

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records

**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 475th
MEETING**



Thursday, 2 December 1965,
at 3.25 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 36:

*The policies of apartheid of the Government
of the Republic of South Africa (continued):*

(a) *Reports of the Special Committee on the
Policies of apartheid of the Government of
the Republic of South Africa;*

(b) *Reports of the Secretary-General. 1*

Chairman: Mr. Carlet R. AUGUSTE (Haiti).

AGENDA ITEM 36

The policies of apartheid of the Government of the
Republic of South Africa (continued):

(a) Reports of the Special Committee on the Policies
of apartheid of the Government of the Republic
of South Africa (A/5692, A/5707, A/5825 and
Add.1, A/5932, A/5957);

(b) Reports of the Secretary-General (A/5850 and
Add.1, A/6025 and Add.1)

1. Mr. MENDOUGA (Cameroon) noted that the South African representative was still absent, despite the steps taken recently by the Chairman at the Committee's request. His delegation had believed that the supporters and accomplices of the South African Government, motivated by self-interest if not by devotion to principle, would use their decisive influence to persuade that representative to resume his seat. His delegation invited all delegations to draw the appropriate conclusions regarding South Africa's stubborn attitude, particularly those delegations which persistently opposed the expulsion of that country from the United Nations, advancing reasons which should be re-examined in the light of the present situation.

2. He congratulated the Chairman and Rapporteur of the Special Committee on the Policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa on their important contribution to the study of the apartheid problem. It was generally agreed that apartheid was a crime against humanity. On 8 September 1965 the fifty-fourth Inter-Parliamentary Conference meeting at Ottawa had adopted a resolution describing apartheid as a serious crime against mankind. The international community had not forgotten that nazism, a political system based on the humiliation and liquidation of so-called inferior races, had plunged the world into the Second World War. If apartheid was not abolished, the international community would be drawn into a conflict with unforeseeable consequences. Twenty years of persuasion had proved fruitless, and it was time to take effective, concerted, coercive action. All Member States should

immediately apply diplomatic and economic sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter.

3. In his statement at the 472nd meeting, the United Kingdom representative had said that the Security Council had never denied that the situation in South Africa represented a threat to peace, but he had added that that did not mean that such a threat fell within the scope of Chapter VII. The delegation of Cameroon did not agree with that interpretation: it measured the frustration and impatience of the non-white population of South Africa, and knew that there was an immediate danger of racial conflict, constituting a threat to the peace within the meaning of Chapter VII. Economic sanctions against South Africa should be applied immediately, in view of the build-up of South Africa's army and police force and the continued support given the country by its main trading partners and the members of NATO.

4. The non-white population of South Africa, inspired by their feeling of human dignity and their love of freedom, felt themselves obliged to resort to violence. In the event of a conflict between oppressed and oppressors, it was to be hoped that those countries which invested in South Africa and supported the racist régime would not sacrifice fundamental human rights to cupidity by landing troops on the pretext of protecting their nationals' lives and property.

5. In his statement to the twentieth session of the General Assembly (1354th plenary meeting), the head of the delegation of Cameroon had expressed his Government's grave concern at the delaying tactics employed by certain great Powers in order to avoid applying sanctions against South Africa. Yet the United Kingdom representative, who was in a sense the spokesman for those Powers, had once more advocated a policy of procrastination, recommending a study of the applicability of sanctions which had already been carried out, and a study of the desirability or feasibility of establishing a trust fund, which already existed as a private fund. Some Governments were apparently always able to juggle with their own conscience and that of the international community. France, which had once proclaimed the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity, continued to support South Africa, invoking the principle of non-interference in the domestic affairs of States. The United States, despite its democratic traditions, supported the apartheid régime directly and indirectly. Even Japan, a member of the Afro-Asian group, maintained commercial ties with the Pretoria régime, which believed that all coloured races were inferior and practised apartheid. Cameroon urged the Japanese Government to adopt a policy conforming to the aspirations of the coloured people of South Africa and of coloured people throughout the world.

