

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 335th
MEETING**



Monday, 22 October 1962,
at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 87:</i>	
<i>The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued):</i>	
<i>(a) Race conflict in South Africa;</i>	
<i>(b) Treatment of people of Indian and Indo-Pakistan origin in the Republic of South Africa</i>	41

Chairman: Mr. Leopoldo BENITES (Ecuador).

AGENDA ITEM 87

The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (A/5167 and Add.1-6) (continued):

- (a) Race conflict in South Africa;**
- (b) Treatment of people of Indian and Indo-Pakistan origin in the Republic of South Africa (A/5166, A/5173)**

1. Mr. JABRI (Syria) said that the many resolutions passed by the General Assembly, and the many discussions and debates that had taken place in the Special Political Committee and other organs of the United Nations, all fruitlessly directed at dissuading the South African Government from practising its discriminatory policies, had already been referred to by many speakers. Despite all those efforts, the Government of South Africa had persisted in its defiance and today seemed more determined than ever to continue its detested policies of apartheid. Those policies, with which the Syrian delegation totally disagreed, were based on the belief that one race was entitled to subjugate and enslave another by the use of violence and military force.

2. Africa was fast becoming a continent of sovereign independent States. Singly and jointly, those States were bent upon creating an atmosphere of human equality in Africa, wherein each citizen would enjoy the full benefits of the principles set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the United Nations Charter, and other similar documents. South Africa's practice of apartheid was not a good augury for its future on the African continent, or as a useful member of the emerging African community of nations. While the rest of Africa was going forward, socially, economically, and politically, South Africa was using the force of arms to stem the tide.

3. The various laws enacted by the Government of South Africa to justify and strengthen the practice of apartheid, including the most recent, the General Law Amendment Act (Sabotage Act) of 1962, were evidence of South Africa's determination to oppose the spirit of the times, world opinion and the United Nations, the social and cultural pattern of development in Africa, human decency, and indeed history itself. All the debates and resolutions of the United Nations and all the

appeals of friendly nations had failed to bring about a change in South Africa's attitude. The whole array of peaceful means embodied in the Charter had so far succeeded only in intensifying South Africa's determination to pursue apartheid to the bitter end. Even such men of peace as the Reverend Michael Scott and Chief Albert Luthuli had dire forebodings of what awaited South Africa, if it persisted in its hateful policies.

4. The United Nations could not continue to allow the majority of non-white South Africans to be enslaved by a white minority and must take steps to secure fair and equal treatment for all South Africans. Those Member States which now acquiesced in South Africa's policies must be reminded of their obligations under the Charter. The time had come to eradicate the shameful prejudices of the South African leaders. In short, the United Nations must fulfil its obligations. To the oppressed non-white majority in South Africa, the United Nations was the only hope for emancipation and the peaceful restoration of their rights. If the United Nations did not agree on effective measures to make South Africa comply, another session would have been wasted and Member States would once more have refused to carry out their obligations. Such a failure would necessarily weaken the force of the United Nations as a symbol to which oppressed peoples could look for salvation. The consequences of failure to carry out resolutions were all too well known. One outstanding case was the failure of the United Nations to force Israel to comply with the many resolutions for the return of the Palestine Arab refugees to their homes.

5. The Syrian delegation believed that it was more than time to put a peaceful end to the South African Government's insane policies of apartheid, before violence ensued. It would be prepared to support any constructive draft resolution which would end the maltreatment of the oppressed millions of South Africa. Many intelligent people in South Africa were well aware that the Government's illogical course must come to an end sooner or later. Reports from South Africa indicated that a large number of liberal-minded persons in South Africa disagreed with the Government's policy. A news dispatch from Johannesburg reported the house arrest of a woman welfare worker for her opposition to apartheid. That should induce the Committee to redouble its efforts to bring the non-white peoples of South Africa self-respect, pride of citizenship, and those equal opportunities which were the essential requirements of man's existence.

