

At the 1576th meeting on 26 August 1971, the President (Italy) read out the following statement expressing the consensus of the Council, which was approved without objection:⁵³³

“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.”

Decision of 30 November 1971 (1603rd meeting) :

Statement by the President

On 14 September 1971, the Security Council Special Mission to the Republic of Guinea established under resolution 295 (1971) submitted its report.⁵³⁴ The report described the meetings at which Guinean officials had given detailed accounts of Guinea's complaint and had responded to questions by the members of the Special Mission as well as documentary and other material relating to that complaint submitted to the Special Mission by the Government of Guinea.

In a letter⁵³⁵ dated 29 September 1971 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of Portugal stated that a perusal of the report of the Special Mission had made it clear that the Mission had found no evidence to support Guinea's charges concerning imminent military aggression by Portugal but showed that the alleged intercepted conversations on which Guinea had based its complaint had taken place between two Guinean nationals. He expressed regret that the Security Council should have been asked to convene on such vague and misleading information.

At the 1586th meeting on 29 September 1971, the Security Council included⁵³⁶ the Special Mission's report in the agenda and considered it at that meeting and at the 1603rd meeting on 30 November 1971. At the 1586th meeting the representative of Guinea was invited⁵³⁷ to participate in the discussion.

At the 1586th meeting on 29 September 1971, the representative of Syria, one of the two members of the Special Mission, introduced⁵³⁸ the report.

The representative of Guinea* stated that the report was a faithful record of observed facts which clearly indicated the continuing threat posed by Portugal to the security of his country. He appealed to the Security Council to ensure the security of Guinea by enforcing General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) which guaranteed the right of self-determination to all peoples and by applying the necessary sanctions to Portugal in order to ensure its compliance with the relevant resolutions of the Council.⁵³⁹

At the 1603rd meeting on 30 November 1971, the President (Poland), with the authorization of the members of the Council,⁵⁴⁰ made the following statement of consensus on behalf of the Council:⁵⁴¹

⁵³³ 1576th meeting, paras. 4-5. See *OR, 26th yr., Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council 1971, p. 4.*

⁵³⁴ S/10309/Rev.1, *OR, 26th yr., Special Supplement No. 4.*

⁵³⁵ S/10344, *OR, 26th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1971, p. 69.*

⁵³⁶ 1586th meeting, preceding para. 92.

⁵³⁷ *Ibid.*, para. 92.

⁵³⁸ *Ibid.*, paras. 94-101.

⁵³⁹ *Ibid.*, paras. 109-112.

⁵⁴⁰ 1603rd meeting, para. 5.

⁵⁴¹ Decision of 30 November 1971, *OR, 26th yr., Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council 1971, p. 5.*

“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 of 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’.”

QUESTION OF BAHRAIN

INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

In a report⁵⁴² dated 28 March 1970, the Secretary-General informed the members of the Security Council that, in response to requests by the Governments of Iran and the United Kingdom and following extended consultations with the two parties, he had agreed to exercise his good offices in a matter pertaining to Bahrain. In agreeing to that, he had in mind that such action by the Secretary-General, at the request of Member States, had become customary in United Nations practice and in certain situations had proved to be a valuable means of relieving and preventing tension which could otherwise be prolonged or aggravated by premature disclosure and public debate.

The report contained the text of an announcement issued by the Secretary-General, after consultation with the parties, in which the Secretary-General outlined the events leading to his decision to exercise his good offices and quoted the terms of reference agreed upon by the Governments of Iran and the United Kingdom as follows: “Having regard to the problem created by the differing views of the parties concerned about the

⁵⁴² S/9726, *OR, 25th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1970, pp. 175-176.*

status of Bahrain and the need to find a solution to this problem in order to create an atmosphere of tranquillity, stability and friendliness throughout the area, the Secretary-General of the United Nations is requested by the parties concerned to send a personal representative to ascertain the wishes of the people of Bahrain". The announcement went on to state that, following consultations with the parties, the Secretary-General had designated Mr. Vittorio Winspeare Guicciardi, Under-Secretary-General and Director-General of the United Nations Office at Geneva, as his personal representative. The Secretary-General had been assured that the people of Bahrain would be enabled to express their wishes to him freely and privately. The personal representative was to submit his findings in a report to the Secretary-General, who would, in turn, as agreed by the parties concerned, transmit them to the Security Council for its consideration and endorsement.

In a note⁵⁴³ dated 30 April 1970, transmitting to the Security Council the report of his personal representative, the Secretary-General recalled that the Governments of Iran and the United Kingdom had undertaken to accept the results of his findings after, and subject to, their endorsement by the Security Council. The Secretary-General indicated that with the submission of his personal representative's report, his responsibilities in the exercise of his good offices with regard to Bahrain had been fully discharged. In his report, the personal representative stated that his consultations had convinced him that the overwhelming majority of the people of Bahrain wished to gain recognition of their identity in a fully independent and sovereign State, free to decide for itself its relations with other States.

