

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWELFTH SESSION

Official Records

Tuesday, 29 October 1957,
at 3 p. m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 60:

Page

The question of race conflict in South Africa
resulting from the policies of apartheid of the
Government of the Union of South Africa (continued) 57

Chairman: Mr. Emilio ARENALES CATALAN
(Guatemala).

AGENDA ITEM 60

**The question of race conflict in South Africa resulting
from the policies of apartheid of the Government of
the Union of South Africa (A/3628 and Add.1) (con-
tinued)**

1. Mr. SUÑOL (Costa Rica) regretted the absence of the delegation of the Union of South Africa. He expressed the hope that in the coming year the Union Government would realize the advantage of heeding the resolutions of the General Assembly concerning its policy of racial segregation, and that it would not be necessary to discuss the item at the following session.

2. The representative of Uruguay had recently drawn attention in the General Assembly (685th plenary meeting) to the significance of the word "essentially" in Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter of the United Nations. That Article, far from reaffirming the old absolute concepts of sovereignty, denied the competence of the United Nations only in respect of matters which were essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State.

3. The Costa Rican delegation supported the Uruguayan view. It would go even further and say that those formerly domestic matters which had been raised by the Charter to the status of matters of international concern had, as from 1945, ceased to be matters which were essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State. One such matter was human rights. Whenever those rights were violated it was the duty of the Assembly to assist, to decide, and in extreme cases to condemn. His country would always support the Assembly in such cases.

4. A number of multiracial States Members of the United Nations had solved their racial problems with dignity. In Latin America, Brazil was an outstanding example. The Government of the Union of South Africa, on the other hand, had not even attempted such a solution. It had ignored the resolutions of the General Assembly, and was aggravating the situation by continuing to adopt inhuman discriminatory laws.

5. The protest of world public opinion as reflected in the United Nations should not be silenced. It would be intolerable if the present situation were prolonged through the failure of the Assembly to do what it could to restore the rule of human dignity in a Member State.

6. Mr. O'BRIEN (Ireland) believed that there was full agreement among all delegations represented at the meeting that racial discrimination was fundamentally wrong and immoral. That fact was in itself encouraging, for two decades ago racist doctrines had been held by several important States. The principle that the law must not distinguish between human beings on considerations of race had gained ascendancy as a result of the constant reiteration of the moral, scientific and political arguments in its favour. That historical perspective should encourage the Special Political Committee to persevere in the task of impressing on the Government of the Union of South Africa that its policies were condemned by the overwhelming majority of mankind, that they must consequently fail, and ought therefore to be changed.

7. Certain delegations, while sincerely deprecating policies of racial discrimination, held that the racial policies of the Union Government were essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the Union and that the Organization was debarred by Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter from intervening in them. In that connexion members of the Committee ought to consider that, in the case of so difficult a problem, different lines of approach might usefully be tried; and that countries which were trying those different lines of approach should regard them as convergent rather than divergent. While it was right that the indignation felt in the face of the racial policies enforced by the Union Government should find expression in the Committee, some countries might sincerely consider that they could best pursue the common purpose, the improvement of interracial relations, by other means and in other contexts, and that the usefulness of their action might be impaired if they were to associate themselves with more or less condemnatory draft resolutions adopted by the Committee. The motives inspiring the course taken by such countries ought to be respected. However, the Committee as a whole did not have to adopt a similar course since it was not collectively governed by the same considerations.

8. His delegation could not regard the racial policies of the Union Government as a matter falling essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of that Government. Such policies engendered fear and hatred—the seeds of war. The problem therefore was in the broadest and clearest sense an international, not a domestic, matter. Had the Union Government been endeavouring to bring existing racial discrimination to an end, the question could have been held to be essentially domestic. But it was striving not to diminish but to extend a system of racial discrimination, and the question of principle therefore presented itself insistently.