6. The eradication of apartheid was impossible without the co-operation of the great Powers and of South Africa's main trading partners, but certain Powers, despite their pious statements, continued to invoke specious pretexts to avoid applying sanctions and blocked United Nations action in the Security Council. The African people's faith in the United Nations was shaken, and the Organization's prestige and moral authority were threatened. He appealed to all Governments to show their political determination to eradicate apartheid. If the Security Council still remains paralysed by the veto of certain great Powers, the General Assembly should assume its residual responsibilities under the Charter and act in the cause of international peace and security by calling for economic sanctions against South Africa. Such sanctions represented the international community's last chance to find a peaceful solution to the apartheid problem.

7. Mr. HASEGANU (Romania) said that his delegation shared the general regret at the South African delegation's failure to participate in the Committee's debate on apartheid. His delegation was gravely concerned by the fact that after almost twenty years apartheid continued to represent an ever-increasing danger. The South African Government had ignored all the United Nations resolutions designed to eliminate racial discrimination in that country, and there were signs that apartheid now menaced other parts of Africa, as was shown by the unilateral declaration of independence by the white minority in Southern Rhodesia.

8. The reports of the Special Committee on apartheid described the measures taken by the South African Government against the non-white population in flagrant violation of the provisions of the United Nations Charter. They showed clearly that the South African Government continued to deprive 14 million Africans of the fundamental rights and freedoms set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. His delegation congratulated the Special Committee on apartheid on its work, and hoped that the recommendations contained in document A/5932 would be supported by all delegations.

9. His delegation wished to stress certain facts mentioned in the reports in question which explained why United Nations resolutions remained a dead letter while apartheid continued to flourish. Annex I to document A/5932 stated that not all States had respected the Security Council resolutions 181 (1963), 182 (1963) and 191 (1964), which called on all Member States to prohibit the provision of assistance to South Africa for the manufacture of arms and military equipment, to deny training facilities to members of the South African armed forces and to refrain from joint military exercises with those forces. Yet the major Western Powers had on various pretexts collaborated with the South African Government, thus enabling it to increase its military potential. South Africa's defence and police budget for 1965-1966 would total \$321,160,000, five and a half times greater than it had been in 1959-1960. The situation had in fact deteriorated and serious international repercussions could ensue.

10. The major Western Powers, in defiance of world public opinion, continued to invest large amounts of capital in South Africa, thus encouraging that country to flout United Nations resolutions and to pursue its policy of racial discrimination. The Western Powers accounted for over four fifths of the volume of South Africa's foreign trade, and it was easy to see why they did not wish to renounce their profitable investments. The indigenous population, oppressed and humiliated, constituted a source of cheap labour.

11. Those facts led inescapably to the conclusion drawn by the Afro-Asian countries, namely that apartheid was a problem of concern not only to South Africa and the United Nations, but also to the major Western Powers, which ostensibly condemned but in reality supported the South African Government. His delegation believed that the Western Powers would have to change their attitude if South Africa was to be compelled to revise its position on apartheid. In a letter to the President of the Security Council dated 16 July 1964 (A/5825, annex I) his Government had stated its position on the South African Government's policies and had expressed its conviction that the strict implementation by all States of the measures advocated in General Assembly resolution 1761 (XVII), and Security Council resolutions 181 (1963) and 182 (1963) would deprive that Government of support and encouragement in promoting the policy of apartheid. His delegation would support any action designed to produce a speedy and definitive solution to the problem of apartheid, in conformity with the spirit of the Charter.

12. Mr. DEHLAVI (Pakistan) said that all that could now be done about apartheid was to review and evaluate the situation and decide on further measures to make United Nations decisions in that regard more effective. South Africa's inhuman policies and practices had been universally condemned and measures adopted to eliminate them, but the reports of the Special Committee and other evidence showed that the situation in South Africa continued to deteriorate. Mass arrests, detention without trial, mistreatment of prisoners, residential segregation, discrimination in employment and education and the deliberate build-up of the South African army and police for the purpose of further repression were a challenge not only to the principles of the United Nations Charter but to the conscience of mankind as a whole. The racist minority should be warned that it might soon have to pay a terrible price for its inhuman policies. The non-white population was long-suffering, but one day it would revolt and strike back, like the people of Kashmir.

