

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



1164th
PLENARY MEETING

Tuesday, 6 November 1962,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 87:

The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa;

(a) *Race conflict in South Africa;*

(b) *Treatment of people of Indian and Indo-Pakistan origin in the Republic of South Africa*

Report of the Special Political Committee . . . 659

President: Mr. Muhammad ZAFRULLA KHAN
(Pakistan).

AGENDA ITEM 87

The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa:

(a) *Race conflict in South Africa;*

(b) *Treatment of people of Indian and Indo-Pakistan origin in the Republic of South Africa*

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/5276)

1. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has before it the report of the Special Political Committee [A/5276]. The financial implications of the draft resolution recommended by the Special Committee are to be found in paragraph 9 of the Committee's report.

2. In addition, amendments to the draft resolution have been submitted by Trinidad and Tobago [A/L.400].

3. Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark) (Rapporteur of the Special Political Committee): I have the honour to submit for the consideration of the General Assembly the Committee's report on the question of the policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa.

4. This year, for the first time, the consideration of the Committee covered both the question of race conflict in South Africa and that of the treatment of people of Indian and Indo-Pakistan origin in that country. The question was included in the agenda at the request of forty-eight delegations and over the objection of the representative of South Africa.

5. Again, this year, the General Assembly allocated the item to the Special Political Committee. The Committee devoted sixteen meetings to its examination of this matter. The representative of South Africa did not attend the meetings.

6. I believe that the thoroughness of the Committee's examination is attested to by the fact that seventy-two delegations expressed their views in the course of the general debate and every one condemned the racial policies maintained by the Government of the Republic of South Africa.

7. During the course of the discussion, a draft resolution was tabled in the Committee by thirty-four delegations, to which amendments were presented by the delegation of Guatemala. Seventeen statements were made during the discussion of the texts which had been presented, and fourteen delegations made statements in explanation of their vote.

8. When the Committee reached the voting stage, some representatives requested that parts of the draft resolution be voted on separately. This was objected to by the representative of Ghana. It was decided, by a roll-call vote of 46 to 39, with 11 abstentions, that the draft resolution should not be voted upon in parts. Accordingly, the draft resolution was voted upon as a whole. It was adopted by a roll-call vote of 60 to 16, with 21 abstentions.

9. Therefore, I now place before this Assembly the draft resolution recommended by the Special Political Committee, which is to be found in paragraph 13 of the report before the Assembly [A/5276].

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the Special Political Committee.

10. The PRESIDENT: Before I call upon any speakers who wish to explain their vote on the draft resolution recommended by the Special Political Committee [A/5276] and on the amendments proposed by Trinidad and Tobago [A/L.400], I have to explain to the Assembly that the amendments proposed by Trinidad and Tobago are still in the course of being processed and, naturally, we cannot proceed further unless they have been made available to the Members. That will take a little time. Unless there is any objection, I propose to suspend the meeting until 12 noon, so that the amendments should become available.

11. If any Member should wish to speak in explanation of vote before I suspend the meeting, I should be glad to call upon him.

12. The representative of South Africa had sent up his name, stating that he desired to speak in explanation of vote. If he should wish to speak at this stage, I shall be happy to call upon him.

13. Mr. LOUW (South Africa): In the course of the debate in the Special Political Committee, South Africa was once more—with a few exceptions—the target of violent attacks by most of the speakers. It was what The New York Times correctly described as a "bitter debate". The draft resolution now before the Assembly [A/5276] is based largely on a series of unfounded allegations and of distortions of fact alleged in the debate in the Special Political Committee. One of the more general allegations in the draft resolution before the Assembly is the "total disregard by the ... Republic of South Africa of its Charter obligations". This is one of the grounds for the demand that punitive measures—that is, sanctions—be taken against South

Africa. May I say in passing that, on that ground, I could name a number of Member States against which action could be taken. But, of course, the double standard will prevail.

14. Now, on what grounds are measures sought to be taken against South Africa? Is South Africa to be punished because, per caput of our non-white population and particularly of our Bantu population, more schools, both primary and secondary, are available for the non-whites than in the countries of most of the sponsors of this resolution? Four out of every five Bantu children are at school, and that number is increasing steadily.

15. Is South Africa to be punished, in the terms of this resolution, because, per caput of our non-white population, more beds are available for non-whites in our hospitals than in any other State in the continent of Africa? For instance, in the Baragwanath Hospital at Johannesburg, there are 2,500 beds; ample provision for the treatment and also for the hospitalization of Bantu and non-whites is made in all our cities and also in all our towns.

16. Are sanctions to be applied against South Africa because, per caput of our non-white population, more housing has been provided for non-white occupation than in many of the countries which, in the Special Political Committee, voted for this resolution? So it is also with regard to money spent on social services for the Bantu, such as for old-age pensions and disability grants.

17. I ask: Is South Africa to be punished because there are more non-white students attending universities than in any State in Africa, and probably in any other States that supported this resolution? Are sanctions to be applied to South Africa because facilities are provided for agricultural training of Bantu in their own territories?

18. Is South Africa to be punished because self-government, ultimately leading to independence, is being progressively introduced in the Bantu territories?

19. It would appear that those delegations that have attacked and maligned South Africa, and which are sponsoring this draft resolution, are more concerned about the system of "one man one vote", that is, with whites and non-whites voting together, than they are concerned about the welfare and the prosperity of the Bantu who vote in their own territories for their own representatives.

20. One of the delegates described the Transkei plan as a "sham". What do he and his fellow-delegates know about it, except, of course, what they have learned from distorted and false reports appearing, not only in the newspapers; but put out by two subversive Bantu organizations—which, I may add here have the support of only a small percentage of the Bantu people—or information they have got from Bantu expatriates in Africa, Europe and the United States, or information which they have received from the American Committee on Africa here in New York.

21. For instance, in connexion with the matter which also forms a basis of this draft resolution, do they know that only two or three weeks ago Chief Matanzima, who will be the Prime Minister of the new Transkei Government, addressing a gathering of Bantu, made the following statement:

"If there should be a war involving the Republic, every regiment of Transkei will stand side by side with the Government of the Republic."

22. But when I give authentic information, as I did in the general debates, in 1960 [905th meeting], 1961 [1033rd meeting] and again this year at the present General Assembly [1128th meeting], I am told in so many words that I am giving false information, and the General Assembly is then asked, as they have been asked today, to take punitive measures against South Africa.

23. I repeat, how many leaders of delegations, particularly the sponsors of the draft resolution before the Assembly, have any knowledge about conditions in South Africa except what they have learned, as I have said, from these distorted Press dispatches and from members of subversive Bantu organizations now living outside of the country? Why do they not check up on the information, by consulting, for instance, American and British business-men who regularly visit South Africa and who have studied conditions there?

24. An unsavoury aspect of the anti-South African campaign is that a number of delegations, and particularly the sponsors of the draft resolution before the Assembly, knowing of some unsatisfactory conditions existing in their own countries—the insufficiency of schools, of medical care, of social services and of decent housing, to say nothing of discriminatory practices—are quite prepared to condemn South Africa in this draft resolution. In view of unsatisfactory conditions prevailing in their own countries, they do not have the moral right to judge South Africa, and they certainly do not have the right to accuse South Africa of not carrying out the precepts of Articles 55 and 56 of the Charter, and still less to support the draft resolution now before the Assembly.

25. In the past, both in the Special Political Committee and in the draft resolution before this Assembly, the main charge against South Africa is that of discrimination against non-whites.

26. For the purpose of the record it is necessary that I should once more ask what business the internal affairs, the domestic affairs of South Africa, are of any individual delegation or of this Assembly. I pointed out before that these delegations are the very first to object if any motion comes before this Assembly affecting their own internal affairs. Therefore I say, what business is it of these delegations and of this Assembly to ask that sanctions be applied to South Africa on account of purely domestic affairs of our country; or to ask in terms of the draft resolution that these sanctions will be applied if South Africa does not abandon its policy.

27. In view of the fact that our opponents and the supporters of this draft resolution have again relied on Articles 55 and 56 of the Charter, relating to fundamental human rights and freedoms, as justification for their demand to apply sanctions against South Africa, may I, once more—I have done it before—challenge delegates to come to this rostrum and to explain how they get past the clear conditions attached to Articles 55 and 56 in a resolution unanimously passed by the plenary session of the San Francisco Conference, namely

"Nothing contained in Chapter IX [which includes Articles 55 and 56] can be construed as giving

authority to the Organization to intervene in the domestic affairs of Member States."

28. When this matter was discussed at San Francisco, Mr. John Foster Dulles, later United States Secretary of State, gave strong support to that resolution. He was speaking on behalf of the United States and he said:

"Article 2, paragraph 7 presents a new and basic principle governing the entire Organization, namely, that the Organization in none of its branches, in none of its organs, shall intervene in what is essentially the domestic life of one of its Member States."

And then he went on to say, and I quote this particularly:

"The Organization is going to deal with Governments of Member States ... and not itself to penetrate into the economic and social life of Member States."

29. I suggest it is the duty of those delegations, which in 1945 committed their respective countries by voting for that resolution, to tell the Assembly why they do not adhere to the conditions specifically agreed upon by their respective delegations at the plenary session of the San Francisco Conference. Those delegations that decline to take note of the resolution passed at the founding conference at San Francisco must please not try to argue that the condition was not incorporated in the Charter. We are here concerned, not merely with opinions expressed in the course of the discussion at San Francisco, but with a resolution formally adopted by the plenary session of the founding conference.

30. Operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution before the Assembly "reaffirms"—I quote the word "reaffirms"—that alleged conditions in South Africa "endanger international peace and security". The purpose of those statements, of course, is to try to secure action by the Security Council. Those delegates have evidently forgotten that the same allegations were made in connexion with South West Africa, and that after two United Nations emissaries recently visited that territory they had to admit, both in the course of the Pretoria discussions and in the later communiqué, that they had found no evidence in support of those allegations.