9. The principle asserted by the Union Government, that of the alleged superiority of the so-called white race, was contrary to the whole spirit of the Charter. The representative of Haiti, in his statement at the

52nd meeting, had effectively dealt with the argument of domestic jurisdiction by pointing out that in ordinary civil law the head of a family who sequestered members of his family and caused them to grow in conditions of deprivation and degradation would be committing an offence. In other words, the community as a whole could not regard such conduct as a purely domestic matter in which the head of the family alone was competent. The relevance of that observation was underlined by the repeated assertions of the Union Government itself, which defined the relationship of the European to the non-European community as being that of guardian to ward. What would be thought of a guardian who, in deliberate defiance of the best medical and scientific opinion, persisted in regarding his ward as mentally defective and treating him as such? That was essentially the position of the Union Government. It was an indefensible position and the Committee, in the view of the Irish delegation, should say so in plain language. He wished to emphasize that in taking that position, as it felt morally obliged to do, his delegation was not actuated by unfriendly feelings to the European community in South Africa. On the contrary, it felt that it was acting in its best interests.

10. Religious freedom perished when the laws of the Union of South Africa prohibited priests and clergymen from carrying out their religious duties if such duties conflicted with racial theories which were fundamentally opposed to Christian teaching. Such a system was one which Christians everywhere were obliged to condemn, and had condemned. In the same way, the Union Government had invaded academic freedom, the freedoms of the medical and legal professions, the freedom of the Press, the rights of trades unions and of employers, the freedom of political organization and even the humble social freedom of entertaining guests at home.

11. Of late, in spite of the intensification of the apartheid policy, there had been signs of a stirring of liberal opinion among the European population. That fact should encourage the United Nations not to relax its determination to make it plain that the present policies of the Union Government were condemned by the great majority of the nations.

12. Certain representatives, including the representative of New Zealand (53rd meeting), had put forward tentative suggestions concerning the form which the Committee's draft resolution might take. While reserving its position on those suggestions, the Irish delegation could say already that it would not favour any draft which might be interpreted as a weakening of the position taken by the Committee in earlier years, unless there was serious evidence of the intention on the part of the Union Government to modify its current racial policy. So far all the evidence pointed in the other direction. However, the Irish delegation would carefully consider any suggestions which offered a reasonable hope of progress in the matter.

13. Mr. BOGDAN (Romania) recalled that the Assembly had repeatedly rejected as unfounded the view that the Union Government's racial policies were a matter within that Government's exclusive competence. The harmful character of the policy of apartheid became even more evident when the policy was examined in the context of developments on the African continent as a whole. The prevailing trend in that area was towards

the awakening of the black peoples to an independent life, the overthrow of the oppression of the colonial system and the shattering of the concept of white supremacy which had served colonial domination. The continuing emergence of independent States in Africa had demonstrated the ability of the African peoples to organize their own life and to contribute to the strengthening of the international community. There could be no doubt that the African population of the Union of South Africa could make a similar contribution to the progress of their country.

14. The apartheid policy of the Union Government was creating a gap between the Union of South Africa and all the other independent States of the African continent. The Union of South Africa thus represented a stronghold for any colonialist attempts to oppose the progress towards independence of the native peoples of Africa.

15. Since the previous session of the Assembly, the Union Government had intensified its apartheid policy. There was no doubt that it was relying directly or indirectly on the support of colonial Powers. In the view of his delegation such support was shaky at best and had no future. It was also obvious that the Union Government expected that Member States would become discouraged after so many years of debate.

16. The United Nations must not abandon its efforts to bring about the abolition of racial persecution in the Union of South Africa. The Assembly must continue to support and help forward the inevitable historical process which constituted a fundamental feature of the progress of human society, the liquidation of colonialism and of the political concepts and practices based on the supremacy of one State, one nation or one race over another. If it failed to do so, the Assembly would be contributing to a discrepancy between United Nations activities and the realities of historical development, which had already been responsible for a number of failures in the activity of the Organization.

17. The Romanian delegation, convinced that the inevitable progress of mankind would eventually put an end to such reactionary inheritances of the past as the policy of apartheid, would support any measure which would bring that objective closer.

18. Mr. AZIZ (Afghanistan) said the position of his delegation on the item under consideration had been made abundantly clear at previous sessions of the Assembly. His country found it very difficult to understand how the policy of apartheid could be applied in a world of scientific achievement and liberal ideals, where new nations were being born and the Charter was subscribed to by the great majority of the population of the earth.

19. It was perhaps time to think of some other way to attempt to persuade those who practised apartheid that the future of their people and their country would be better served if they followed the universal trend towards liberalism. His delegation would support any constructive steps that would help to solve the racial conflict in South Africa.