13. Mr. GHAREKHAN (India), speaking on a point of order, said that the question of Kashmir, which related exclusively to the internal jurisdiction of the Indian Government, was not relevant to the subject under discussion.

14. The CHAIRMAN requested the Pakistan representative to confine his remarks to the subject under discussion.

15. Mr. DEHLAVI (Pakistan) said that he would abide by the Chairman's ruling, although he had intended to show that the question of South Africa could not

be viewed in complete isolation, since events in other parts of the world exerted an influence on the situation in that country, particularly from a psychological point of view. Moreover, the policy of apartheid and the problems created by colonialism and neo-colonialism were interrelated.

16. There was a general desire to seek a peaceful solution to the apartheid problem under the Charter and to prevent the South African Government and other racist Governments from maintaining highly explosive situations which could lead to international conflict. Those considerations, combined with humanitarian motives, had led the United Nations to adopt measures designed to influence the Government of South Africa. It was, however, clear from the report of the Special Committee that South Africa was pursuing and intensifying its repressive policies. It was able to do so because certain industrially advanced countries had not implemented the various measures against South Africa that had been proposed and adopted. The white man's interest still remained paramount. For example, the United Kingdom, despite its assurances continued to supply aircraft and spare parts to South Africa. South African military personnel continued to receive training in the United Kingdom, particularly in the use of weapons purchased in that country. South Africa was to be supplied with 300 jet trainers, powered by British engines, and American light aircraft would be used for special police duties, the nature of which was easily imagined. The construction of factories for the manufacture of modern arms and aircraft would not only make South Africa self-sufficient and therefore even more ruthless in applying its policy of apartheid, but would make it possible for that country to supply its racist neighbours, thus enabling them to pursue similar inhuman policies against the indigenous population. The Afro-Asian countries could not ignore those sinister developments.

17. His Government's position had been expressed in a statement by the Pakistan Minister for Foreign Affairs at the nineteenth session of the General Assembly (1319th plenary meeting), recalling that Pakistan had fully implemented General Assembly resolution 1761 (XVII) and had urged South Africa's major trading partners to apply economic sanctions against that country. South Africa was able to defy the United Nations because there were weak elements among the Member States. It was clear that future efforts must be directed to coping with loop-holes in order to tighten the measures already adopted and to taking further measures in order to make United Nations action more effective. His Government would support and implement any action recommended and adopted to that end.

18. Mr. BUSNIAK (Czechoslovakia) said that on the twentieth anniversary of the United Nations it was appropriate to recall that the world Organization had been established as a result of co-operation among peoples which had fought against all forms of oppression and racial discrimination in the Second World War. Racism had been one of the pillars of nazism and fascism and the United Nations would be guilty of betraying its mission if it did not take decisive measures against a régime which had adopted those nazi-fascist principles and was applying them

in its political, economic, legal and social relations with the indigenous African population of the country which it ruled.

19. The documentation before the Committee, including the very useful report of the Special Committee attested to the increasingly arbitrary rule of the South African Government. The time had come when, in the interests not only of the indigenous inhabitants of South Africa but also of international peace and security, the United Nations must move from words to action. The explanation of how it was possible for the South African Government to continue pursuing its racist policies and destroying those who were fighting for human rights in that country was to be found not only in the report of the Special Committee but also in the statements made by African and Asian representatives in the Security Council, who had stressed that the South African régime would have found it impossible to maintain that policy had it not been for the economic, political and military support of certain imperialist Powers and the solidarity between the South African racists and the monopolies which were making such enormous profits from their investments in South Africa. The representatives of the imperialist Powers criticized apartheid in the United Nations, but in reality their Governments were doing everything in their power to uphold the South African régime. The dominant NATO Powers—the United States, the United Kingdom and West Germany—were constantly expanding their economic co-operation with South Africa, where capital investment yielded higher returns than in any other country in the world. The imperialist Powers and international monopolies saw in the continued application of the system of racial discrimination against the indigenous inhabitants of South Africa and surest guarantee that those high rates of profit would be maintained.