31. One of the Western delegates, referring to our Government's policy of self-government for the Transkei, repeated the baseless charge that it is an attempt to confine the Bantu to the poorest region of South Africa. The fact is that the Transkei is one of the most fertile parts of the Cape Province. Again a case of delegates relying upon information that is completely false, and on the strength of which it is now being demanded today that sanctions be applied against South Africa.

32. I come now to the important question: What is the basis of South Africa's policy of separate and parallel development of whites and non-whites—the policy condemned in the draft resolution before the Assembly, and on account of which the imposition of sanctions is demanded? Put briefly, it is the natural and elemental human urge to survive, an urge that is common to every nation represented in this Assembly. That is something which should be understood and appreciated by the white population of the North American countries, whose early history is similar to that of the European population of South Africa.

33. The original Dutch immigrants came to Table Bay a short time after the first Dutch immigrants landed on Manhattan Island. At about the same time

the first Bantu immigrants from Central and East Africa crossed the Limpopo River, the present northern boundary of South Africa. The Dutch in South Africa were later followed by French Huguenot, and still later by English immigrants.

34. The first European settlers in North America found a country inhabited by what became known as Red Indians.

35. In South Africa, the Bantu population has during the past three centuries of European occupation very greatly increased and it is still annually increasing. Between 1951 and 1960, a nine year period, the Bantu population increased in South Africa by 26.3 per cent, in spite of these allegations of "ill-treatment", "oppression", "poverty" and even "slavery". During the same period the European population increased by only 16.1 per cent. It is on such grounds that the Assembly is asked to take punitive measures against South Africa.

36. During more than three centuries, the white population of South Africa has built up and developed the country into what it is today, unquestionably the most advanced and highly industrialized State on the whole of the African continent. Also in the scientific sphere, particularly in medical research, South Africa today occupies a leading position not only in Africa, but in the Southern Hemisphere.

37. The delegations from thirty-two African, Asian and Middle Eastern countries are, in effect, by the draft resolution before the Assembly, asking the permanent white population to abdicate, and to hand over to the Bantu what has been accomplished during the past three centuries. The position of South Africa's permanent white population is in no way different from that of the descendants of the original immigrants that established their homes in North America and developed the United States and Canada to what they are today. South Africans of Dutch, French and also of British descent, cannot return to live in their respective countries of origin—any more than, shall I say, the Roosevelts can return to Holland, the Eisenhowers to Germany or the Duponts to France. This is their home. And so also we are South Africans. We know no other home but South Africa. The African representatives speak of us as "settlers". Will they be consistent and speak of the old-established American families as "settlers" in this country?

38. I return to the point which I have made, namely, that the reason for South Africa's acknowledged policy of separate and parallel development is the elemental human urge to survive, an urge that is common to every nation represented here today. I would add that this policy is also for the purpose of allowing the different racial groups to live peacefully side by side.

39. Speaking in London eighteen months ago, Dr. Verwoerd, the South African Prime Minister, dealt with this particular aspect of South Africa's problem. These are the words of the Prime Minister—a policy statement:

"We do not only seek and fight for a solution which will mean our survival as a white race, but we also seek a solution which will ensure survival and full development—political and economic—to each of the other racial groups, and we are even prepared to pay a high price out of our earnings, to ensure their future. The moral, as well as the political, problem is to find a way out of this extremely difficult and complicated situation, caused by the fact that no

longer is the Bantu incapable or undesirous of participation in the control of his destiny. Nor are we any longer prepared to refuse the fulfilment of such ambitions in a form that is fair to everybody."

After comparing the very different conditions existing in other parts of Africa, the Prime Minister went on to say:

"We want each of our population groups to control and to govern themselves, as is the case with other nations. Then they can co-operate as in a Commonwealth—in an economic association with the Republic and with each other. In the transition stage the guardian must teach and guide his ward. That is our policy of separate development. South Africa will proceed in all honesty and fairness to secure peace, prosperity and justice for all, by means of political independence, coupled with economic interdependence."

40. Speaking in the South African Parliament, the Prime Minister made another policy statement and he said that the basis of the Government's policy was to get away from white domination. He said:

"That is why we adopt the policy that the Bantu, wherever he may live in different areas of his own must be given political control and domination or dominion over his own areas and people... They should be able to go to the highest level, and we want to help them to attain that position... I foresee that the eventual outcome of this policy will be one of no discrimination and no domination."

41. The permanent white population of South Africa whose forebears, over three centuries, developed and built up the country to what it is today are not prepared to abdicate and to hand over that part of the country which traditionally has been the home of the white population to the control of the Bantu majority. Rather do we follow the policy outlined in the statement of the Prime Minister, namely, the development of each population group within its own area and within its own territory.

42. In accordance with that policy, the area of the Bantu territories has in the past years been enlarged by Government purchases of adjacent white-owned farms. Steps were taken to improve the territories in various ways, such as by combating soil erosion, by fencing projects and the building of dams. The young men are being instructed in modern agricultural methods, and cattle of good stock have been introduced to improve their herds.

43. A few years ago the Bantu Authorities Act was passed, which was designed to give a greater measure of authority to Bantu chiefs. It is this Act that forms the basis of the recently adopted measures which will ultimately give the Bantu territories full self-government.

44. Meanwhile, the interests of the urban Bantu, the Bantu living in cities in the white areas, have received the attention of the Government, such as the provision of large housing schemes, schools, hospitals and social services.

45. Subversive Bantu organizations in South Africa, which—as I have said—enjoy the support of only a small percentage of the Bantu people, with active encouragement from small white communist and ultra-Liberalist groups, have fully realized that the active and progressive steps taken by the Government are having a favourable reaction among the Bantu, particu-

larly in their own territories, and they are therefore doing their best to undermine the Government's plans and to create discontent among the Bantu. As I have said, expatriate members of these subversive organizations are very active in carrying on an anti-South African campaign overseas—particularly in London and also here in New York.

46. During the discussion in the Special Political Committee, there have been repeated attacks on South Africa's so-called "Sabotage Act". It has been described not only by African-Asian, but also by Western, delegations as an inhuman measure whereby all the known principles of law and of the administration of justice have been thrown overboard.

47. It was with this legislation in mind, that the draft resolution now before the Assembly refers to the enforcement of "measures of increasing ruthlessness". A number of delegates complained in the Special Political Committee that this legislative measure "gives to the South African Government the almost unlimited right to restrict personal freedom and the civil liberty of the subject", and that "it is designed to silence criticism of the régime, and to eliminate all elements seeking to bring about political and economic change". I will not mention the names of the delegates who come with that accusation—the President would probably rule me out of order.

48. I presume that those who have used this legislation as a basis for the demand that sanctions be applied against South Africa have read the statement of the Minister of Justice, Mr. Balthazar Vorster, when he moved the second reading of this Bill in our Parliament—if they have not read that statement they should not come to the Committee and to the Assembly to complain of that legislation. If so, they will know that previously our laws in South Africa made no provision for dealing with sabotage in the modern sense of that term. They will also know that the measure was introduced because of several acts of attempted sabotage by plastic bombs and other explosives—attempts to destroy buildings, attempts to destroy pylons for high power electric wires and also railroad tracks. In at least two cases, the attempted sabotage was the work of white agitators. Sabotage of this nature is likely to lead to loss of life, and for that reason the legislation was introduced in our Parliament. The Bill was drafted to include other forms of sabotage which would seriously damage property or which would endanger not only life but also the welfare of the State.

49. Our critics of this measure, who, I presume, have read the statement by the Minister of Justice, otherwise they have no right to criticize, will know that no proceedings can be taken against any persons under the provisions of that Act merely on the initiative of the police or on the initiative of the public prosecutor. Such action must be specially sanctioned by the Attorney-General of the province.

50. Reference has been made to the abolition of trial by jury in these cases, which has been criticized by some delegations. I can inform the Assembly that the jury system has almost fallen into desuetude in South Africa, by reason of the fact that our law provides that an accused person can elect whether he wishes to be tried by a jury, or by a Judge of the Supreme Court sitting with two Assessors, generally senior magistrates. The reason for this arrangement of a Judge and two Assessors is, of course, that in our country all magistrates are appointed on the basis of ability and

training as members of the public service. Judges of the Supreme Court are selected from senior members of the legal profession. Such appointments are made only on merit and on their standing in the profession. In South Africa judges and magistrates are not elected by popular vote at contested elections. Once a judge or magistrate has been appointed he is in no way affiliated with, or under obligation to, any political party. He is absolutely free to do as he pleases, according to his judgement.

51. I wish to deal briefly with paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, in which Member States are requested to take certain punitive measures, generally known as sanctions, against South Africa. As I have already indicated, this request is based on allegations which in many cases are blatantly false and in other cases grossly distorted. In both cases they are actuated by enmity and even hatred, not only of South Africans, not only of the South African Government, but of the white man as such. We see manifestations of that feeling also in other neighbouring African territories.

52. For the purpose of considering a draft resolution asking that punitive measures be taken against a Member State, the General Assembly, and this is of great importance, assumes a character similar to that of a criminal court of law, which is called upon to judge as to the guilt, or otherwise, of the accused person. I submit that the principles observed in the judicial system of all civilized countries should, in a case like the present, be applied also by the United Nations Assembly. Above all, the General Assembly should be satisfied that convincing evidence has been produced before reaching a definite conclusion on this matter.

53. A feeling of "abhorrence"—a word used in the Special Political Committee—or vague charges such as "oppression" and "stifling freedom and dignity", these are not sufficient. Nor would "hearsay evidence" which was the main feature of the charges made against South Africa in the special Political Committee, be accepted by a court of law in any civilized country. Then, there is our old friend, namely that "international peace and security are endangered". Is it seriously suggested that international freedom is endangered merely because a number of Member States, for reasons of their own, annually choose to attack South Africa—or any other country, for that matter? The allegation that a particular action or event, however unimportant, is a "danger to international peace and security" is being made so often, also in other issues before the Assembly, that it is in danger of becoming an international cliché. It is twice used in the draft resolution now before the Assembly.