6. Mr. JARGALSAIKHAN (Mongolia) observed that under the provisions of Article 1, paragraph 3 of the Charter the United Nations could not stand by while millions of Africans and people of Indian and Indo-Pakistan origin in South Africa were being subjected to the arbitrary racist practices of the reactionary white settlers. The Government of South Africa had

disregarded the appeals of progressive public opinion everywhere and was intensifying its policy of repression which had become law. Many representatives, particularly those of the African States, had made detailed statements concerning the objectionable features of that policy and the threat which its continued application entailed. He would therefore confine his remarks to an expression of the reaction of his Government and people to the situation prevailing in South Africa. It was only natural that Mongolian public opinion should condemn the policy of apartheid, for under the democratic socialist system in Mongolia all citizens had equal rights. In accordance with the Mongolian Constitution it was illegal to restrict the rights of citizens on account of their ethnic or racial affiliation. Racial discrimination was contrary to Mongolian law and to the ideological and moral principles of the Mongolian people. The General Assembly had repeatedly adopted resolutions stating that the racial policy of the South African Government was incompatible with the Charter and with the obligations of a Member State. In flagrant disregard of that judgement, the South African Government had recently enacted a Sabotage Act under which the slightest expression of dissatisfaction with the policy of racial segregation could be treated as a subversive act. Africans in the Republic could not move about freely in their own land and were continually being fined for violations of the pass laws. The facts all indicated that the indigenous inhabitants of South Africa were totally denied freedom of expression and that the repressive measures applied to them bordered on genocide. World public opinion had long since categorically denounced the anti-democratic racist policies of the Government of South Africa and called upon it to put an end to those abuses.

7. The régime prevailing in that country, under which a small number of white settlers held absolute sway over the great majority of the inhabitants, was an offshoot of colonialism and the condition of the indigenous inhabitants represented colonial slavery at its worst. The threat to peace and security in that part of the world to which the policy of apartheid gave rise was intensified by the entry of the Republic of South Africa into military and political agreements with the Portuguese colonialists and the so-called Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland and by the recent increases in the Republic's military expenditures. Those developments led to the conclusion that a military and political union of reactionary forces directed against the national liberation movement of the peoples of Africa was being formed. The statement by the Chairman of the South African delegation in the general debate (1128th plenary meeting) and the findings of the Special Committee for South West Africa as set forth in its report (A/5212) showed that the South African Government had no intention of complying with the decisions of the United Nations. The conscience of the world could no longer tolerate the situation which had been created in South Africa, and the United Nations should take the sternest and most effective measures to put an end to it. His delegation had joined in sponsoring the inclusion of the item in the Committee's agenda (A/5167 and Add.1-6) for the current session and would be ready to support any United Nations action that would assist the oppressed people of that country to win their freedom.

8. Mr. CHAKRAVARTY (India) welcomed the five new Members of the United Nations; he was sure that they would make a valuable contribution to the Com-

mittee's deliberations. For the benefit of the new Member States and those individual representatives who might be new to the subject, he gave a brief survey of the history in the United Nations of the question of the treatment of people of Indian and Indo-Pakistan origin in the Republic of South Africa and of the question of race conflict in South Africa. The two items had remained separate for many years for historical reasons and because of the violation of solemn treaty obligations by the Government of South Africa in regard to the case of people of Indian and Indo-Pakistan origin. However, as the Indian delegation had repeatedly pointed out during debates on the items, India did not desire that any special treatment should be accorded to people of Indian origin in South Africa. By agreeing to merge the two items at the current session, the Government of India had given further proof of its desire for equal treatment, equal rights and equal privileges for all the inhabitants of South Africa, whatever their origin, race or religion. It looked upon the solution of the question of the treatment of Indians in South Africa as an integral part of the solution of apartheid in general. A single debate on the two items would not only save the Committee's time but would also make the debate more effective by allowing all the relevant facts to be marshalled at once.