20. He cited examples showing the extent of United Kingdom and United States investments in South Africa and drew attention to the growing economic co-operation between South Africa and the Federal Republic of Germany. In 1958 a West German firm had made a huge loan to the largest South African mining company and had thus placed itself in an influential position with respect to the mining of South African uranium in the interests of Bonn's policy of preparing the West German army for nuclear war; and two German firms had sent technicians to the South African Institute for Missile Research. South Africa's close relations with the imperialist Powers were enabling the régime to survive and grow stronger, thus posing a constant threat to the security of the entire African continent. Moreover, it was South Africa's confidence in the continuing support of the Western Powers which had emboldened it to the point of applying the system of apartheid to South West Africa, a Territory in which it had no legal rights. Now the South African Government, illegally and against the will of the overwhelming majority of the indigenous population, was giving its full support to the racist régime it had helped to establish in Southern Rhodesia.

21. The adoption of General Assembly resolution 1761 (XVII) had been a turning point in the work

of the United Nations on the question of apartheid and if its provisions had been applied by all Member States the problem would now be moving towards a solution. Czechoslovakia was one of the States which had applied the provisions of that resolution to the full, breaking off all relations with South Africa. But the major imperialist countries had not pursued the same course. In 1964 the Security Council had set up an expert committee on sanctions (resolution 191 (1964)) to study ways and means of applying sanctions against South Africa. However, some members of that Committee—those same main trading and military partners of South Africa to which he had referred—had deliberately tried to sabotage the Committee's work. His own delegation considered that in view of the demonstrated futility of appeals and moral condemnations the application of sanctions offered the only means of bringing the system of apartheid to an end. It was a means provided for in the Charter and in the present circumstances it was the duty of all Member States to apply it. A number of African representatives had warned of the grave consequences which would inevitably flow from failure on the part of the United Nations to take the necessary action. Full responsibility for the situation which would then arise would rest on those States which had refused to implement the decisions of the United Nations and had continued to support the South African régime.

22. Czechoslovakia, as one of the earliest victims of nazi aggression and as a country whose people had been considered "inferior" by the nazis, knew from its own experience what racism was. It was therefore particularly well qualified not only to condemn apartheid but also to call for decisive measures which would bring that policy to an end and ensure the full political and social freedom of the indigenous inhabitants of South Africa.

23. Mr. NABWERA (Kenya) congratulated the Chairman of the Special Committee on the informative statement he had made at the 469th meeting. The Rapporteur of that Committee was also to be commended for the preparation of its searching report.

24. Apartheid rested on the belief that a non-white was inferior to a white person, regardless of the personal qualities of either. The advocates of apartheid treated the Africans, who constituted the great majority of the population, as though they were sub-human, denying them all human rights, confining them to reserves which constituted only about 10 per cent of the total area of the country, forbidding them to own property in urban areas, arbitrarily separating members of families, and throwing Africans into prison on the slightest pretext. The apologists of apartheid told the United Nations that it should be patient and the problem would be solved with the passage of time; yet history showed that ever since 1910, when the United Kingdom had handed political power in South Africa to the white minority, the situation had been steadily deteriorating. As for the argument that apartheid was a domestic problem in which other countries could not interfere, the answer was that the rest of Africa and the world could not be expected to sit by and watch while the African inhabitants were oppressed and persecuted. The moral pressure brought to bear on the South African racists by the

United Nations in the past had been unavailing and the Organization must now consider what practical steps should be taken. Unfortunately, even the very limited measures it had already recommended were being sabotaged by South Africa's main trading partners, i.e. the United States, the United Kingdom, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and now Italy. If those States and Japan were to impose economic sanctions and an arms embargo South Africa would be compelled to take the United Nations resolutions seriously and begin modifying its domestic policies. The Government of the United States was committed to a policy of equality among its own citizens but in South Africa it was prepared to trade with a Government whose ideas were similar to those held by the Ku Klux Klan. France, which had made abstention during votes on South African and colonial questions an act of faith, had increased its trade with, and supply of arms to, South Africa. A third permanent member of the Security Council, the United Kingdom, was now equivocating on every issue that had anything to do with the rights of Africans. In the case of Southern Rhodesia the United Kingdom protested verbally against the illegal proclamation of independence by the Smith régime but claimed that it could apply only non-punitive economic sanctions.