54. May I point out that there must be at least two parties, if there is to be a threat to world peace. South Africa certainly has no intention of creating a situation such as is envisaged in the Charter. Such a situation can only arise if there are Member States that are contemplating aggressive action against South Africa. Then such a situation could arise.

55. If the General Assembly is really worried about world peace being endangered as the result of South Africa's policy, then it will have to look elsewhere for the incitement which is likely to lead to a situation such as is contemplated by the draft resolution now before the Assembly.

56. One of the charges in the draft resolution before the Assembly is that "South Africa is flouting world opinion". May I ask: Does a majority of this Assembly

represent "world opinion"? If so, then I suggest that there has been an enormous amount of "flouting" since the United Nations was established. I should in any case like to be informed which Article of the Charter provides for punitive action for an alleged "flouting of world opinion".

57. South Africa is also charged with disregarding its obligations under the Charter. Which obligations has South Africa disregarded, I should like to know? The reference here is presumably to Articles 55 and 56 of the Charter, and I want to ask the question, how many Member States—particularly those sponsoring this resolution—are, to the same extent as South Africa, carrying out the obligations set out in sub-paragraphs a and b of Article 55 for promoting in their respective countries "higher standards of living", "full employment", "conditions of economic progress", "solution of social, health and related problems"? How many delegations are carrying out those obligations of the Charter—how many? I shall go further and I shall ask how many Member States are carrying out sub-paragraph c, relating to "human rights and freedoms"?

58. Will this Assembly be prepared to entertain a request for sanctions to be applied to Member States that do not carry out the obligations set out in Article 55 of the Charter? I would say that I could draw up quite a formidable indictment against most of the Member States sponsoring this draft resolution.

59. I wish to repeat also what I have said on previous occasions—that it is an accepted principle in the legal systems of all civilized countries that "a complainant", and the sponsors of draft resolutions are complainants, "must come to court with clean hands". I leave it at that.

60. I must warn this Assembly that Member States who support this draft resolution, which is based on false and unsubstantiated allegations and on vague charges relating to the endangering of international peace and security, will be helping to create a very dangerous precedent, a precedent which, at some time in the future, may react on some of them.

61. Operative paragraph 8 of the resolution before the Assembly envisages the expulsion of the Republic of South Africa from the United Nations. I shall say no more than that once the United Nations starts expelling Member States, that will be the beginning of the end of the United Nations. The position of the Organization is not so strong nor its prestige so high, that it can afford to take such risks.

62. The PRESIDENT: I recognize the representative of the United States who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

63. Mr. PLIMPTON (United States of America): I should like to reject any comparison between the United States and the Government of South Africa such as the representative of that Government has attempted to make. The policies and practices of the South African Government have been thoroughly described in these debates. As to the policies and practices of the United States Government, I do not think I need to repeat the complete opposition of our Government, supported by the overwhelming majority of our citizens, to any such policies or practices, and to racial discrimination in all its forms. We reject apartheid; we believe that in the partnership of the races and not in the separation of races lies man's best hope for a peaceful and successful society. To that end, we are using the most determined and the best of our efforts.

64. Mr. JANTUAH (Ghana): We have listened to Mr. Louw with patience, in the hope that he was going to assure the Assembly of his country's willingness, and of its repentance to change its iniquitous policies of apartheid.

65. However, we have been greatly disappointed to hear him enumerate all the achievements of the so-called social and economic progress made by his Government in South Africa. This is what every Government tries to do, within the limits of its resources. Governments are elected to carry out development plans for the benefit of the country's citizens. The question, therefore, does not lie in the enumeration of the measures for development and progress—or of universities built, and so on—in South Africa. The problem there is precisely one of the distinction between who is to use what. The problem is that the South African Government bars all persons except those whom they call whites from making use of the tremendous resources of South Africa.

66. I think I can only re-echo the declaration made a little while ago by the representative of the United States of America. The representative of the United States made it quite clear that the United States of America rejects in full and in part the apartheid policies of South Africa. Mr. Louw obviously has come here to play to the gallery. Mr. Louw has come here and has tried to repeat the same old arguments against the competence of the United Nations with regard to apartheid. If Mr. Louw had had the nerve to come, the honesty to appear before the Special Political Committee, he would have had his answers to the objections which he has raised. Since, of course, Mr. Louw could not face the Special Political Committee and since he has chosen only to play to the gallery, I feel it beneath my dignity to go into details as to the competence of the United Nations in this matter.

67. Mr. Louw has come here also to pretend to speak on behalf of the 11.5 million Bantus in South Africa. Mr. Louw knows very well that the 11.5 million Bantus in South Africa have no representation in the Parliament of South Africa. Mr. Louw also knows that not only have they no representation in the Parliament of South Africa, but that they are not even allowed to approach persons like Mr. Louw, who are Ministers and who are supposed to be the representatives of the people of South Africa. How, then, did Mr. Louw get his powers, his authority, to speak on behalf of the 11.5 million people of the Bantus in South Africa? Mr. Louw, of course, also talked about hospitals and beds in hospitals. Granted that there are hospitals and beds in the hospitals, granted that there are social amenities in South Africa—may I ask Mr. Louw what he would prefer: would he prefer liberty and freedom, or would he prefer only beds in hospitals?

68. There are also, said Mr. Louw, universities and there are many more Africans in the universities than we here believe. Here, of course, Mr. Louw did not say what universities he referred to. Was he referring to the ghetto universities set aside for the Africans, or was he referring to a university which was multi-racial? If he was referring to a university which was multi-racial, then wherein lies the necessity of apartheid policies? If, on the other hand, he was referring to the ghetto universities set aside for the Africans, is he not then confirming our charges that they are

practising in South Africa a policy which is iniquitous to the Bantus and to the people of Indo-Pakistan origin?

69. The fact that apartheid is based on the erroneous doctrine of the superiority of one race is well known to everyone. In this respect I have only to draw the attention of Mr. Louw to the resolutions which the United Nations General Assembly and the Security Council have passed on his policies of apartheid.

70. Finally, Mr. Louw spoke about the Transkei plan as one that is calculated to lead the people of that area eventually to self-government. We are really amused now to hear that the South African Government has admitted somehow that it has now become a colonial Power and has usurped the rights of the people whom they met in South Africa. If the Transkei programme is calculated to lead the Transkei people to eventual self-government, then are we not right and justified in saying that the people of Transkei at this very moment are not being treated, are not being considered, as equal with all the other peoples in South Africa? Is it not an admission that the people of Transkei are now only being trained to become independent, whereas South Africa is as a whole an independent country?

71. I am afraid that Mr. Louw's intervention this morning has done more harm than good to his cause. We in Africa think and believe that Africa has room enough for everybody. We in Africa have not the slightest desire to chase anyone from Africa. But, we in Africa think that every person that comes to Africa to settle there must be accepted on one condition, and one condition only, that he recognizes the Africans, the people whom he meets there, as his equal and dignified enough to sit in council with him. On this, and only on this, condition will the African peoples accept and welcome settlers in Africa. Any other people, persons like Mr. Louw and like Dr. Verwoerd, are, of course, naturally unwelcome in Africa. Their presence in Africa only adds to the strain and stresses which this world has known for so long.

72. The PRESIDENT: I understand that the representative of Trinidad and Tobago is now ready to introduce the amendment to the draft resolution. [A/L.400]

73. I recognize the representative of Trinidad and Tobago.

74. Mr. CLARKE (Trinidad and Tobago): Mr. President, I think I owe it to you and to the representatives here to explain why it is that the voice of Trinidad and Tobago which is so seldom heard here, or even in committees, is being raised today.

75. We in Trinidad and Tobago feel particularly qualified to speak on this matter. We heard, not so long ago, about people who did not have the moral right to judge conditions in South Africa, people who, because they were supposed to be guilty themselves of one form of abuse or another, should not pass judgement on others. We feel that these remarks could not possibly apply to us. We have a truly multiracial society. We have a country in which, although the majority of the inhabitants come from Africa, India and Pakistan and a minority from the same groups that predominate in South Africa, they—this minority—find it a great pleasure to live in Trinidad and Tobago. They find that their welfare and prosperity are increased by their association with the majority, that there is no fear of domination and that they do not require apartheid to

preserve "the natural and elemental human urge to survive".

76. So that we feel that we have every right to candour, every right to speak on this particular issue. By doing so, let me make one point perfectly clear. Although we have proposed an amendment to the draft resolution, we do not find ourselves in any sense in conflict with those who have put forward that resolution. We do not disagree emotionally or intellectually with the proponents of the draft resolution now before the Assembly. We have one point of difference with them only, and that is as to the way in which truly effective action can be obtained in this matter. If anything, we go further than they do.

77. All that we say is that we are sick and tired of reading that one resolution after another has been disregarded, year in and year out, by one recalcitrant Government. It is for that reason that we seek to modify, not to depart from, but to modify what has been put forward in the hope that we will find an easy passage commanding the unanimous support of all Members of this Organization other, of course, than South Africa. So we yield to none in our abhorrence of the barbaric practices and policies of that unhappy country.

78. If I have used the expression "barbaric", I think that I have not indulged in vitriolic expletive. I have used an expression which, in its modern meaning and connotation, describes accurately the view of most civilized people of the conduct of the Government of South Africa; and I use an expression which in its origin the ancient Greeks, and the Romans following them, used in order to describe those who were beyond the pale.

79. I do not believe that there is one Member of this Organization that would come to this rostrum and openly support the Government of South Africa. I refuse to believe that there is one Government that would even condone the behaviour of the Government of South Africa. But there may possibly be more than one Government, there may, unfortunately, be too many Governments, that will find it difficult because of their country's policies, economically and in other respects, to go all the way with the draft resolution that is before this Assembly. There may be such people, and one has to consider and respect the right of those people to order their own affairs.