9. At the sixteenth session (279th meeting), the Indian delegation had devoted itself to demonstrating the absurdity of the South African Foreign Minister's contention that apartheid was really a policy of separate development for South Africa's non-white population. It had drawn its material chiefly from the discriminatory laws on the South African Statute Books. In the course of the past year, none of those discriminatory laws had been repealed nor had their enforcement been in any way relaxed. In fact, further legislation had been enacted, designed to inflict even greater tyranny and suffering on the non-white population. The General Law Amendment Act, better known as the Sabotage Act, adopted on 27 June 1962, was, as its name implied, a series of amendments of laws already enacted for the purpose of maintaining white supremacy in Africa. Sabotage was defined in very broad terms in the Act and included almost every conceivable action to which the Administration might choose to object. Normally there would be no pre-trial examination for offenders under the Act, trial was to be without jury and the burden of proof of innocence was on the accused. Punishment on conviction was imprisonment for a minimum term of five years and the maximum penalty was death, even in the case of juveniles. The International Commission of Jurists had issued a statement and condemned the Act before it was passed; it criticized in particular the extremely wide definition of the offence of sabotage, the excessive penalties and the placing of the onus of proof on the accused. In the view of the Commission, the Act drastically reduced the right of free assembly, of freedom of speech, of freedom of the Press and freedom of movement. The definition of sabotage was so wide that almost anyone who undertook any action against the status quo could be accused of it.

10. Chief Albert Luthuli, President of the African National Congress, now under a ban, had said that the provisions of the Act went far beyond legitimate peacetime security measures in truly democratic countries. He had added that the Act amounted to an admission by the South African Government that the struggle of the people for freedom had become effec-

tive. Mr. Mandela, another prominent leader of the banned African National Congress, had been arrested under the Act on 5 August, along with several other persons, including liberal Europeans. The first house arrest order issued under the new Act had been against a European woman, Mrs. Helen Joseph. Since 20 October 1962, the holding of meetings in protest against such convictions had been prohibited in South Africa and South West Africa, in order to prevent further demonstrations on behalf of Mr. Mandela and against the house arrest of Mrs. Joseph. Legislation of that type was bound to drive opposition underground; it was subjecting South Africa to a tyranny worse even than that practised in Nazi Germany.

11. In his recent speech to the General Assembly (1128th plenary meeting), the Foreign Minister of South Africa had complained that the Special Political Committee regarded the so-called Bantustan policy as merely a bluff. He claimed that the policy had been well received by the Bantu of the Transkei and was operating smoothly and successfully. In fact, the Bantustans were nothing more than native reserves, set up to provide reservoirs of cheap labour for the whites. Under the arrangements for so-called self-government, the police and security forces would still be under white control. The Chiefs were to be nominated by the Government and were to work under the control and guidance of white administrators. The Prime Minister himself, speaking in the South African Senate, had made it quite clear that there was no question of making the Bantustans independent States.

12. The South African Foreign Minister had also complained about the functioning of the United Nations, and claimed that in recent years it had become a different organization. He had asserted that important provisions of the Charter were being callously disregarded or used to serve the ends of groups of States, that principles were being ignored and that the application of a "double standard" had developed. It was extraordinary that South Africa, which had consistently violated the provisions of the Charter and flouted successive resolutions of the General Assembly, should complain of the disregard of the Charter, and ironical that a country which had one law for the white and another for the non-white should charge the United Nations with having a "double standard". It was true, however, that the United Nations had changed since 1946, particularly as far as South Africa was concerned. At that time there had been very few African and Asian Members and it had been difficult even to get the two items under discussion on the agenda. During the first period, up to 1957, many countries had consistently abstained, and some had even voted against the resolutions calling upon South Africa to reconsider its apartheid policies. Many delegations had justified their abstention on the grounds that the United Nations was not competent to deal with the internal affairs of a Member State, which was exactly the position taken by South Africa. The Indian delegation, which had been in the forefront of the attempt to bring conditions in South Africa to the notice of the world Organization, had had an uphill task to perform. To obtain maximum support, it had been necessary to tone down the resolutions on race conflict in South Africa and render them as moderate as possible. The resolutions had merely deplored the situation in South Africa and called upon that country to live up to the Charter which it had signed.