25. African States, which had accounted for 14 per cent of South Africa's total foreign trade, had imposed the boycott recommended by the United Nations at great sacrifice to themselves and in the full knowledge that a boycott by Africa alone could not hurt South Africa. In the case of his own Government, upon achieving independence it had banned all trade with South Africa and Portugal, resulting in a trade loss of some £2 million a year; it had ordered the South African Consulate at Nairobi to be closed and had subsequently expelled the South African Consul-General: it had withdrawn the landing and passage rights previously enjoyed by South African Airways on Kenyan soil and in Kenya's air space; and it had consistently taken a firm stand on apartheid at all international conferences.

26. Certain countries had taken advantage of the situation created by the African countries' compliance with General Assembly resolution 1761 (XVII) to increase their own trade with South Africa. Japan, which as a member of the Afro-Asian family of nations might have been expected to take the same stand as the African countries, was one of the chief beneficiaries of that situation. The Japanese Government and people should know that they could not have it both ways—they could not consider Japan a member of the Afro-Asian family and at the same time continue to fraternize with the South African racists who were oppressing and persecuting non-Whites because of the colour of their skin. At the current session members were being asked to elect Japan to the Security Council. If they did, what would Japan's stand be when the question of economic sanctions came before the Council?

27. If the United Nations could not take steps to compel South Africa to change its racist policies, then others must assume that responsibility. He appealed in particular to fellow Africans not to be

satisfied with the adoption of condemnatory resolutions. Ultimately the question of apartheid must be solved by force of arms, and when that time came Africans and their friends must join hands and face the white racists. The action of the Smith régime in Southern Rhodesia had brought that time considerably nearer. Africans should be willing to pay any price to regain and preserve the rights of the African people and check the forces of oppression and inhumanity on the African continent.

28. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) said that although he could understand why the representative of South Africa preferred to be absent during the present discussion, he wished to emphasize that in becoming a signatory to the Charter, the Government of South Africa had committed itself to upholding the principles upon which the United Nations was based, and it was its duty to fulfil its obligations. Its representative should appear before the Committee to defend his Government's policy. It might be that some of the facts submitted to the Committee were inaccurate. In that case, the representative of South Africa should be present to correct them. But his presence or absence did not in any way affect the Committee's right and duty to study the question of apartheid.

29. The most recent report of the Special Committee (A/5957), which described the persecution and oppression of opponents of the régime, deserved the Committee's applause. Further information could be found in the reports of the Committee on South West Africa, of which he himself had been the Chairman. In the course of his duties, he had collected evidence in Ghana, Tanzania, Kenya, Rhodesia, the United Arab Republic, Sudan and Ethiopia. The only countries he had been unable to visit were those in which apartheid existed—South Africa and South West Africa. Permission to enter those countries had been refused for the very reason that the representative of South Africa was now absent. South Africa had nothing to show and everything to hide. The representative of the United States (474th meeting) had quoted the words of Adlai Stevenson, who had said that apartheid was racist in origin, arrogant in application. That arrogance could be seen in the refusal of South Africa to enter into a dialogue with the Committee. It would seem that the supporters of apartheid did not wish to sit in the same room as the representatives of African and Latin American countries. Perhaps they wished to bring the principle of apartheid into the meetings of the United Nations itself. The peoples of Latin America represented all races, religions and nations. Among them were coloured people. Like the people of Africa, they had their heroes who had fought for independence from colonialist rule. He challenged the representative of South Africa to come among them to defend apartheid.

