that the Programme should be financed from a trust fund made up of voluntary contributions,

Further recalling that, by paragraph 8 of resolution 2349(XXII), it authorized the Secretary-General to appeal to States Members of the United Nations or members of specialized agencies for funds to achieve a target of \$U.S.3 million in the period from 1968 to 1970,

Noting that the voluntary contributions received in the four-year period from 1968 to 1971 have fallen far short of the original three-year target,

Noting further that such funds as have been made available have been expended annually to provide assistance in the form of individual awards to persons from the Territories concerned to further their education and that, consequently, additional funds are required if the Programme is to continue in operation,

Expressing its firm conviction that the provision of assistance for the education and training of persons from the Territories concerned is as essential as ever and should not only continue, but also be expanded,

1. Expresses its appreciation to all those who have made voluntary contributions to the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa since its inception;

2. Urgently appeals to all States, organizations and individuals to make generous contributions to the trust fund for the Programme so that it might not only be continued, but also strengthened and expanded;

3. Decides that, as a further transitional measure, provision shall be made, under section 12 of the regular budget of the United Nations for the financial year 1972, for an amount of \$100,000 to ensure continuity of the Programme pending the receipt of adequate voluntary contributions;

4. Expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General and to the members of the Advisory Committee on the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa, established in pursuance of paragraph 2 of General Assembly

resolution 2431 (XXIII) of 18 December 1968, for the work they have accomplished during the period under review in connexion with the Programme;

5. Takes note with approval of the efforts made during the period under review to strengthen co-operation between the Programme and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the specialized agencies and the Organization of

African Unity, and hopes that these efforts will be continued with a view to further co-ordination of their activities in the field of education and training for persons from the Territories concerned;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session on the progress of the Programme.

## Co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity

On 15 November 1971, the representatives of 36 African States requested the inclusion in the agenda of the General Assembly's current session of an item entitled: "Co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity: holding of meetings of the Security Council in an African capital."

In an explanatory memorandum these States recalled that the item on co-operation between the two bodies had been included in the agenda of the Assembly's 1965, 1966, 1967 and 1969 sessions. They also recalled that the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) had, at its eighth session, at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, in June 1971, adopted a resolution requesting the convening early in 1972 of a special session of the Security Council, in an African member country of OAU, devoted solely to the measures to be taken with a view to implementing the various Security Council and General Assembly resolutions on decolonization, the struggle against apartheid and racial discrimination in Africa.

The Assembly took up the item in plenary meetings. At the same time it considered a report by the Secretary-General on co-operation between the United Nations and OAU since 1 November 1967, the date of his last report. The report covered the following major topics: representation at meetings; technical co-operation offered by United Nations bodies at the request of OAU;

co-operation between OAU and the Economic Commission for Africa; and co-operation with respect to the situation in southern Africa.

On 20 December 1971, the General Assembly invited the Security Council to consider the OAU request to hold meetings of the Council in an African capital.

The Assembly took note with satisfaction of the Secretary-General's report and asked him to continue his efforts to intensify co-operation between the United Nations and OAU. It invited the specialized agencies and other United Nations organizations, particularly the United Nations Development Programme, to continue their co-operation with OAU.

These decisions were embodied in resolution 2863 (XXVI), adopted by 113 votes to 2, on the basis of a text proposed by the following 41 Members: Algeria, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Congo, Dahomey, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, the Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, the Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Zaire and Zambia. (For text of resolution, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

### DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES

General Assembly—26th session  
General Committee, meeting 196.  
Fifth Committee, meeting 1487.  
Plenary meetings 1990, 2025, 2027.

A/8386. Co-operation between United Nations and Organization of African Unity (OAU). Report of Secretary-General.  
A/8494 and Corr.1 and Add.1. Letter of 15 November 1971 from Algeria, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Dahomey, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Swaziland, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Zaire, Zambia (request for inclusion in agenda of item entitled: "Co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity: holding of meetings of the Security Council in an

African capital").  
A/8500/Add.3. Fourth report of General Committee.  
A/L.653. Algeria, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Dahomey, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Zaire, Zambia: draft resolution.  
A/C.5/1427, A/8631. Administrative and financial implications of 41-power draft resolution, A/L.653. Statement by Secretary-General and report of Fifth Committee.

RESOLUTION 2863 (XXVI), as proposed by 41 powers, A/L.653, adopted by Assembly on 20 December 1971, meeting 2027, by 113 votes to 2.

The General Assembly,

Taking note of the request by thirty-six African States for the holding early in the year 1972, in an African country member of the Organization of African Unity, of meetings of the Security Council devoted solely to the measures to be taken with a view to implementing the various resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly on decolonization, the struggle against apartheid and racial discrimination in Africa,

Taking note of the statement made by the Chairman of the Organization of African Unity before the General Assembly on 24 September 1971,

Recalling its resolutions 2011(XX) of 11 October 1965, 2193(XXI) of 15 December 1966 and 2505(XXIV) of 20 November 1969 on co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity,

Noting with satisfaction the increased co-operation between the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations, the specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system, especially in their efforts to solve the grave situation in southern Africa,

1. Takes note with satisfaction of the report of the Secretary-General on co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity;

2. Invites the Security Council to consider the request of the Organization of African Unity concerning the holding of meetings of the Council in an African capital;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to continue his efforts to intensify co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly;

4. Invites the specialized agencies and other organizations concerned within the United Nations system, particularly the United Nations Development Programme, to continue their co-operation with the Organization of African Unity;

5. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its twenty-seventh session the question of co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity.

#### Other documents

S/10272. Letter of 13 July 1971 from Executive Secretary of Organization of African Unity (OAU) to United Nations (transmitting resolutions adopted by 8th Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU).

S/10477. Letter of 23 December 1971 from Guinea.

S/10480. Letter of 29 December 1971 from Secretary-General (transmitting text of resolution 2863(XXVI)).