80. It is for that reason, and only for that reason, that we have sought to table an amendment to the draft resolution which could command, by its acceptance, the overwhelming support of delegations here, the support which all these delegations wish to give in order that they may justify the existence and the purpose and the vitality of this Organization.

81. Sir, I am not—and I believe there must be few here who are—as pessimistic about our Organization as the representative of South Africa. I believe, and I am sure most of the delegations here believe, that its prestige is high. I refuse to accept that, because it has not yet dealt effectively with South Africa, its prestige is not high. But if we are to ensure that its prestige remains at the level that we wish, then we must find some means, not of uttering pious exhortations, not of moralizing, not of sentimental mouthings—we must find some means of getting through this Assembly a resolution which will speak to South Africa in the language which it can understand, for it is manifest that the language of counsel, the language of indicating

a view, is not a language which falls upon an open ear in the case of South Africa. There must be the language which hurts: the language which will carry conviction not because of its sincerity, not because of its honesty, not because of its high principles. It must be a language which carries with it sanctions that South Africa can feel.

82. If, therefore, we were convinced that other Members of this Organization would feel free to support fully what is sought in this draft resolution, let me assure those here that we would be willing to withdraw our amendment. If people will generally support the draft resolution as it stands and give it full force and effect, we have no desire whatsoever to push our amendment.

83. I hope if anybody opposes our amendment that they do so only on one firm ground and that is that they vote for the draft resolution itself. If they oppose our amendment, may I accept that as a vote of acceptance of the main draft resolution; because we shall support it if our amendment is not successful. We offer it here in the spirit of compromise. We offer it here so that all nations may be able to show how little they regard what has been said on behalf of South Africa, how utterly they detest the policy which tends to separate human beings, to deny the fundamental dignity of man to so large a population.

84. Let me explain, therefore, that in suggesting these changes to which I shall give more detailed attention, I do so only in the hope that, either as the result of the acceptance of what we offer as a concrete, workable proposal we may carry out and put into effect what we all desire, or alternatively, that other nations all feel so convinced that without further discussion they can accept the original resolution, in which case we, of course, offer it our wholehearted support.

85. We have sought the omission of the final paragraph of the preamble; we have sought that for a very simply reason. We think that, when dealing with a question such as the South African question, no side issues ought to be introduced at all. We may have differences of view with other nations, we may think there are particular matters on which we would criticize them, but we do feel that it would be unfortunate if we had to include in the preamble the regret that the actions of some Member States indirectly provide encouragement to the Government of the Republic of South Africa. We find it easier to believe that if such encouragement is provided, it is done thoughtlessly and without any intent so to provide it, for we can conceive of no country that would willingly offer encouragement to the Government of the Republic of South Africa in the perpetuation of its detestable policies.

86. In seeking the replacement of operative paragraphs 4 to 8 by those which we have set out in our amendments, we seek to deal specifically with one matter after another in a way that we feel no State can object to reasonably. We are convinced that South Africa is not threatened by any of its neighbours or by any other territory, and that there is, therefore, no reason for the exportation to South Africa of arms, ammunition, and official information for the manufacturing of weapons. We think that the exportation of any such goods to South Africa will merely encourage it to keep moving in the wrong direction as it has been doing and, eventually, to use physical force against

those for whom it has shown so little regard that it does not respect their human rights.

87. We feel that the discontinuance of the importation of the South African goods that we have specified will not cause undue hardship to any one country. We are convinced that alternative sources of supply can be found by any country that now imports these goods. We know that there are many countries that do not; our country, for instance, is one. We have not done this by legislation. This has been a voluntary, spontaneous act on the part of our citizens living as they do in a non-racial community and shocked at the fact that so many of their kith and kin are being treated so abominably by a minority. But we do feel that even those who have not yet voluntarily adopted this stand could, without any dislocation of their economy and without any great hurt to themselves, indicate their displeasure at what is the official policy of the South African Government by discontinuing their importation of the goods that we have specified. We feel further that this matter should not end there, that it should continue under the supervision of a committee, and we have indicated the way in which the committee should be established.

88. We feel, therefore, that our suggestions in this particular matter are in keeping with the provisions of the Charter; from those provisions we would not wish ever to depart. Article 14 of the Charter reads:

"Subject to the provisions of Article 12, the General Assembly may recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations among nations, including situations resulting from a violation of the provisions of the present Charter setting forth the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations."

We think that nobody will deny for a moment that there has been a violation by the Government of South Africa of the provisions of the Charter setting forth the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations. We think that that is a situation which needs peaceful adjustment and, after years and years of fruitless talking, of discussion, of attempts, by the passage of resolutions here and in the Security Council, to convince the Government of South Africa of the distastefulness of its ways to all the rest of civilized mankind; we think that some other peaceful measure must be found—a measure which they will not only understand, but feel.

89. We are convinced, therefore, that those who distinguish themselves from the Government of South Africa in their attitudes must decide whether or not this Organization is going to be recognized as an effective working body, not a debating society, not a place where speeches are made, but a body that can put into effect its decisions, its strong, immutable feelings, because those are its feelings against the policies of the Government of South Africa.

90. If that is so—if everybody expects this Organization to be really a body that not only talks, but acts—then, I ask, either be prepared to go all the way and support the draft resolution before the Assembly, or if one does not feel capable of going as far as that, take the very minimum step that we seek and support the amendment that I have just put forward.

91. The PRESIDENT: It has been suggested—so far as I am personally concerned, I am in sympathy with the suggestion but, naturally, I shall do what the

Assembly may desire—that we might have a suspension of the meeting for half an hour to enable Members to study more carefully the amendment [A/L.400] that has just been introduced, and also perhaps to consult among themselves with regard to their reactions to it so that, when the meeting is resumed, there might possibly be some agreement as to whether the amendment should be voted upon or withdrawn. I, myself, of course, as President, will conduct the meeting in accordance with the rules and in the light of the situation as might then emerge.

92. I recognize the representative of Nigeria on a point of order.

93. Mr. ADEBO (Nigeria): If it is the wish of the Assembly to adjourn, I will postpone my speech. But I put down my name to say a few words because I find myself quite unable to subscribe to this amendment, and I felt that it was only fair to the representative of Trinidad and Tobago that I should make clear why it is quite impossible for me to subscribe to his proposition. I am prepared to do so, if it is the wish of the Assembly to hear me now. But if it is the wish of the Assembly to postpone discussion, then I will resume my seat until the discussion is resumed.

94. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Nigeria is the first speaker on my list, if we proceed with the discussion immediately or if we resume after the suspension of the meeting. I would also point out—as I have said and as has also been expressed by the representative of Nigeria—that I will naturally be guided by the wishes of the Assembly. If there is no objection to the suggestion which has been received by me ...

95. I give the floor to the representative of Ghana, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

96. Mr. JANTUAH (Ghana): Mr. President, with due deference to the views which you have expressed as regards suspension of the discussion, on behalf of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution, I should like to say that we regret that we are unable to support such a move, that we earnestly urge you to allow the Assembly to continue.

97. The amendment to the draft resolution is not new to any of us. We have already had it. Therefore, I believe that further study of it—with all due respect to you, Sir—is superfluous. Therefore, on behalf of the co-sponsors of our draft resolution, I would request that the Assembly continue its work of this morning.

98. The PRESIDENT: In deference to the representative of Ghana, I should like to offer two slight corrections to what he has stated. There is no question of my allowing the Assembly to proceed. The Assembly is entitled to proceed unless it decides otherwise; and I had not suggested the suspension of the meeting for further consideration of the draft resolution, but for further consideration of the amendment, which was introduced only this morning.

99. Subject to those corrections, I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to proceed without suspension of the meeting, and we shall, therefore, continue our explanation of votes on the draft resolution and the amendment.

100. I recognize the representative of Nigeria.

101. Mr. ADEBO (Nigeria): Mr. President, it does not give me any pleasure at all to find myself differing from the representative of Trinidad and Tobago. When

his country was admitted to the United Nations, the representative made a speech here upon which we all congratulated him. We had no doubt at all where he stood on many of the important issues that divide the world. We have no doubt where Trinidad and Tobago stands regarding the policy of South Africa or the policies of metropolitan Powers in regard to the remaining pockets of imperialism in the world. So what I am going to say now is no reflection at all upon his bona fides. We accept it, and I personally agree that he has introduced this amendment in order to help us. But I should like to submit to him and to those who might be tempted to follow his line that the amendments constitute no help to us. They would be a positive hindrance to our efforts.

102. This list of amendments starts by asking us to omit the final paragraph of the preamble to our draft resolution. I will read what that preambular paragraph says:

"Regretting that the actions of some Member States indirectly provide encouragement to the Government of the Republic of South Africa to perpetuate its policy of racial segregation which has been rejected by the majority of its population."

We are not suggesting in that paragraph that anybody is deliberately encouraging South Africa, and we pray that no critic of this draft resolution may read that intention into the paragraph. The word "indirectly" there was deliberately inserted to provide against this misunderstanding. We realized that those who continue to pour capital into South Africa do not intend by that to encourage Dr. Verwoerd and his Government to perpetuate the policy of apartheid. We accept their bona fides, but we submit to them that what they are doing has these unfortunate effects: when elections were going to be held in South Africa, the opponents of Dr. Verwoerd were saying several things. They said that if he did not mend his ways, South Africa would find itself in economic isolation from the world. They said that South Africa might be kicked out of the Commonwealth. They said that that would mean that South Africa would be economically injured. They said that all the nations of the world might put South Africa in economic isolation. Dr. Verwoerd told them that it was all nonsense; that his policy was right; he could not care less who thought it was wrong; and he assured his countrymen that if they followed him, South Africa would continue from strength to economic strength. Those who are putting more and more capital into South Africa are helping to justify what Dr. Verwoerd said to his countrymen. It is not that they had that intention when they put this money there, but that is the effect that it is having. We do not think that it is right that that should be happening. That is why we say that we regret, and we have put it as mildly as possible, that the actions of some of our Member States are having these effects; and these are Member States which have joined with us, every single one of them, to denounce South Africa and its policies.