30. During his visit to Africa he had addressed the students of Ghana University. He had told them of the great contribution made to the American culture by the slaves brought from Africa. Africans had provided a cultural element that had made a distinctive contribution in art, poetry, painting, music and dancing in Latin America. All that had been achieved through the absence of racial discrimination.

31. Speaking as a teacher, he deplored the lack of education for the victims of apartheid in South Africa. A teacher could not discriminate in his work because education was sacred. If South Africa denied its subject peoples the right to knowledge, it was because the very principle of education had been violated.

32. The laws of apartheid classified men on a racial basis into Europeans, non-Europeans, Coloureds and Natives. The Government of South Africa went so far as to arrogate to itself not only the right to decide to what race a person belonged, but to place him in a different category if he transgressed the apartheid laws.

33. The apartheid system was now being extended to South West Africa. That fact was relevant because South Africa had claimed that its racial policies fell within its own domestic jurisdiction under Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter. Even assuming that that argument was justified—and he personally did not accept it—it could not apply to the people of South West Africa, who had been entrusted to the Government of South Africa with a view to achieving full independence and national sovereignty.

34. Apartheid represented a threat to international peace. It was true that discriminatory practices existed in other countries, but efforts were being made to abolish them. In South America, for example, the lot of the indigenous people had given rise to what was known as a "literature of denunciation". But nothing comparable existed in South Africa. The only course available to its peoples was to fight, and already the cause of freedom in Africa had its martyrs. It was the duty of the United Nations to speak out clearly, as the Security Council had done on the subject of Southern Rhodesia. The situation created by the policy of apartheid was explosive. As Chairman of the Special Committee for South West Africa he had noted that fact himself; and now the Special Committee on apartheid had come to the same conclusion.

35. Evidence of the dangerous situation now existing in South Africa could be found in the account of the Rivonia trial held in Pretoria (A/5692, annex I). Leaders of non-white organizations and other opponents of apartheid had been tried for sabotage and other offences. The indictment alleged that the accused had committed 222 acts of sabotage throughout the country. Although South African justice was such as to raise doubts about the accuracy of the charges, they were expressive of the prevailing feeling among the opponents of the régime. Men were held in prison, segregated and threatened with the death penalty for upholding exactly the same views about the South African Government as members of the Committee. Repression had now extended to those who defended the opponents of apartheid. The Special Committee on apartheid had expressed serious concern over the arrest of Abram Fischer, leader of the defence team in the Rivonia trial (A/5825, para. 104). The martyred people of South Africa could not be expected to tolerate such conditions much longer. Time was running out and the United Nations must take serious action.

36. The representative of Iran had stated (471st meeting) that year after year the same protests about apartheid were repeated. The representative of Cuba had asked (473rd meeting) what more was there to discuss with South Africa. In the face of South Africa's persistent refusal to change its policies, the United Nations must take sterner measures. The delegation of Uruguay would support any action in line with the views he had expressed. Something must be done to convey to the victims of apartheid in South Africa and South West Africa the solidarity of the United Nations with their cause.

37. Mr. KANO (Nigeria) said that his delegation attached great importance to the United Nations discussions on apartheid for a number of reasons. First, it believed that the pursuit of a policy which so openly flouted one of the cardinal principles of the United Nations posed a challenge that the Organization could continue to ignore only at great cost to its authority and influence. Secondly, the unabated repression to which the majority of the inhabitants of South Africa were being subjected was moving South Africa towards an inevitable explosion which would have the direst consequences for peace in Africa and racial harmony throughout the world. The need for the United Nations to take more positive action to bring about the abandonment of the policy of apartheid was therefore increasingly urgent. His delegation strongly supported the findings of the Special Committee on apartheid to the effect that events in South Africa constituted a threat to international peace and security and therefore called for action by the United Nations under Chapter VII of the Charter. Experience had proved that appeals, platitudes and moral pressure had no effect on the South African Government. His delegation was convinced that the imposition of economic sanctions offered the only peaceful means for bringing about a change in South Africa, for it was apparent that as long as that country's economy flourished, the Pretoria régime would be able to devote huge resources, not only to the maintenance of a Gestapo-like police system, but also to the manufacture and importation of the arms and ammunition without which the system of apartheid would collapse. Those Member States which continued to maintain economic relations with South Africa in defiance of General Assembly resolution 1761 (XVII) should be reminded that the oppressed people of South Africa and their sympathizers elsewhere in Africa could not for ever remain indifferent to such blatant complicity with and support for a system which was an insult to the dignity of Africans.