20. Mr. GAJEWSKI (Poland) regretted that the Government of the Union of South Africa rejected the invitation contained in General Assembly resolution 1016 (XI), paragraph 4, to co-operate in a constructive approach to the question, because in the view of his delegation the best way to solve the question was by peaceful and friendly negotiation.

21. He would not deal with the question of the competence of the United Nations in the matter, which had been settled by the past resolutions of the General Assembly, but he wished to draw attention to the situation created in the Union of South Africa as reflected in recent information from that country. He quoted excerpts from the articles by Mr. James Morris in the Manchester Guardian Weekly to illustrate the coldly calculated and merciless economic struggle that was being waged to keep the indigenous population in a state of economic dependence. Certain circles were interested in perpetuating the backward state of the indigenous population with a view to its exploitation as cheap labour in agriculture, mining and industry.

22. The position of three-fourths of the population of the Union of South Africa was worsening day by day. Each new United Nations resolution on the question seemed to be met by new discriminatory legislation. The Union Government had drawn up a vast body of regulations to enforce a series of laws which offended human dignity. In 1949 it had adopted the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act, No.55; in 1950, the Immorality Amendment Act, No.21, the Group Areas Act, No.41, and the Population Registration Act, No.30; in 1953, the Public Safety Act, No.3, and the Criminal Law Amendment Act, No.8; in 1954, the Native Resettlement Act, No.19, and in 1956 the Industrial Conciliation Act No.28—all of them designed to penalize the non-white population. During the past year the Government had enacted the Native Laws Amendment Act and the Separate University Education Act. Those Acts, which limited traditional freedoms, had aroused a wave of indignation in religious and university circles.

23. Behind the cold legal terminology of such legislation stood the tragedy of millions of people, a tragedy to which the United Nations could not remain indifferent. The Polish delegation was prepared to support any draft resolution aimed at finding a solution consistent with the interests of the population of the Union of South Africa and the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

24. Mr. QUIROGA GALDO (Bolivia) said that Bolivia had learned from its own experience that the main cause of racial prejudice was economic inequality, and that to eliminate such inequality the standard of living of the coloured peoples must be raised. The historical reasons for the so-called racial superiority of the white population of Dutch or British origin in South Africa and of the Spanish colonies in Latin America were similar. The technical achievements of Western civilization had enabled the white conqueror to impose his rule upon the natives, and the process of colonial exploitation had followed. The colonizers had used the system of racial segregation to create a feeling of inferiority among the indigenous inhabitants and gradually to destroy their national personality. Nevertheless in some countries the gradual mingling of the races, psychologically and biologically, had led to the rise of mestizo nations, and ethnic discrimination had begun to decline. At a given point, such multiracial societies had realized that they were infinitely richer in human resources than in the days of discrimination.

25. In the Union of South Africa, however, the white population, despite all it had in common with the non-whites, was continuing to erect barriers against racial equality, and the small group of reactionaries who were

responsible refused to acknowledge that they were fruitlessly opposing an irreversible process.

26. The United Nations must find a way of bringing to an end the negative and harmful attitude of the Government of the Union of South Africa. That Government had consistently ignored the repeated recommendations of the General Assembly, and had extended its policy of apartheid to the fields of politics, education, religion and even medicine. At a time when other countries, in particular the United States, were making every effort to end discrimination, the Union Government was persisting in outworn and discredited racist theories. Existing inequalities between the races had been brought about by economic and technical factors, the temporary effects of which would disappear when their cause was removed. Ultimately, the inevitable economic and cultural advance of the non-white population of South Africa would bring about the end of discrimination.

27. It was to be hoped that the Union Government would eventually realize that compliance with the United Nations recommendations could only redound to the progress and prestige of the Union of South Africa. The Bolivian delegation would support any draft resolution reiterating the firm determination of the United Nations to secure the application of the principles of the Charter, or else to remove from membership a State which, by absenting itself from the deliberations, had voluntarily placed itself outside international law.