103. I have no doubt in my own mind that if the major countries of the world were prepared to go along with us and apply economic sanctions to South Africa, Dr. Verwoerd, Mr. Louw and their associates would mend their ways.

104. We are not asking for special privileges. We want human brotherhood. We want to be brothers with Dr. Verwoerd and Mr. Louw, but they reject our brotherhood. They reject the principle of racial

equality for which the United Nations stands. It is the duty of all of us to do something about it and to avoid doing anything which has the contrary effect. For that reason I must say that I would find it quite impossible to delete the final paragraph of the preamble and I have no doubt that the co-sponsors of the draft resolution would feel likewise.

105. As regards the remaining paragraphs of the amendment, I regret that it is too late now for us to begin to examine all that has been said here. As the representative of Ghana pointed out, a great deal of it is not new. We covered this subject in its entirety in the Special Political Committee. We were told we were not realistic since sanctions are a bad thing—they would do nothing to South Africa. After considering all these points carefully, we felt unable to change the draft resolution, and I still feel the same.

106. To begin to single out certain exports from South Africa as taboo is of little value to us. We realize that if everybody stops taking things from South Africa or sending any goods to them tomorrow, there would be economic sacrifices to be borne by the different countries. We appreciate readily enough that different countries have different economic capacities and that some countries may not be able to go the whole way all at once. The list is selective and it can be gradually adopted by each country. We have also indicated that it would be our wish that each country should report regularly to the Secretary-General, for our information, just how far it has proved possible to apply the sanctions we propose here. I do not think that we can accept these amendments. I certainly would find it impossible on behalf of Nigeria, to subscribe to them.

107. I dislike long speeches and I will try to make this brief. I would like to address an appeal to those who are our friends. There is not a single country which came to this rostrum and spoke in support of the apartheid policy of South Africa.

108. It is not South Africa to which we should address ourselves now. We should address our words to each other. Are we really matching our actions with our words? It is a challenge to all of us and to all our friends. If you find it impossible to go with us, I beg you, in the name of humanity, not to vote against this draft resolution. I pray that you do not deceive yourselves any longer in thinking that diplomatic approaches are of any value.

109. The major Powers—the United States of America and the United Kingdom—have been making diplomatic approaches to South Africa. What have they accomplished over these many years? What they have accomplished is reflected in the contribution of Mr. Louw to our debate. He is absolutely unrepentant. All the diplomatic approaches have been valueless. They have had negative effects. He feels that everybody is wrong and that the only country which is right, is South Africa and those who rule that country by force today.

110. Some countries have told us that they do not like violence; they do not like sanctions and therefore they do not like expulsion. Who is practising violence? Is it we who are asking for these economic sanctions, or is it the Government of the Republic of South Africa that is hounding our own people, of our own race, there every day, that are making it impossible for them to live in their own country happily, that is segregating them from the most fruitful part of the country? Is it they who are for violence or is it we? I pray that we may all search our conscience and do the right thing.

this morning. Let those who feel most inclined to vote against us tell us just what they propose to do, apart from those diplomatic approaches that have meant nothing. If we pass this draft resolution and they do nothing about it, it is of no value. It will prove the case of those who say sanctions are ineffective. Of course they are ineffective, if they are not effectively applied. That is the point. Are we going to apply them effectively?

111. I have always said that when we kicked South Africa out of the Commonwealth of Nations, South Africa would have come to its knees, if every single member of the Commonwealth had treated South Africa as it deserved.

112. We put this draft resolution to the United Nations General Assembly today and we appeal for a massive majority in favour of it. After that massive majority has been obtained, we appeal to all of you, all your Governments at home, to realize that here is a danger that must be removed and to help us to remove it.

113. I realize that South Africa is not only a disgrace to our continent, but it is a great embarrassment to its friends. Its friends come here and tell South Africa where it goes wrong and South Africa goes to the rostrum and says that they are all in the same boat, they were all settlers, they have the same policy, and the like. What can they do about it? They can vote for our draft resolution.

114. I would like to say that we are being very realistic and it is those who are pleading for a very innocuous and pious draft resolution who are being unrealistic. It is not only the African people and their friends who are engaged in this, but also the liberal elements in all lands that are in favour of our steps.

115. On 20 October 1962, *The Economist* in the United Kingdom had this to say about South Africa:

"The tale of repressive acts continues to mount. Mrs. Helen Joseph, a white liberal and believer in non-violence, has just been put under house arrest. Mr. Nelson Mandela, a moderate African leader, is now on trial on charges of incitement and illegally leaving South Africa;—even if you want to leave this horrible place, you cannot—"his defence lawyer could not appear at his trial in Pretoria on Monday because the lawyer was himself confined to Johannesburg by a restrictive order."

116. Those are the people who are trying to help South Africa to change its ways within South Africa. We are told that what we propose will harm the black people of Africa and their friends in South Africa. If we should leave Dr. Verwoerd, Mr. Louw, and their associates to continue to do all this, it will not harm them. We are talking to them and they are not listening. You can only persuade someone who is listening. They are not listening to us. So the only thing they understand is that they should be put into a position of economic embarrassment. This will also affect our black people in South Africa—it will affect the liberal elements. But the world has learned one thing, and that is to accept temporary sacrifices in order to achieve long-term gains.

117. I apologize to Members of the General Assembly for inflicting this fairly long speech upon them, but we who have sponsored this draft resolution feel that this is a most realistic step that is warranted in the circumstances of South Africa today. We pray that our

friends in the United Nations will not let us down on this occasion. For goodness' sake, if you cannot go with us then refrain from voting at all.

118. We have no doubt that voting for this draft resolution and implementing it heartily will bring some temporary economic and other sacrifices to the liberal elements of South Africa, but they, as well as we, are quite convinced that they will have to accept those sacrifices if they are going to see the end of apartheid in South Africa.

Mr. Auguste (Haiti), Vice-President, took the Chair.

119. Mr. COLLIER (Sierra Leone): I have come here to lend support to the remarks which have already been made by my colleagues from Ghana and Nigeria. In so doing, I wish to say how much we appreciate the gesture made by our friend from Trinidad and Tobago in tabling this amendment [A/L.400]. We wish his delegation to know that we understand the motives behind his move; we appreciate them, but, none the less, we do not think that his purpose would be served. This is why I ask him, on behalf of the co-sponsors, to withdraw the amendment and not to press it to a vote. We may have no difficulty in doing this, as he has already indicated that if we express strong opposition to it, that he would do so. We express opposition in the strongest sense for reasons which have already been stated and a few others which I intend to add. Looking through the amendment to the draft resolution an attempt can be seen to soften the approach we have made.

120. First of all, in the first paragraph of the amendment he asks us to omit the final paragraph of the preamble. His intention is obviously to take the sting out of this paragraph, which condemns the encouragement given to South Africa by some States. I think that on such an issue we should be honest with ourselves; however pleasant it may sound to those particular delegations involved, it is a fact that resolutions have been passed here before. Even if those resolutions which have already been passed, mild as they are, had been respected and followed in every particular, by all the delegations, South Africa would be in a difficult position.

121. As my friend from Nigeria stated, when South Africa was expelled from the Commonwealth many of us hoped that the speed of that expulsion would have been followed by the member nations of the Commonwealth and we have reason to believe that if that treatment had been followed, South Africa would not be in the position that it is today. But what are the facts? Apartheid continued to flourish and they have had the effrontery to say on many occasions that this has not affected them in any way at all. So if there were any real reason for believing that it is possible to talk to South Africa, we would be willing to accept any compromise at all, as we have done in the past, even though we have been very unfairly accused on this occasion of being extreme; but delegates will remember that we have, on many occasions, been willing to accept all kinds of compromises so that a resolution would be passed with the widest area of support.

122. We have done so in the past because we genuinely believed that, for a resolution to be effective, it needs to have the widest area of support but, in this case, we have studiously resisted any such suggestion because when we talk to South Africa, we speak in different terms. You cannot talk to South Africa—we know this. What have they been doing?

When the indignation of the world has been clearly expressed, over and over again, the reaction of the South African Government has been to persist in repressive legislation. It tightens the rope, it is the situation of a desperate nation and we are in a desperate situation. The remedy will have to be a desperate remedy and this is why we have tabled a resolution which sums up, in clear terms, what we think. We are not so naïve as to believe that the mere passage of this resolution will bring about what we are asking. Indeed, we are very familiar, at the United Nations, with having resolutions passed and little notice being taken of them. In fact, we were very busy, as we all know, in the First Committee yesterday, passing resolutions the effect of which we are very doubtful. But we pass them and the effect of passing these resolutions is generally that they express the opinion of the United Nations.

23. And what should be our temper at this time? Our temper should be to symbolize to the world our disgust. We still have the spectacle of Mr. Louw coming here in sheer bravado after refusing to take a seat in the Special Political Committee when the question was being debated. He comes here, as somebody has properly described, to make a show, and when we are being asked to take a compromising step. Why should we? What effect would it have? Now, whatever the length to which we go to try to produce a kind of resolution which would be acceptable, South Africa will ignore it. Mr. Louw has told us, over and over again, what he thinks. I think it is about time that we told him what we think.

24. Much has been said about the legality or otherwise of imposing sanctions. But I think it is important to state here that some countries, including my own, have already imposed sanctions against South Africa. All these sanctions and more have been imposed by my country against South Africa. We know that some countries, for other reasons, may not be in a position to do this, but nonetheless those which are in a position to do so will feel strongly enough to do it.

25. There has been much talk in recent times about interference in the internal jurisdiction of South Africa. I will not go into the details of that. Some delegations have said that by adopting the draft resolution we would be flouting certain fundamentals of the Charter. I would like to comment, in passing, that we are all too familiar, particularly in recent times, with countries taking actions which others would think are in flagrant violation of certain fundamentals of our Charter, so it is quite idle to pretend that we are all in accord as to what constitutes a violation of these fundamental rights. And we have even answered this argument at great length in the Special Political Committee, as to whether it is legal or not. So it is idle for us to try to answer Mr. Louw here and I do not think we should descend to doing it, when Mr. Louw refused to take part in the debate at the proper time.