13. There had been a yearly request by India and Pakistan calling on South Africa to discuss the question of its ill treatment of citizens of Indian origin. South Africa had not even replied to the invitations received from India and Pakistan and had gone on ignoring the platitudinous resolutions adopted year after year by the General Assembly. It was, therefore, understandable that the South African Foreign Minister should regret those good old days. Gradually, more and more countries had begun to condemn the policy of apartheid until ultimately South Africa's only supporter was Portugal. The situation had changed even further during the last two years, after the entry of a large number of African States which had, naturally, demanded more energetic action. Resolutions had become progressively stronger but had still failed to produce the desired results. At the thirteenth session of the General Assembly, the United States had for the first time voted in favour of a resolution (1248 (XIII)) expressing regret and concern at South Africa's continued flouting of the Charter.

14. It was not until the fifteenth session that, for the first time, there had been no opposition to the resolution (1598 (XV)), except from Portugal, and no abstentions. That resolution had requested all States to consider taking such separate and collective action as was open to them. The Indian Government had taken steps as early as 1946. It had no diplomatic ties with the Republic of South Africa, and there had been no trade between the two countries since 1946. After the fifteenth session, several African countries had broken off political or economic relations with South Africa. The Indian delegation deeply regretted that other States had not found it possible to follow a similar course of action. The efforts of a few African-Asian countries had cost South Africa only a small portion of her trade which was being made up by increased trade with other nations. South Africa could not be hurt unless the most important trading countries imposed a boycott. About 70 per cent of South Africa's exports went to ten countries, and a number of them would suffer more than South Africa from a trade boycott since they had a favourable balance of trade. South Africa knew, therefore, that there was no need to worry about any real movement for economic sanctions in the United Nations.

15. The South African Government's behaviour had created a dangerous and explosive situation. So far, African movements had been remarkably peaceful and restrained in the face of continual provocation. A complete failure of non-violent methods, however, had now given rise to a demand for more militant action. The non-violent movement, inspired by the action of Mahatma Gandhi, was being discredited and leadership was passing to the hands of people who felt that only violence could bring about any change in South Africa. Time was running out and unless some peaceful solution was found it might be too late. The South African Government seemed to be determined to try to maintain itself by intensified repression. The fact that a number of liberal white South Africans were leaving the country was a portent. If the struggles by the non-whites in South Africa should receive active support from outside, it might even lead to a major international conflict. There could be no doubt that there existed a serious threat to peace in the area.

16. The votes in the Assembly during the past few years must have shown South Africa that it was becoming more and more isolated. The world unequi-

vocally condemned the South African Government's racial policy and the time had come when South Africa must understand that its policy of apartheid, which was a negation of human rights, must be changed, if not on humanitarian grounds, at least on those of enlightened self-interest. Not South Africa alone but the whole world was exposed to the dangers arising out of racial conflict and to the affront to human dignity. There was still time to call a halt.

17. Mr. LAMANI (Albania) observed that the profound changes taking place throughout the world clearly showed that nothing could now stop the tide of liberation that was sweeping through Africa, Asia and Latin America.

18. Everywhere there had been an awakening among oppressed peoples who were determined to shake off the yoke of foreign domination. All efforts, therefore, on the part of the colonial powers to maintain their rule were doomed to failure. The tide of liberation was also beginning to be felt in South Africa, where 12 million Africans and other non-whites were suffering the effects of a cruel policy of racial discrimination at the hands of a minority fascist Government.

19. The two items that were being considered together were both familiar to the Committee, for they had been discussed for a number of years and been the subject of numerous resolutions. The Government of South Africa had been condemned for its disregard of the United Nations Charter and for its denial of elementary human rights, both by the Organization itself and by world opinion. However, past resolutions on the subject had failed to contain any provisions that would have compelled the South African Government to abandon its discriminatory policies—simply because a number of countries with colonialist and neo-colonialist interests were aiding and abetting that Government. It was no secret that the Governments of those countries were even today providing South Africa with substantial political, economic, and military assistance; they incurred thereby a heavy responsibility in the eyes of the world. Despite public statements to the contrary, the economic and military aid which South Africa received from the western Powers was being used, not to improve living standards but to strengthen the policy of apartheid and racial discrimination and to facilitate the exploitation of non-white inhabitants by the white settlers both in South Africa and in neighbouring territories.