28. Mr. STRATOS (Greece) said that the Assembly had always approached the problem of racial discrimination in South Africa in a spirit of conciliation. However, all attempts had failed in the face of the Union Government's determined hostility. That Government insisted that the United Nations attempts to secure respect for human rights constituted unacceptable interference in its domestic affairs. Nevertheless the Assembly must continue to make every effort to convince the Union Government that it should re-examine a policy so contrary to the principles of the Charter and should approach the racial question in a spirit of justice. The Greek delegation understood the problem with which the Union Government was confronted, but it could not feel that a policy of racial discrimination offered any solution. It found it hard to realize that there could still be Governments maintaining that one race was superior to another by reason of its origin or colour. It was incomprehensible that a government which had accepted the Charter of the United Nations and signed the Declaration of Human Rights should apply the very policy of racial discrimination which it had fought against and condemned.

29. In all the resolutions which the General Assembly had adopted on the matter, the Members of the United Nations had re-stated their faith in human rights. His delegation believed that the United Nations should continue to reaffirm its position of principle, in the hope that the time might come when the Union Government would recognize the truth and do its duty. It would not be without value, therefore, to appeal once more to the Union Government to reconsider its position, which was universally condemned, and respect the decisions of the General Assembly. The Greek delegation was ready to support any constructive move, and would vote in favour of any draft resolution

designed to find a solution to the racial problem in South Africa. It urged the Union Government to abandon its present attitude and to associate itself with the efforts of the United Nations to solve the problem in the spirit of the Charter.

30. Mr. KOZACHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) noted that the United Nations Commission on the Racial Situation in the Union of South Africa, established under resolution 616 (VII), had reported the existence of such flagrant racial discrimination as to cause anger throughout the world. The Union Government had refused to heed the repeated appeals of the General Assembly and was persisting in its shameful policy, and the representatives of the Union of South Africa in the United Nations had extolled the policy of apartheid as the best solution to the racial problem. The non-European majority in South Africa were forbidden to participate in public life, and their rights in regard to trade-unionism, property ownership, travel and education were shamefully curtailed. They were subjected to a mass repression the closest parallel to which was the Nazi concentration camps.

31. The Union Government's policy could not be claimed as a purely internal matter, since it constituted a source of friction between Governments. The peoples of Asia and Africa were rightly concerned over the Union Government's continual violation of the human rights of the non-white population.

32. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic had always been hostile to racial discrimination. In the Second World War it had experienced the harmful effects of racist theory as a national policy. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic accordingly condemned the Union Government for following a policy which aimed at the gradual destruction of the non-white population of South Africa. His delegation urged the Assembly unanimously and strongly to condemn the Union Government's policy. It would support any proposal designed to settle the problem of racial discrimination in the Union of South Africa in accordance with the Purposes and Principles of the Charter.

33. U HLA KYAING (Burma) said that his country, whose peoples were firm believers in the equality of man, was baffled by the policy of the Government of the Union of South Africa which persisted in its policy of apartheid, despite the repeated recommendations of the General Assembly and despite its obligations under the Charter. The Union Government had refused even to attend the deliberations of the United Nations on apartheid and had sought to justify that attitude by Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. The Burmese delegation could not agree that racial segregation was a matter of domestic jurisdiction; such acts were a violation of the fundamental human rights and freedoms embodied in the Charter.

34. At the Bandung Conference of Asian and African nations held in April 1955, there had been unanimous disapproval of the policy and practice of racial segregation, which was denounced as a gross violation of fundamental human rights and a denial of the fundamental values of civilization and the dignity of man. In the face of such widespread condemnation, the Union Government had a duty to reconsider its attitude towards apartheid and to adopt a more reasonable and civilized approach in regard to its own citizens.

35. The Burmese delegation realized that the United Nations was not a world government and was not in a position to impose its decisions on an unwilling or unco-operative Member State. Nevertheless, it should not remain passive. In the end, the universal disapproval of apartheid was bound to stir the conscience of the Union Government, and the day would come when it would change its attitude. The Burmese delegation would therefore continue to press for the discussion of the problem of apartheid in the United Nations, and would support any draft resolution which would contribute to the solution of the question of race conflict in South Africa.

36. Mr. MAKIEDO (Yugoslavia) noted that the Union Government was persisting in its refusal to co-operate with the United Nations in the settlement of the question on the grounds that under Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter the entire matter was a domestic affair in which the international community had no right to intervene. That argument had been refuted on so many occasions that it was unnecessary to do more than point out that no country was entitled to invoke Article 2, paragraph 7, in order to avoid fulfilling obligations specifically laid down elsewhere in the Charter—in the case in point, Article 56 c and Article 56.