By letter⁵⁴⁴ dated 4 May 1970, the representative of Iran requested a meeting of the Security Council to consider a report of the Secretary-General on the question of Bahrain.

By letter⁵⁴⁵ dated 5 May 1970, the representative of the United Kingdom submitted a similar request.

The item was included in the agenda⁵⁴⁶ and was considered by the Council at its 1536th meeting on 11 May 1970. The representatives of Iran,⁵⁴⁷ Southern Yemen⁵⁴⁸ and Pakistan⁵⁴⁹ were invited to participate in the discussion.

Decision of 11 May 1970 (1536th meeting) : resolution 278 (1970)

At the beginning of the 1536th meeting, the President (France) drew attention to a draft resolution,⁵⁵⁰ formulated as a result of consultation by the members of the Security Council prior to the meeting.

At the 1536th meeting on 11 May 1970 the draft resolution was unanimously adopted.⁵⁵¹ The resolution⁵⁵² read as follows:

"The Security Council,

"Noting the communication from the Secretary-General to the Security Council of 28 March 1970,

"Noting the statements made by the representatives of Iran and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in their letters to the Secretary-General of 9 March 1970 and 20 March 1970,

"1. Endorses the report of the Personal Representative of the Secretary-General which has been circulated to the Security Council, under cover of a note from the Secretary-General, on 30 April 1970;

"2. Welcomes the conclusions and findings of the report, in particular that 'the overwhelming majority of the people of Bahrain wish to gain recognition of their identity in a fully independent and sovereign State free to decide for itself its relations with other States'."

The representative of Iran* stated that with the decision taken by the Council the long-standing dispute between Iran and the United Kingdom had come to an end, both sides having agreed to defer to the wishes of the inhabitants of Bahrain as ascertained by the Secretary-General, if his findings were endorsed by the Security Council. The reduction of tension and the peaceful adjustment of an international difference would be welcomed by all who cherished the principles of the Charter. The Security Council had endorsed the Secretary-General's report, and Iran was abiding by that outcome and was certain that the basic human rights of persons of Iranian origin would be fully respected and safeguarded.⁵⁵³

The representative of the United Kingdom referred to the agreement reached on Bahrain as a classic example of how disputes could be settled peacefully. A deeply rooted dispute, which could have led to suspicion, mistrust and perhaps disruption, to the detriment of the people directly concerned, had been peacefully settled, thanks to a number of convergent favourable factors.⁵⁵⁴

The representatives of China, Colombia, Finland, France, Nepal, Pakistan,* Sierra Leone, the United States and Zambia referred to the agreement reached on Bahrain as an example of how disputes could be settled peacefully. By submitting the problem to the good offices of the Secretary-General and by accepting the results of his findings, the Governments of Iran and the United Kingdom had shown their faith in the principle of peaceful settlement. By agreeing to exercise his good offices the Secretary-General had acted in the best tradition of the United Nations. The results accomplished, said the representative of France, were within the spirit of the United Nations Charter, which under Article 33(1) provided that Member States could use any peaceful means they chose.⁵⁵⁵

The representative of the USSR stated that, regarding the procedure followed in the action undertaken by the Secretary-General, his Government adhered to the position set forth in its letter of 2 April 1970 to the Secretary-General.⁵⁵⁶ With regard to the substance of

⁵⁴³ S/9772, OK, 25th yr., Suppl., for April-June 1970, pp. 166-170.

⁵⁴⁴ S/9779, *ibid.* p. 175.

⁵⁴⁵ S/9783, *ibid.* p. 178.

⁵⁴⁶ 1536th meeting, para. 3.

⁵⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, para. 4.

⁵⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, para. 5.

⁵⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, para. 33.

⁵⁵⁰ S/9772 (mimeo).

⁵⁵¹ 1536th meeting, para. 7.

⁵⁵² Resolution 278 (1970).

⁵⁵³ 1536th meeting, paras. 10-16.

⁵⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, paras. 23-32.

⁵⁵⁵ For consideration of the provisions of Chapter VI, see chapter X, part I.

⁵⁵⁶ S/9737, OR, 25th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1970, p. 143. In the letter addressed to the President of the Security Council, the USSR Permanent Mission to the United Nations drew attention to the fact that the Secretary-General had considered it possible to communicate information to the members of the Security Council on an *ex post facto* basis, without consulting the members of the Council beforehand, concerning the adop-

the question under discussion, he stressed that the USSR had always favoured the implementation of the principles of self-determination, freedom and national independence of countries and nations under colonial domination, or in colonial or semi-colonial dependence on imperialism.⁵⁵⁷

QUESTION OF RACE CONFLICT IN SOUTH AFRICA

Decision of 23 July 1970 (1549th meeting) : resolution 282 (1970)