26. In closing, I would appeal to all our friends, because we have many. We have many, and we know they are our friends, because we know their personal views and that they have expressed publicly on this matter. They are the countries which feel as strongly as we do about what is happening in South Africa—facts which are not doubtful. There is no use to reiterate these facts here because they are not in doubt, and we know there are many friends among us here who feel as strongly as we do. Our only point of divergence has been on procedure; such steps to adopt best to show the indignation of

different societies over what is happening in South Africa.

127. We ask them, because South Africa has put itself beyond all the normal approaches of the Organization, and beyond the normal reaches of negotiation and discussion, and the only thing left for us to do is to pass a resolution like this which we know—indeed like many other resolutions—will never, in fact be carried out, but will be, nonetheless, a useful record of our opinion, at this time, on what is happening in South Africa. We ask these friends of ours to come along with us, if they believe what they say to us privately. If they genuinely believe what they say here, about South Africa and its policies, they should come along with us and vote on this draft resolution, feeling that nothing less would meet the situation and that it would do a lot, not only to encourage the struggling masses of the people in South Africa, but also to express in clear terms the condemnation of the Organization and of humanity of the policies of that country. We ask them not to vote against this draft resolution but, indeed, to vote with us so that we shall be able to get the kind of majority we require and, I think, we deserve.

128. Finally, I want to say again how very grateful and appreciative we are to our friends from Trinidad and Tobago for the gesture they have made. We would not wish to let the feeling prevail, of course, that we are displeased at their gesture; on the contrary, we understand their motives, but we think that the ultimate goal which we are all pursuing would be better served if this amendment is withdrawn, and we all come together and show, by mass support, our indignation.

Mr. Zafrulla Khan (Pakistan) resumed the Chair.

129. Mr. OREAMUNO (Costa Rica) (translated from Spanish): I shall briefly state my delegation's view.

130. As we declared in the Special Political Committee when explaining our vote on the question before us, we are totally opposed to every form of racial discrimination; and when racial discrimination becomes institutionalized and forms part of a State's legal and social structure, as in the case of apartheid in the Republic of South Africa, then our rejection of it, as in all previous years, cannot be more emphatic.

131. We should therefore like to be able to vote in favour of the draft resolution sent to this plenary meeting by the Committee concerned, but at the same time we have some doubts and reservations concerning certain measures for which the draft resolution provides. Our doubts arise from the fact that we regard those measures as inappropriate for the achieving of the objective aimed at; our reservations arise because some of the measures do not accord with our country's legal system or because the ordering of them is not very clear, while others do not seem to proceed from a proper interpretation of the Charter.

132. All these reasons prompt us to hope that some of the draft resolution's provisions will be altered. If they are, we shall be able to vote in favour of it. The amendments submitted by Trinidad and Tobago are a very good starting-point from which to arrive at the right solution.

133. Mr. BINDZI (Cameroon) (translated from French): I would not wish, at this very advanced hour, to inflict a long speech on the Assembly.

134. On behalf of my friends who have asked me to come to the rostrum, I hasten to join the representa-

tives of Nigeria and Sierra Leone in making an appeal to the delegation of Trinidad and Tobago. The representative of that country told us that he came from a multiracial society where there was no discrimination. O happy people of Trinidad and Tobago! If we, in the immediate past, have not experienced what is called discrimination, at least we have experienced a system which was known as "indigénat"; but that system, I hasten to say, had absolutely nothing in common with what is now happening in South Africa. But, I repeat—happy people of Trinidad and Tobago, not to have experienced such mortifying measures! Did not one of our Heads of State say, in speaking of that period, that we built fine palaces but that our only right is to keep them clean? Happy people of Trinidad and Tobago, not to have experienced the anxiety of waiting for an ambulance because the ambulance is reserved for people of a certain colour! Happy people of Trinidad and Tobago, not to have experienced segregation in the hospitals, where the most up-to-date and effective remedies are used in some sections only, and where the most perfect hygiene is applied in some wards but not in others!

135. Yet it is precisely for those reasons that we come to this rostrum and ask the representative of Trinidad and Tobago to be good enough to withdraw his amendments [A/L.400]. It is extremely painful for us, as Africans, to find ourselves in disagreement with a representative of African origin who knows full well, as we all do, why there are Africans in Trinidad and Tobago today. We ask him, in the name of the motherland which, I am sure, he remembers just as we do, to withdraw his amendments when he thinks of the shameful and unparalleled lot which is that of the Bantu people of the Republic of South Africa.

136. We have listened to the representative of that latter country here, and I must say that his speech is beyond all comment. For six years the General Assembly has been adopting endless resolutions; for six years we have been accepting appeals for compromise; for six years we have been hearing appeals for moderation. We believe that it is not too late to use the only possible weapon—economic coercion. Perhaps that will give pause to the Republic of South Africa, because the system practised in that country is, as many others have already said, unique.

137. We know that discrimination is present in the world, but not in the form in which it exists in South Africa. When we see the Government of our host State, for instance, in its own territory, chartering aircraft and mobilizing its troops to go to the protection of a Negro, we cannot but appreciate such efforts.

138. The United States Government recognizes that in its territory there are still forms of discrimination; but that Government, as its representative has just told us, condemns whatever forms of discrimination may exist, and makes the greatest possible efforts to eliminate them.

139. If the Republic of South Africa came here and spoke to us in the same way, we should understand, because we know that every State in the world has problems of its own. What is evil is to refuse to acknowledge them, but, on the contrary, to persist, as the Republic of South Africa does, in raising them to the status of a system, and then to come here and defend that system. As for the amendments submitted by Trinidad and Tobago, we notice that they have already in some form been introduced in Committee, and the representative of Trinidad and Tobago is well aware of

the fate with which they met. Furthermore, we see that paragraph 4 (b) of these amendments is aimed at limiting the importation of South African goods listed in classes I-III of what is called the "Foreign Trade Statistics" of South Africa. We therefore ask the following question: why those articles, and no others? Why merely animal, pastoral and agricultural products; ales, wines, spirits and beverages; tobacco and manufactures thereof? We know that these goods are produced precisely by the industries which employ the largest labour force, recruited from among the very people who suffer from the system of discrimination.

140. That is why we believe that the remedy here prescribed is worse than the disease. If we pursue the logic of the amendments presented to us, we shall notice that the measures proposed would hit precisely the people who are exposed to discrimination; whereas mineral products, which provide the South African exploiters with the greatest profits, have been overlooked—we wonder whether purely by chance.

141. We therefore invite all Members of the Assembly to take the course outlined in our draft resolution [A/5276]—which quite simply means taking economic sanctions, for the first time, against South Africa. We are certain that, once that country finds its economic potential affected, its representatives will come to this rostrum and speak words less marked by bravado and defiance than those to which they have accustomed us.

142. We ask everyone to vote for our draft resolution.

143. U ON SEIN (Burma): I wish to make a brief statement to explain the vote of my delegation. The Special Political Committee discussed the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa and after a lengthy debate submitted a resolution to the General Assembly, which is contained in the report [A/5276].

144. Racial discrimination is entirely repugnant to the traditions of our culture and civilization. We yield to none in our condemnation of racial discrimination in all its manifestations. We share the feelings of our African brothers in their resentment over the conduct of the South African Government, but with regard to the draft resolution we have before us, my delegation supported it in the Special Political Committee—although with some reservations regarding the two operative paragraphs.

145. Operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution relates to sanctions—diplomatic, political and economic—to be applied against the Government of South Africa. We have serious misgivings as to the wisdom of such sanctions. We have serious doubts as to the wisdom of replying to a boycott with another boycott. Should there be a request for a vote by paragraphs, we would abstain on that one.

146. Operative paragraph 8 relates to the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations. We believe in the principle of universal peace, and it is incompatible with the idea of expulsion. Expulsion, as envisaged in operative paragraph 8 of the resolution, could create a very bad precedent. We would accordingly abstain on that paragraph also. With these two reservations, we would vote for the draft resolution as a whole.

147. Mr. RICHARDSON (Jamaica): My intervention in this debate will be very brief. I will speak not as someone who is making a substantive contribution to the main subject of discussion. What I shall have to

say will be closer in its content to an explanation of vote.

148. It was Jamaica's suggestion that this meeting should adjourn its discussion of the draft resolution [A/5376] for half an hour so as to give representatives the opportunity to confer amongst themselves and to consider the amendment in greater detail. In its wisdom the Assembly decided not to accept that proposal. It had seemed to me that there was in the Trinidad and Tobago amendment [A/L.400] an intention and objective which was sufficiently valid and useful to merit further consideration. I should like, therefore, at this point to express some regret that we were not given that opportunity of conferring amongst ourselves a bit further.

149. Turning now to the draft resolution that is before us, I think that Jamaica can speak in much the same terms as Trinidad and Tobago can. Our society is truly non-racial. We have faced similar circumstances. We found ourselves in a situation not very different from that which South Africa inherited many years ago. We found a solution to our problems. We have evolved along a road which, in our view, leads to peace and prosperity for all the people of our country. We can therefore say quite honestly to the people of South Africa: we believe that your approach is unwise; we suggest that you follow the same road which we have taken and you will find that it will be to the advantage and to the benefit of all the citizens of your country, and will produce prosperity for all.

150. The people of Jamaica abhor the policy of the South African Government as strongly as any of the people represented here. We would be prepared to suffer the most extreme privations in order to make our abhorrence effective in convincing the people of South Africa that we really mean what we say. We, therefore, in supporting the amendment by Trinidad and Tobago, are doing so on the basis of principle.