37. It was clear that the Union Government was deliberately ignoring the developments that had taken place since the Second World War. It disregarded the changes that had occurred in Asia and Africa, where many of the formerly oppressed peoples had won their independence and were now rising in defence of those peoples who were still subjected to discrimination. The international implications of the policy of apartheid, and the danger which it constituted to international peace, were growing constantly. The situation had become so acute that it justified the oft-expressed fear that the policy pursued by the Union Government would one day make it necessary to examine the question in the far graver circumstances of an immediate threat to peace.

38. Yugoslavia had suffered greatly from racial discrimination during the Second World War. It was the more determined to support every effort of the United Nations against racial discrimination wherever it might arise—and particularly in the Union of South Africa, where it had assumed forms which denied basic human rights to the majority of the population and seriously endangered international relations. The Yugoslav delegation sincerely hoped that the Union Government would reconsider its attitude, abandon its policy of non-co-operation with the United Nations, and settle the problem under discussion in accordance with the Purposes and Principles of the Charter.

39. Mr. ESPIL (Argentina) pointed out that the question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid of the Government of the Union of South Africa (agenda item 60) and the treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa (agenda item 61) were both part of the fundamental problem of racial discrimination, and it was therefore illogical to consider them separately.

40. Ever since the first session of the General Assembly in 1946 the Union Government had maintained that the question was covered by the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. A number of important countries, all of them staunch supporters of the Charter, had shared that view. On the other hand, a

larger number of countries believed that in its racial policy the Union Government was violating essential principles of the Charter and more especially those relating to respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.

41. Thus, while the Union Government maintained that no State was subject to control or intervention in matters within its domestic jurisdiction, those opposing that view had maintained at successive sessions of the General Assembly that adherence to the Charter involved a limitation of national sovereignty which extended to the domestic sphere, and that the Assembly was therefore within its rights in studying any question involving discrimination.

42. In view of those two conflicting but equally valid standpoints, and being of the opinion that the question was a moral rather than a political one, his Government preferred every time to avoid entering into the legal question of the United Nations jurisdiction in the matter and to concentrate on the search for a compromise. The discussion which had gone on year after year, far from producing any practical result, had aggravated the situation by keeping the delegation of the Union of South Africa away from the deliberations; and his Government felt that in the face of the express provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, the way in which the Union Government handled the problem of segregation of its population was a matter which did not come within the purview of the United Nations, since it was essentially a domestic affair of that State.

43. Nevertheless, the actions taken by a country with regard to matters within its jurisdiction should be in keeping with the fundamental principles which inspired and constituted the raison d'être of the United Nations. It was therefore the duty of the Member States to adopt such measures as were in their power to implement the great Purposes and Principles of the Charter.

44. In that spirit, and subject always to respect for the principle of not interfering in the domestic affairs of the Union of South Africa, his delegation would examine favourably, as it had always done in the past, any studies or recommendations by the General Assembly with a view to assisting in the realization of "universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion", as laid down in Article 55 c of the Charter.

45. When the Charter had been drafted, some delegations had proposed that Article 2, paragraph 7, should be amended to include a provision to the effect that the International Court of Justice should decide whether or not a particular matter fell within the domestic jurisdiction of a State. When the issue had come up at the first session of the General Assembly, the delegation of the Union of South Africa had disagreed with the Indian view that a recommendation by the General Assembly would not constitute an intervention in the domestic affairs of South Africa. It had held that the utmost which the Assembly was authorized to do by the provisions of the Charter was to make a recommendation, and that to do so in regard to a domestic issue would involve actual intervention. The delegation

of the Union of South Africa had formally proposed^{1/} that the General Assembly should seek a ruling from the International Court of Justice as to whether the question of the treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa was a matter essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of that country. That proposal had not been accepted and instead the General Assembly had subsequently called for direct negotiations between the Government of the Union of South Africa and the Government of India (resolution 265 (III)).