20. Certain North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries, with a direct or indirect interest in South Africa and other African countries, were doing their utmost to maintain that bastion of colonialism and neo-colonialism in Africa. That fact explained the opposition of the western countries to the Soviet Union's proposal^{1/} to impose an embargo on the supply of arms to South Africa. Secure in that support, the South African Government was able to declare that apartheid was a tradition in South Africa, designed to safeguard what the whites had built up in the course of three centuries. It was obvious that the proponents of racialism and many members of the European community in South Africa had never subscribed to the principle of equality, and sought to justify discrimination by the use of philosophical and religious arguments.

21. Once again the South African Government was defying the United Nations, stating that no amount of criticism would induce it to abandon its policy of apartheid. That policy was now so discredited that it had to be made more palatable by the use of such euphemisms as "new frontiers" and "separate development". The only new development that had occurred in South Africa had been the intensified repression of all who had the courage to speak out in favour of justice and freedom. As a result of the new Sabotage Act the Government was now more free than ever to persecute and terrorize. Even the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs had been unable to refute any of the accusations levelled at his Government's policy from all quarters of the globe.

22. The claims that were made by the South African Government about the well-being of the native population were hardly credible. True, a minority of whites, who held the reins of power, prospered at the expense of what they considered to be an "inferior race". But it was hard to speak of well-being in view of the reports of the savage repression of a defenceless people by bands of racialists and fascists. Ignoring the resolutions of the United Nations and the appeals of other groups and organizations, not to mention public opinion, the South African Government was continuing to enforce its criminal policy. Ever harsher measures were being introduced in that country to stifle protest. Also racial discrimination was being extended to every sphere of life. The public health situation was deplorable too, in that "peaceful and happy" country. It was reported that more than 12,000 people—mostly non-whites—died each year from tuberculosis. The non-white population also suffered from serious malnutrition, and more than 10,000 children were reported to die each year from under-feeding. As part of the policy of apartheid, monstrous plans were being devised to set up separate African States where entire communities would be removed from their homes—not to a promised land, as alleged, but to a barren and impoverished region. It was clear that the Government intended to transfer the Bantus to areas without natural resources where they would be kept under rigid supervision, thereby constituting reservoirs of cheap labour. The Government would thus achieve two aims simultaneously, namely to isolate the Africans and exploit them more easily. Those new plans had given rise to considerable public indignation throughout the world.

23. The Albanian delegation believed, with many other delegations, that the time had come to put an immediate end to that intolerable situation. The African population of South Africa had long been awaiting a solution; resolutions that did no more than deplore the policy of apartheid would provide no remedy. It was beginning to feel that only by its own efforts would it succeed in winning its freedom, and history showed that once a people was determined to shake off the yoke of oppression no force could restrain it. Albania believed that the only course was to apply political, economic and other sanctions against South Africa, promptly and without hesitation. In view of that country's persistent disregard of the fundamental principles of the Charter, Albania similarly supported the proposal that South Africa should be expelled from the United Nations in accordance with Article 6 of the Charter.

24. Mr. GARCIA DEL SOLAR (Argentina) said that he was glad that two questions that had previously

^{1/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 70, document A/SPC/L.74.

been considered separately were now being dealt with together. Both had their roots in racial discrimination and, if a satisfactory solution was to be found, the evil must be attacked at the source, whatever its manifestations and whoever its victims might be. It was very rare to find such agreement in the United Nations concerning a political question. However, with South Africa absent from the Committee room, virtual unanimity had been achieved. Not only had speakers categorically condemned what was euphemistically described as "separate development", but they were becoming increasingly impatient to end the frustration generated by South Africa's lack of response to the Organization's repeated appeals.