151. We would like to say to our African friends, who are among the principal sponsors of the draft resolution, that we believe that we understand as well as you do how strongly you must feel about what is taking place at the southern end of your continent. The representative of Cameroon who spoke before me, but one, made it clear that in so far as his people were concerned they were tired of this and were anxious to have something done. It is because we, too, think that something ought to be done that we are supporting the Trinidad amendment.

152. We would like to take as firm action as anyone in this Assembly, but we have certain reservations about one or two of the operative paragraphs of the draft resolution before us. We are advised that, in effect, paragraphs 4 and 8 would eventually amount to an expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations. Believing as we do in the principle of universality, we do not agree that South Africa should be expelled from the United Nations. Now, if that advice is not correct, we stand corrected and we move on.

153. We supported wholeheartedly the action of the British Commonwealth which resulted in South Africa's being compelled to withdraw. The British Commonwealth, however, is what might be termed an organization that is not universal, and it is quite in order that people should ask those of like mind in that organization to request someone who is not conforming to its principles to withdraw.

154. The United Nations is something different. We believe that nations of all persuasions, of all social systems, no matter how erroneous their ways, should still have a place here and that action should not be taken to expel them.

155. It seems to us that the representative of Nigeria and one or two speakers who followed him have not studied with sufficient care the proposals of the Trinidad and Tobago amendment. I am making bold to say that this is how it strikes me. It strikes me as likely to be more effective, both in the short and in the long run, than the substantive draft resolution which is now before this Assembly.

156. What do we really want? Do we want the United Nations to pass a resolution which will in the end become a dead letter, once it has been passed? I recognize that it may have great moral force, but it is not going to have the effect which is sought. South Africa will continue to thumb her nose at the United Nations. She will come back to this rostrum, as I was pained to sit and listen to the Foreign Minister of South Africa some weeks ago, sneering at the United Nations, telling us what is wrong with it, and saying that it is going to be as ineffective in the future as it has been in the past.

157. Therefore, I propose that this Assembly should give a little more attention to the operative provisions of the Trinidad and Tobago amendment. These paragraphs propose that, instead of asking countries immediately to impose economic sanctions over the whole range of South Africa's exports and to refuse to send anything to South Africa, Member nations should deal first of all with arms and the means of making arms, that they should quietly remove from the Government of South Africa the means of effectively imposing its will upon the people in the event that they should wish to overthrow the Government. We consider this to be a practicable proposal and one which ought to commend itself to the Members of the Assembly. And going further, I am impressed by the results of the voting in the Special Political Committee when this resolution was adopted. I discovered that the countries which take more than 80 per cent of South Africa's exports either abstained or voted against this resolution. What do I understand that to mean? I take that to mean that, when this General Assembly resolution is communicated to those countries, they will do exactly what they have done in past years. They will either say that this is a matter for private enterprise, and that they can do nothing about it, or they will make one or two pious motions, and nothing will happen.

158. The main point of the Trinidad and Tobago amendment, as I see it, is to narrow the range of the sanctions, to put them within limits, which are likely to make it possible for a larger area of agreement to be reached in the Assembly on the extent of the sanctions to be imposed. I suggest, therefore, that it is easier—Members may not agree with me, but I suggest it is easier—and more likely to command the support of some of these very important trading partners of South Africa if the area, over which the sanctions extend, is limited in the first place. It can be extended later on.

159. Having this view of the matter which faces us, I then say: are we to proceed and achieve the moral, theoretical victory of a unanimous vote which then becomes ineffective, or should we take something which is less sweeping but likely in practice to be effective later on?

160. I believe that it is, shall we say, our innocence of United Nations procedure that makes us believe that this is possible and likely to be more effective in the long run. If so, we will learn. At present we are of the view that it is better to pass a diluted resolution which would call upon Member States to impose limited sanctions, extending those sanctions if necessary as time passes, than to make a general, too-sweeping resolution which, when it is passed and adopted, will then become a dead letter.

161. It is in that spirit that I have ventured this morning to support the amendment by Trinidad and Tobago. I suspect that it does not have much opportunity of passing, and then I shall, of course, deal with the substantive resolution with the reservations which we have about one or two of the operative paragraphs. But I should like to support the Trinidad and Tobago amendment and ask the General Assembly to approve it, or to incorporate it into the draft resolution, as one which is likely to be effective if adopted, and one which, in my view, is likely to command support from a larger number of South Africa's main trading partners than the substantive draft resolution.

162. Mr. CHANDERLI (Algeria) (translated from French): Mr. President, speaking for the first time in the General Assembly, I have the pleasant duty of tendering to you, on behalf of my delegation and myself, our heartiest congratulations on your election. Your talents and experience, combined with your sagacity, provide us with the assurance that our debates will be conducted objectively and effectively.

163. My delegation took part in the debate in the Special Political Committee [339th meeting] on the question of the policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa. We also participated in the preparation of the draft resolution [A/5276] presented to the Assembly, of which we have the honour to be a sponsor.

164. We would not have thought it necessary to speak on this item in the General Assembly if the honourable representative of the Republic of South Africa had not seen fit, in his statement this morning, to take the sponsors of the draft resolution to task. He was perfectly entitled to do so and he will forgive us if we, for our part, take the liberty of challenging some of his assertions. We shall do so briefly, for all that could be said about the policy of apartheid has been said in the past ten years; and, with all due respect to the honourable representative of the Republic of South Africa, it has been said by men from all over the world. The remarkable unanimity with which that policy has been condemned embraces every race, every creed and every people; none the less, and with extraordinary obduracy, the delegation of the Republic of South Africa continues to present to us a truly idyllic picture of the situation in that country.

165. According to this picture, everything is for the best in the best of South Africa. For three centuries, peaceful and hard-working people have patiently accepted the amicable overlordship of a minority of settlers. They are moving slowly, as they realize it is wise, towards advancement and economic and social development. They are satisfied with, and grateful for, the schools and hospital beds with which their masters have recently decided to provide them. Strangely enough, they prefer freedom to liberty, dignity affronted to the values of equality; oddly enough, these people, with no natural aspirations, do not even under-

stand the thesis of subversive elements that they are entitled to a better lot and that this hypocritical paternalism which keeps them in their present state is the worst form of that colonialism whose bonds have been shaken off by their brothers of the African continent.

166. That is why, as everyone knows, they have never rebelled; thousands of them are not in prison; their rights are respected in every sphere; Sharpeville is nothing but a geographical location, and it is only the ill-will of saboteurs, black and white, which has led to their present frightful situation. No stories, no reports, no books and no films have been issued to describe their condition; and Article 55 of the United Nations Charter is the mainstay of the policy of apartheid.

167. This policy, the honourable representative of the Republic of South Africa tells us, is but the expression of the ardent urge to survive of the white population of the Republic of South Africa. There is no suggestion that the indigenous population, too, might feel the same urge to live and to survive, much less the need to express that urge; and, if I understand the honourable representative of South Africa correctly, to concede the equality of the peoples of that country would amount to abdication on the part of the minority. What nonsense! As though to recognize, at long last, that men are equal would be to abdicate! It would be abdication only for those who believe in overlordship, in the superiority of one race over another, and that is what we desire to denounce here. That is what the peoples of the world, the morality of the world and the Charter reject. That is what justifies us in intervening, despite the invoking of Article 2 (7) of the Charter, because the cause of man is mankind's affair, and not exclusively the affair of the Pretoria Government.

168. Sooner or later, unless that Government admits that it is maintaining a system at variance with all that civilization has succeeded in building up on this earth, it will have to face tragic responsibilities. Sooner or later, the subversive elements whom the honourable representative of South Africa treats so lightly will triumph, because their cause is just, as the cause of the subversive elements that now constitute a good half of this Assembly was just.

169. We would ask our friends from Trinidad and Tobago to consider these factors, and to withdraw their amendments [A/L.400]. The representative of Jamaica has just told us that the amendments had great merit and that we had lacked the time in which to study them carefully. I recall, however, that in the Special Political Committee the representative of Trinidad and Tobago had included the essence of his amendments in his statement [339th meeting]. Consequently, those present at the meeting of the Special Political Committee are well acquainted with his thinking, and some of them have even refuted certain of the facts and arguments which he advanced in the Committee.

170. It is very difficult, after all these years and in view of the fact that the Government of the Union of South Africa has been flouting any number of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, to say that now is the time to agree on so-called moderate resolutions acceptable to both sides. No resolution is acceptable to the Republic of South Africa, and there is no reason to believe that by trying to reach a compromise we should persuade that Republic to abandon its policy of apartheid or change its plans and become, overnight, a democratic republic in which all men would

be equal, Whites being as good as Blacks and vice versa.

171. I would therefore address a very brotherly appeal to the delegation of Trinidad and Tobago for the withdrawal of its amendments, especially as our colleague from Trinidad and Tobago, in his statement this morning, indicated that in any case he would vote for the draft resolution before us.

172. At this stage, I think we must speak out loud and clear and, in addressing the leaders of the Republic of South Africa use a language as strong as our convictions, as forceful as our determination, and as unqualified as the justice of a cause which is the cause of humanity.

173. Algeria, which has barely emerged from a fierce struggle not only for its independence but, still more for the dignity of its people will do everything possible to ensure that the oppressed and exploited peoples of South Africa recover their rights, their voice and their place in the sun of Africa.

174. Mr. KANYIKE (Uganda): It is, of course, not at all necessary to go into the charges and rebuttals concerning the sensational problem of apartheid in the Republic of South Africa. These details have been fully covered by many competent speakers already. What the Uganda delegation would like to stress now is, to remind the Republic of South Africa—and anyone who cares to hear this—that the point which affects most intelligent people in the world today is that the United Nations should always be concerned with conditions obtaining in any part of the globe that are likely to endanger world peace, not only at the present time, but also in some foreseeable future.