38. South Africa was engaged in a massive propaganda effort to deceive the world about its racist policies, to turn racial prejudices to its own advantage and to discredit African States, the United Nations and the non-white population of South Africa. In addition to spending huge sums on newspaper advertisement, particularly in those countries with which it maintained trade relations, it had recently begun to utilize the radio to that same end. The new transmitters of the short-wave radio station called "The Voice of South Africa", which had been opened in October 1965 and was to broadcast in nine languages, would be twelve times more powerful than those used previously. The Government was being aided in its

propaganda efforts by the South Africa Foundation, which had been set up by South African businessmen and was supported by foreign companies with large interests in South Africa. It had offices in the United Kingdom and West Germany and representatives in France, the Netherlands and Belgium, and it had announced the intention to open an office in New York. There were also South African Committees in other countries, promoted by business interests. One such Committee had recently been set up in the United States: it was composed mainly of people associated with the "Katanga lobby" and its purpose was to oppose the imposition of sanctions and other measures against South Africa. It had a large budget and encouraged a number of columnists and newspapers to denounce United Nations action against South Africa.

39. He would like to draw attention to paragraph 159 of the report of the Special Committee (A/5957) in which mention was made of the need to provide relief and assistance to the victims of the South African Government's racist policies. As a result of the persecution of the opponents of racial discrimination in South Africa tens of thousands of persons, particularly women and children, had been placed in such a position that they would have been destitute had it not been for the generosity of people in and outside South Africa who had made contributions to their support. However, as the scope of repression had increased and the collection of relief funds in South Africa had been made more difficult, private fundraising had proved unable to cope with the existing need.

40. His delegation had therefore strongly supported the recommendation made by the Special Committee on apartheid in 1963, resulting in the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1978 B (XVIII), to launch an appeal for contributions by Governments, organizations and individuals for the benefit of persons and their families who were being persecuted by the South African Government. Such humanitarian action not only was consonant with the principles of the United Nations but also constituted the fulfilment of an obligation on the part of the international community towards persons who were being persecuted for defending those principles. It had hoped that those contributions could be made through an appropriate agency, such as the International Red Cross Committee, but the South African Government had barred the International Committee's activities in that respect.

41. The Special Committee had subsequently appealed to Member States to make contributions through existing voluntary organizations, and he wished to commend those Governments which had responded to the appeal. Now the Special Committee recommended that the Assembly should consider the establishment of a United Nations trust fund made up of voluntary contributions from individuals, Governments and non-governmental organizations of Member States. His delegation strongly supported that recommendation, for such a fund would supplement the efforts of voluntary organizations and could be used to make grants to them, to the Governments of countries where South Africans had taken refuge and to other appropriate bodies. The purposes for which the monies

contributed would be used were set forth in paragraph 163 of the report (A/5957). The fund should be administered by a group of trustees appointed by the Governments of Member States to be nominated by the President of the General Assembly.

42. His delegation believed that the establishment of such a fund would give more meaning to General Assembly resolution 1978 B (XVIII). It was particularly concerned over the fate of some 15,000 to 20,000 dependants of victims of apartheid who were desperately in need of help, many of them children who would otherwise receive no schooling. An international fund

such as was proposed would facilitate the collection of money from a larger number of sources and its more efficient utilization.

43. The reason why his delegation never tired of drawing the attention of Member States to the need to bring about the abandonment of the policy of apartheid was because it was convinced that the massive repression in South Africa could not endure indefinitely and that if it was not terminated by peaceful means the entire African continent would be plunged into a bloodbath.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.