25. It would take too long to enumerate all the instances in which South Africa had evaded its international responsibilities under the Charter. Suffice it to point out that fundamental human rights were denied in every sector. Non-white South African citizens were denied civil rights, were subjected to treatment that was detrimental to their health, and were restricted in their right to freedom of expression and of association.

26. The results achieved by passing some twenty resolutions on the subject had been far from encouraging for Member States. Not only did South Africa ignore those appeals but it actually continued to pass laws strengthening its policy of apartheid. Its response to the two resolutions adopted at the past session of the General Assembly had been the Sabotage Act, which tended still further to convert the policy of apartheid into an institution.

27. It was sad for Latin Americans to see the emergence of newly independent nations in Africa overshadowed by the threat of race conflict in several areas of that continent. The development of independent nations should take place in a climate of peace and progress, but neither would be possible in Africa unless South Africa, which was one of the most advanced African States, set the kind of example required by present-day standards of racial co-operation. The States of Latin America had come into existence at a time when enlightened ideas had won recognition, and the Governments of those States had set as their goal the granting of equal rights to all citizens. The fact that people of all races and national origins had been freely admitted to the Latin American countries had been a decisive factor in the progress of those countries. Where vestiges of racial discrimination still remained in isolated parts of the American continent, every effort was made to eradicate the evil.

28. The South African Government had given no encouragement to the hope that it would change its policies. Its only reply to the outcry of indignation all over the world was to invoke Article 2, paragraph 7 of the United Nations Charter, stating that the question of "separate development" was entirely a matter of domestic jurisdiction. That argument carried no weight, for the principles of the Charter established international responsibilities that transcended frontiers. The Argentine delegation adhered firmly to the principle of non-intervention but could not interpret that principle as an excuse for shirking international responsibilities, specially in the present age of international co-operation and interdependence. The provisions of the Charter contained in Article 1, paragraph 3 and in Articles 55 and 56, created inescapable obligations respecting human rights and fundamental freedoms.

29. The Argentine delegation was aware of the difficulties that the South African Government would have in eradicating ideas that were so deeply rooted in certain sections of the population. It was equally lenient in judging isolated infringements of human rights, provided that they were promptly punished. The policy of apartheid did not, however, represent a succession of isolated incidents but had effects that reached far beyond the geographical borders of the country. Furthermore that policy kept the non-white population in a state of suppressed rebellion and encouraged similar discriminatory practices in other parts of Africa where bloodshed had resulted from the discriminatory practices of certain Governments. It was hard, therefore, to see how Member States of the United Nations could allow South Africa to take refuge behind Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter.

30. Argentina had complete faith in man, his creative capacity and his future destiny. However, in order to achieve that destiny man must be allowed to live in freedom and dignity, to work in peace and for peace. Only thus could he make his full contribution to the collective endeavours that must be undertaken in the present century. The obstacles to that happy future of mankind could be eliminated only by the use of peaceful means and by persuasion. Argentina had always favoured mediation, negotiation and arbitration, in international dealings. It hoped that such methods would be used in seeking a solution to the problem of apartheid too. Unfortunately, however, the South African Government gave little encouragement to those who sought a peaceful solution. Its official policy of discrimination was an act of defiance to all free peoples, justifying the growing impatience with which the General Assembly viewed the critical situation in South Africa.

31. Mrs. FEKINI (Libya) said that her delegation deplored the negative response of the Republic of South Africa to the General Assembly's many resolutions on the concern of world public opinion at its racist policies; her delegation felt that it was incumbent upon all Member States, whether separately or collectively, to take immediate action to exert the moral force of the United Nations in a continued effort to put an end to the situation in that country. It was a flagrant anachronism that in an era when the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual were increasingly commanding respect elsewhere, South Africa should continue to pursue policies that were in defiance of the conscience of mankind. Libya, as a recently admitted Member of the United Nations, witnessed with grave concern the flouting of the purposes and principles of the United Nations, laid down in Article 1, paragraph 3 of the Charter, by a founding Member which had signed the Charter at San Francisco and had shared in the task of drafting its articles. Apartheid being, as it was, an outright negation of human rights and freedoms, it was hardly surprising that the delegation of South Africa should have been unable to advance any serious argument in favour of its continuation and should have appealed to Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter as its sole defence. An issue involving such a gross violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms could not be regarded as falling solely within the internal jurisdiction of any country.