175. Now, who in this Assembly can be so blind as to pretend that the racial tensions obtaining in South Africa are not likely to bring about world conflict in the future? We, the people of Africa and, I am sure, many liberal people the world over, are not going to rest until our people in that country are set free. The gentleman from South Africa made a lame excuse when he compared conditions in his country with the racial conflicts in the United States. Granted, of course, that the United States is not yet in multiracial harmony, nevertheless the Government of the United States is, by known facts, making an appreciable effort to eliminate that stain from its otherwise serene social atmosphere.

176. The Government of South Africa, on the other hand, is engaged actively in torturing—that is the word—the majority of its citizens.

177. If there is one such spot on this globe, therefore, which is pregnant with the dynamic international time bomb, it is surely the Republic of South Africa. We only hope that the leaders of that country will make a substantial effort to mend their ways before it is too late for anybody. This is not a threat. It is simply a statement of an obvious possibility, and, therefore, those of us in this family of nations who, because of one reason or another, would be reluctant to face the situation realistically, would do well to remember that the deliberations in which this world body is engaged are not only for us. They are not concerned with the present generation primarily. They are chiefly concerned with the well-being of posterity; and thus we have a very delicate responsibility to execute, irrespective of our personal, or even national, feelings about such problems.

178. Mr. USHER (Ivory Coast) (translated from French): My delegation, having followed the debate on apartheid and spoken on the subject several times in the Special Political Committee, considers it a duty to take the floor here for the first time, as it were—since the representative of South Africa refused to take part in the work of the Special Political Committee. This is also the first occasion, this year, on which I have heard the arguments put forward by the South African representative.

179. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa refuses to regard the situation brought about by the policy of apartheid as a potential threat to peace and security. He further refuses to acknowledge that South Africa has consistently violated the United Nations Charter, and claims that the sponsors of the draft resolution before us [A/5276] made a statement to that effect in their text because they wanted a pretext for the condemnation of his country by the Security Council. But as early as 5 December 1952—at a time when our country was not a Member of the United Nations—the General Assembly recognized [resolution 616 B¹ (VII)] that governmental policies of Member States which were designed to perpetuate or increase discrimination were inconsistent with the pledges of the Members under Article 56 of the Charter. Moreover, it was on 1 April 1960—again at a time when the Ivory Coast was not a Member of the United Nations—that the Security Council recognized, in a resolution,^{2/} that the situation in South Africa was one that had led to international friction and, if continued, might endanger international peace and security, and considered that the principles endorsed by Member States in accepting the Charter had been violated. Consequently, the situation is clear-cut, and the Assembly arrived at an opinion even before the newly independent African States were represented in this Forum.

180. The difficulty is not, in my view, to establish whether the situation is a threat to peace or security; that has already been established. The difficulty confronting us lies, as it were, in trying to find solutions capable of preventing that serious situation from deteriorating year by year and becoming explosive for Africa. There are two obstacles to our efforts in this direction.

181. The first obstacle is one which South Africa itself has created by alleging interference in what it calls its internal affairs. Fortunately, South Africa is the only State to hold that view. It is true that a few people, outside this Organization, are of that opinion; but there again, as the representative of Ghana has pointed out, we shall not try to adduce evidence or to determine merits, since the General Assembly discussed the matter and disposed of it when the debate on apartheid first opened. In 1952 the Assembly established [resolution 616 A (VII)] the United Nations Commission on the Racial Situation in the Union of South Africa. The following year, it endorsed the conclusions of the Commission's report,^{2/} to the effect that the Assembly's right to undertake studies or make the recommendations it deemed necessary concerning the implementation of the principles to which Member States subscribed when they signed the Charter could not be challenged.

^{1/} Official Records of the Security Council, Fifteenth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1960, document S/4300.

^{2/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighth Session, Supplement No. 16.

182. The second obstacle is the real difficulty we encounter when we try to persuade our friends to adopt our position, because some States have doubts regarding the competence of the United Nations to recommend certain measures. For its part, the delegation of the Ivory Coast has been supporting the resolution before us because it sincerely believes that an analysis of Article 11 of the Charter, which provides that the General Assembly may discuss any questions relating to the maintenance of peace and make recommendations with regard to any such question, shows that the Assembly is competent to recommend certain measures. Furthermore, a comparison of Article 14, which applies to the General Assembly, with Article 41, which applies to the Security Council, shows that in the event of threats to the peace, breaches of the peace and acts of aggression the Security Council is empowered under Article 41 to decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed, and that Article 14 empowers the General Assembly to recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation.

183. The comparison of the two Articles reveals that the word "measures" is used in the Charter only in Articles 41 and 14, when what is contemplated is sanctions (enforcement action), and that the word "peaceful" is also used in those two Articles—the first concerning the Security Council, which can only take measures not involving the use of armed force, and the second concerning the General Assembly, which may recommend measures for peaceful adjustment.

184. Our delegation has concluded, from this comparison, that the measures provided for in Article 14 may be the same as those provided for in Article 41. The measures are specifically enumerated in Article 41 solely for reasons connected with the nature of the decisions of the two organs: one merely "recommends", and its recommendations have only moral force; the other "decides", and consequently has the means of giving effect to its decisions. Thus, since the decisions of the Security Council are restrictive (restrict the freedom of action of Member States), the authors of the Charter obviously felt compelled to enumerate the measures which the Council may take. The recommendations of the General Assembly, on the other hand, have only moral force and are not restrictive, and the authors of the Charter accordingly did not find it necessary to enumerate them.

185. Of course, the soundness of the argument which induced my delegation to support the draft resolution may be challenged, but even then I would appeal to those who might have some misgivings about joining us. Even admitting that the authors of the Charter, in their desire to strike a perfect balance between the General Assembly and the Security Council, may have opened the way to an interpretation which is ambiguous, there is a principle of law that can apply in that case—a principle of law, that of *ut res magis valeat quam pereat*, often referred to as the rule of effectiveness. It has already been applied by the International Court of Justice in its advisory opinion on the interpretation of peace treaties with Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania.^{3/}

186. I come now to the amendments submitted by the representative of Trinidad and Tobago [A/L.400]. I should like at once to assure him of my delegation's

esteem for his own and of its respect for his country and people, and I am glad that he said at the outset that his amendments had been designed not to hamper our work, but rather to help us. He further stated that he was ready to withdraw them if the sponsors of the draft resolution felt that they were not helpful, because in fact measures cannot be prescribed to help somebody when that person says that they cannot be of use to him.

187. For this reason I am sure that our colleague will agree to withdraw his amendments, since they do not affect the basic principle which we have tried to lay down in our draft resolution—the principle of enforcement action—but simply list the measures to be taken. There is thus no difference between us as to substance. It is therefore pointless to complicate the debate, and I would request him to agree to withdraw his amendments if the sponsors of the draft resolution, whom he seeks to help, feel that they cannot be of use.

188. Paragraph 6 of our draft resolution has been interpreted as involving the immediate expulsion of South Africa. However, it should be compared with paragraph 4 of the draft, in which the General Assembly recommends certain measures. We know, as I said earlier in stressing the difference between the decisions of the General Assembly and those of the Security Council, that these measures, these recommendations are for us inescapable by reasons of their moral force.

189. But if perchance they should prove ineffectual, we think that the Security Council, which is empowered to adopt decisions and possesses the means, under Articles 41 and 42 of the Charter, to enforce those decisions, should take up the question again, study it and provide for sanctions which would be immediately applicable. As part of those sanctions, it should contemplate the expulsion of South Africa if it refuses to heed our demands. True, South Africa has said that its expulsion would mean the collapse of the United Nations. Well, if that were so, it could only convince us once again that the policy of South Africa constitutes a threat to international peace and security, for the collapse of the United Nations would certainly mean disaster for the world. And we should certainly not want the Commonwealth, from which South Africa is excluded, to collapse; we should not want the Commission for Technical Co-operation in Africa South of the Sahara, from which it is barred, to collapse; we should not want the International Labour Office, from which it is excluded, to collapse, nor the Food and Agriculture Organization, from which it is likewise excluded. We would wish to be spared the death of all our organizations, because it would mean world-wide disaster and conflict.

190. We would also appeal to all our friends to understand the problem of apartheid, a problem peculiar to Africa. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa himself admitted that the Bantu, despite the paradise in which they live, had tried to set off a few plastic bombs—which had caused the Government to pass the so-called anti-sabotage Act,^{4/} because it felt that the paradise was certainly not perfect and that its security was threatened. Now it is commonly conceded that the internal security of a State is necessarily of concern to the States around it because, if plastic bombs begin exploding in South Africa, they may spread to other areas. We are aware of this danger;

^{3/} See Interpretation of Peace Treaties, Advisory Opinion: I.C.J., Reports 1950, p. 65; and Interpretation of Peace Treaties (second phase), Advisory Opinion: I.C.J., Reports 1950, p. 221.

^{4/} General Law Amendment Act, dated 27 June 1962.

we feel that any explosion in South Africa may involve the African continent as a whole, and you felt this even before we did.

191. We want you to help us, your friends, to solve this problem, while at the same time helping South Africa; because if that country is isolated, it will realize that the best way to survive and to preserve what it has described as the patrimony of its ancestors is to come to terms with those who live in the country—to grasp, as the Nigerian representative said, the brotherly hand which the Africans are holding out. May South Africa come to understand this!

192. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inquire from the representative of Trinidad and Tobago whether he desires that his amendment [A/L.400] should be put to the vote.

193. Mr. CLARKE (Trinidad and Tobago): I think that the views of Trinidad and Tobago were sufficiently clearly put and have just been so recently summarized by the representative of the Ivory Coast that it is unnecessary for me to say other than that I accede to his request. I agree to withdraw the amendment.

194. The PRESIDENT: Now that the amendment is out of the way and, in view of the fact that I have indications that questions will be raised with regard to the procedure on the voting, we shall continue the vote, in view of the late hour, immediately upon reconvening at 3 o'clock.

195. Before adjourning the meeting, I have been asked to announce that as soon as the consideration of this item in the plenary is completed, the Special Political Committee will meet.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.