46. Since that time, the Assembly had consistently tried to influence the situation in South Africa, but its reiterated statements and recommendations had merely had the effect of alienating the Union Government. Many delegations wondered whether the Assembly had not gone too far, and likewise recognized that, having established a precedent, it would find it hard to decide where to draw the line in intervening in the domestic affairs of States. There were many instances in which it could be claimed that States were violating human rights in their domestic affairs. That explained the opposition of many States which abhorred racial segregation and themselves respected all the provisions of the Charter, to intervention by the United Nations in any matter which they considered fell within the domestic jurisdiction of States. Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter provided a fundamental guarantee which Member States should not sacrifice and was of vital importance to those among them that were not entitled to exercise the veto. Its existence had been of far greater value in the maintenance of peace than had over-liberal interpretations of the scope of the Organization's activities, however worthy the purpose of such interpretations might have been.

47. Although it was right that the United Nations should do its utmost to promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without regard to race, it was equally true that in doing so it could not make itself into a supra-national authority. Any attempt on its part to intervene in the domestic affairs of its Members weakened its authority and prestige.

48. The racial question in South Africa could not be settled by adopting resolutions condemning the policy of the Union Government. The problem was an extremely delicate one, which South Africa should be left to solve in its own way. There was no point in repeating measures which had proved unsuccessful. It would be preferable to explore new avenues; perhaps it would be useful to obtain an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice. Such an approach could not be interpreted as a weakening of the position adopted by the General Assembly in the past. At the same time, it might be more conciliatory than the method of passing new resolutions which had no effect.

49. Mr. VOUTOV (Bulgaria) noted that the Union Government was intensifying its apartheid policy which applied both to the indigenous non-white population and to the 400,000 residents of Indian extraction, and deprived that population of the most elementary rights. It was clear from the Statement made by the representative of India (50th meeting) that the policy of the Union Government was inconsistent not only with the Charter but with the forces of progress and international co-operation.

^{1/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Second part of first session, Joint Committee of the First and Sixth Committees, annex 1e.

50. The apartheid policy was supplemented by other acts, and the combination of the two could only be described as fascism, the resurgence of which the United Nations was in duty bound to prevent. After passing a number of laws to implement its policy of apartheid, it had launched an attack on all the progressive democratic elements in the country. The Communist Party had been banned and the remaining democratic organizations and parties had been attacked. In December 1956 the leaders of the most important African organizations, together with other democratic leaders, had been arrested; 156 of them had been charged with high treason, merely because they had taken an open stand against the Government's racial policy. The farcical trial had been reminiscent of the trial of Dimitrov by the Nazis in 1933, and the purpose behind the two trials had been identical: to wipe out all democratic organizations and institutions and to intimidate all those who opposed the Government's racial policy. Furthermore, the Union Government had imperialist designs. It had unlawfully seized South West Africa and was at the present time advancing claims on the territory of Northern and Southern Rhodesia.

51. There was therefore every reason to consider that the Union Government constituted a threat to the peace in southern Africa, and recent events in the Union provided fresh evidence to support that view. Racial tension was increasing as the non-white population's resistance to racial discrimination stiffened. The recent boycott of the bus services by the Africans was a case in point. It was obvious that unless the racial policies of the Union Government were altered the struggle would become increasingly bitter and might well have serious repercussions in other parts of Africa.

52. In the past, as at the current session, some delegations had pointed out there was no simple solution to the racial problem in South Africa, which was a domestic matter to be solved by the Government of that country. They therefore advocated patience and were against the adoption of any measures which might exasperate the Union Government. But it had long been recognized that the problem was not a purely domestic issue but one which involved a gross violation of the basic principles of the Charter. It was therefore incumbent on the Union Government to co-operate in a constructive approach to the question. However, that Government had taken no steps to carry forward the purposes of the General Assembly resolutions; it had to all intents and purposes ceased to participate in the work of the United Nations except on those rare occasions when it appeared to be to its advantage to do so. It absented itself because it was well aware that it could not refute the just accusations levelled against its racial policy and because it felt it could rely on the old and new colonial Powers to take its part in the United Nations. The old colonial Powers were obviously sensitive when the question of racial discrimination in South Africa was discussed in the United Nations, since it was a heritage of colonialism in those areas.

53. He advocated the adoption of a stronger policy by the United Nations and as a first step the re-establishment of the United Nations Commission on the Racial Situation in the Union of South Africa. His delegation would support any other proposals and draft resolutions the purpose of which was to end racial discrimination in South Africa as soon as possible.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.