32. The subject of apartheid had been discussed exhaustively year after year since 1952; there was no need for her to dwell upon its manifestations. She

merely wished to observe, therefore, that a system which exalted the fallacious notion of race superiority and the segregation of races on the basis of their colour, was a denial of the teachings of Islam and was entirely incompatible with ethics and morality. The Libyan people was deeply affected by the sufferings of the African inhabitants of South Africa and by the discrimination practised against people of Indian and Indo-Pakistan origin in the Republic. The African inhabitants of South Africa should know that the peoples of the other African countries had espoused their cause and would continue the struggle on their behalf until their rights had been restored.

33. By persisting in its erroneous policy of apartheid the Government of South Africa was violating the obligations assumed by it as a Member State and was thus jeopardizing its membership in the United Nations. The only other case in the history of the United Nations in which a Government had so consistently flouted the resolutions of the General Assembly was that involving the denial of the fundamental and inalienable rights of the Palestine Arab refugees. The policy whereby the South African Government was suppressing the African population constituted a potential danger, for the spirit of nationalism which was growing stronger on the African continent every day would no longer tolerate it. Apartheid was doomed to failure.

34. Now that the Committee was discussing the subject of violations of human rights on the basis of colour, she would like to take the occasion to pay a tribute to the moral courage of certain Governments, particularly that of the United States, which had recently acted firmly and successfully to combat anachronistic manifestations of racial discrimination in their own countries.

35. If the South African Government continued to ignore the appeals of world public opinion as expressed in the United Nations the Organization should resort to more effective measures, including the application of the provisions of Article 6 of the Charter regarding the expulsion of Members who persistently violated its principles.

36. Mr. LONCAR (Yugoslavia) observed that the present session marked the tenth anniversary of the Assembly's discussion of the problem of racial discrimination in South Africa. It was a sad occasion for all Members, for it was an anniversary that did credit to no society or nation. The past decade had been one of continual suffering on the part of the oppressed non-white population of South Africa, deprived as it was of the most elementary human rights. For the

South African Government it had been a decade of persistent struggle against the principles of the United Nations Charter and against progress. And it was particularly tragic that such abuses of human dignity could take place at a time when the colonial system was fast nearing its end.

37. In a decade when the nations of the world had become unanimous in recognizing the right of all peoples to freedom and equality, the South African Government had elevated apartheid to a social philosophy and State policy. And at a time when racial harmony had become essential to the preservation of peace, that same Government was fomenting hatred and strife—antagonizing not only the majority of its own population, but also its African neighbours and the whole of civilized mankind.

38. Not only had there been no improvement in South Africa's attitude over the past ten years, but it was now practising racial discrimination on an even wider scale and in more acute forms. When racial prejudice was being increasingly condemned as regressive, the Government of a white minority was practising the harshest racial tyranny on the very continent that had won universal admiration by its emancipation from reactionary colonialist theories.

39. The South African Government's stubborn persistence in its racial policies was no longer simply a matter for regret and censure. It had become a growing threat to political stability in the region. In view of the dangers of the situation, which were well illustrated by past experiences, the policy of apartheid and the treatment of people of Indian and Indo-Pakistan origin could not be the concern of one country alone. It was a threat to peace of international significance.

40. The Yugoslav delegation therefore felt that the United Nations must resolutely undertake the necessary measures to put an end to so tragic a situation. It should not be discouraged by the lack of results so far for its efforts had the support of the vast majority of the international community.

41. In the face of the South African Government's unwillingness to co-operate constructively in the matter under discussion, the Committee should therefore carefully consider the proposals submitted to it, so that the most suitable and effective measures could be adopted. To surrender to the South African Government would be contrary to the interests of peace and to the responsibilities of the United Nations.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.