By letter⁵⁵⁸ dated 15 July 1970, the representatives of Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Dahomey, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, India, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, People's Republic of the Congo, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia and Zambia requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to resume consideration of the question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa with a view to examining in particular the situation arising from violations of the arms embargo called for in Security Council resolutions 181 (1963), 182 (1963) and 191 (1964). Despite these resolutions, the letter added, a number of Member States continued to furnish South Africa with all types of aircraft, helicopters, heavy arms and other equipment which were being used for the imposition of its racist policies and for military aggression against freedom-loving peoples. The information on the extent of these violations had been provided over the years in the reports of the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa, including the most recent communication⁵⁵⁹ from the Chairman of the Committee to the President of the Security Council.

of measures in connexion with the problem of Bahrain, which related to a type of situation that could lead to complications in international relations. It emphasized that under the United Nations Charter, decisions on matters connected with action by the United Nations relating to the maintenance of international peace and security should be taken by the Security Council. In his reply (S/9738, OR, 25th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1970, pp. 143-144), the Secretary-General stated that his position on the exercise of his good offices had been set forth in his letter of 7 March 1969 (S/9055, OR, 24th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1969, p. 110). However, the Secretary-General felt that it might be useful to call attention to one aspect of the question. From time to time, States Members approached the Secretary-General directly, asking for the exercise of his good offices, because they considered that a difference between them might be capable of an amicable solution if dealt with at an early stage quietly and diplomatically. If the proposals were fully consistent with the purposes and principles of the Charter and in no way impinged upon the authority of the Security Council or any other United Nations organ, he felt obligated to assist Member States in the manner requested. To do otherwise would be to thwart a commendable effort by Member States to abide by the principle of peaceful settlement of disputes. The good offices in Bahrain entailed only a fact-finding mission, and a report thereon would be presented to the Council, so that any substantive action would be taken only by that organ.

⁵⁵⁷ 1536th meeting, paras. 73-86. For texts of other relevant statements, see: *ibid.*: China, paras. 125-126; Colombia, para. 89; Finland, paras. 131-132; France, paras. 154-158; Nepal, paras. 120-122; Pakistan, paras. 143-150; Sierra Leone, paras. 94-97; Spain, paras. 63-66; United States, paras. 53-56; Zambia, paras. 111-116.

⁵⁵⁸ S/9867, OR, 25th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1970, p. 106.

⁵⁵⁹ S/9859 and Corr. 1, *ibid.*, pp. 75-76.

cil. The failure of the Security Council to denounce the violations had encouraged other States to reconsider their commitment to the observance of the embargo. The violations of the embargo had enabled the Government of South Africa to amass considerable military power, which it used not only to impose its racist policies but also to flout the decisions of the United Nations with regard to Namibia, Southern Rhodesia and the Portuguese-occupied Territories of Angola and Mozambique. In addition, its military power was being employed to threaten the sovereignty of neighbouring independent African States. Any further weakening of the arms embargo would have grave consequences both for the United Nations and for the peoples of southern Africa and would seriously prejudice relations between African States and those States who were contravening the embargo. Subsequently, the representative of Chad associated himself with the above request for a Council meeting.⁵⁶⁰

At the 1545th meeting on 17 July 1970, the Security Council included the item in its agenda⁵⁶¹ and considered the question at the 1545th to 1549th meetings between 17 and 23 July 1970. The representatives of India, Mauritius, Somalia,⁵⁶² Ghana and Pakistan⁵⁶³ were invited to participate in the discussion.

At the 1545th meeting on 17 July 1970, the representative of Mauritius,* speaking as Chairman of the African group at that time, stated that, in spite of the arms embargo imposed by the Council, the South African Government had continued to receive arms and military equipment as well as spare parts from a number of countries and had been able to receive licences, technical assistance and foreign capital for an expanded manufacture of arms, ammunition, military vehicles and other equipment. The views of these States that the embargo covered only arms which could be used for internal repression and for imposing *apartheid* and that, consequently, they could provide South Africa with the arms and equipment it needed for its external defence was no longer valid, inasmuch as South Africa had committed itself not only to a policy of repression of the organized opposition to its own racial policies but also to a policy of military and economic support of the white minority régimes elsewhere in southern Africa. South Africa and Southern Rhodesia had been conducting against the combined forces of the liberation movements of South Africa and Zimbabwe a guerrilla warfare in which South Africa had been using arms and equipment supposedly supplied for its external defence. Furthermore, South Africa had repeatedly threatened the independent States of southern Africa for their support of the opponents of *apartheid*. The African States therefore called for a complete and mandatory embargo on arms, ammunition, military equipment and vehicles to South Africa, not only because the military build-up of South Africa enabled her to defy the United Nations but also because it constituted a serious threat to international peace and security.⁵⁶⁴

At the same meeting, the representative of Somalia,* who was Chairman of the Special Committee on *Apartheid*, stated that, contrary to the hopes that had been raised by establishment of the arms embargo and by

⁵⁶⁰ 1545th meeting, President (Nicaragua), paras. 11-13.

⁵⁶¹ *Ibid.*, preceding para. 10.

⁵⁶² *Ibid.*, para. 10.

⁵⁶³ 1546th meeting, para. 13.

⁵⁶⁴ 1545th meeting, paras. 17-38.