

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FOURTEENTH SESSION
Official Records



**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 140th
MEETING**

Friday, 30 October 1959,
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda items 19, 20 and 21:

Question of amending the United Nations Charter, in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 108 of the Charter, to increase the number of non-permanent members of the Security Council and the number of votes required for decisions of the Council (concluded)

Question of amending the United Nations Charter, in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 108 of the Charter, to increase the membership of the Economic and Social Council (concluded)

Question of amending the Statute of the International Court of Justice, in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 108 of the Charter of the United Nations and Article 69 of the Statute of the Court, with respect to an increase in the number of judges of the International Court of Justice (concluded)

Agenda item 61:

Question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of "apartheid" of the Government of the Union of South Africa

Page

65

67

Chairman: Mr. Charles T. O. KING (Liberia).

AGENDA ITEMS 19, 20 AND 21

Question of amending the United Nations Charter, in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 108 of the Charter, to increase the number of non-permanent members of the Security Council and the number of votes required for decisions of the Council (concluded)

Question of amending the United Nations Charter, in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 108 of the Charter, to increase the membership of the Economic and Social Council (concluded)

Question of amending the Statute of the International Court of Justice in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 108 of the Charter of the United Nations and Article 69 of the Statute of the Court, with respect to an increase in the number of judges of the International Court of Justice (concluded)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited representatives to explain their votes on the draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.32/Rev.2 and A/SPC/L.33 and Add.1) and on the amendments thereto (A/SPC/L.34-36).

2. Mr. ROBERTSON (United States of America) said that his delegation was mainly concerned to secure the long-overdue enlargement of certain principal organs

of the United Nations and had voted in favour of the Salvadorian draft resolution (A/SPC/L.32/Rev.2), which it felt was in keeping with that purpose. He had no strong feelings regarding the proposed committee and, although it might not in fact accomplish any substantial results, he saw no reason to oppose an action which many members had felt would be a constructive step. He had abstained from voting on the twelve-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.33 and Add.1), as it had seemed unnecessary to adopt a second resolution which could in no way affect the Committee's recommendation to the plenary session of the General Assembly. He regretted that the question of enlargement of membership, which had been the basic purpose of both resolutions, and on which nearly all Members were agreed, had been almost lost sight of in the discussion of resolutions and procedures.

3. Mr. DE VAUELLES (France) said he had abstained from voting on the twelve-Power draft resolution because he felt that its contents were covered by the Salvadorian draft resolution already adopted. The only fault he had to find with the twelve-Power draft was its platonic character. Had the nine-Power amendment (A/SPC/L.34) to the Salvadorian draft resolution been adopted, his delegation would have voted against the twelve-Power draft to emphasize its opposition to the elimination of the only element which constituted an advance on the previous year's resolutions.

4. Mr. SANZ (Argentina) said his delegation had supported the Salvadorian draft resolution because it had felt that the text would constitute a substantial advance towards amendment of the Charter. He had abstained from voting on the twelve-Power draft resolution because its substance was contained in the Salvadorian draft already adopted.

5. Mr. PAPAGOS (Greece) said he had voted for the Salvadorian draft resolution because it represented an attempt to advance one step further towards the desired amendment of the Charter. The establishment of a committee meant that efforts would continue after the closure of the current session, and such a measure should not be rejected without a trial. His delegation would have preferred a single recommendation to the Assembly, but it had voted in favour of the twelve-Power draft resolution in view of the keen desire of its sponsors that it should reach the Assembly, although the substance of it had already been accepted in a resolution which went further.

6. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said his delegation had voted against the Salvadorian draft resolution for the following reasons. In the first place, the second preambular paragraph reaffirmed a resolution his delegation had opposed at the previous session. Secondly, the preamble tended to create the impression that the Assembly was already in favour of amendment of the Charter, whereas the Assembly merely favoured discussion of the matter at the following session. There was therefore a contradiction

between the operative part and the preamble. Thirdly, the setting up of the proposed committee was unjustified and could serve no useful purpose. The debate had shown that there was no likelihood of conditions becoming more favourable for a discussion of the membership of the bodies in question; such conditions would depend primarily on a satisfactory settlement of the question of the representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. Moreover, the representative of El Salvador had suggested that the proposed committee should, in fact, prepare the text of Charter amendments, even if no decision to that effect were taken by the Assembly. The Soviet delegation could not support such a move. He rejected the contention that the USSR's position was the sole obstacle to the adequate representation of Asian and African countries in the Economic and Social Council. The main obstacle was the fact that the principles of the Charter were being ignored, with regard to the People's Republic of China, by a group of influential Members, and in particular by the United States. He urged all Members to endeavour to create a more favourable atmosphere for the discussion of adequate Asian and African representation in the principal organs of the United Nations. In conclusion, he said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the twelve-Power draft resolution out of respect for its sponsors.

7. Mr. ESCOBAR (Colombia) said he had voted in favour of the Salvadorian draft resolution, with which his delegation was entirely in agreement. Colombia believed that it would have been useful to proceed with the amendment of Article 108 of the Charter to ensure more equitable representation in the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. Such a move would have constituted a significant legal and moral step forward and would have met the legitimate wishes of many Member States. However, in view of the prevailing atmosphere in the debate, his delegation had agreed with that of Argentina not to move such an amendment at the present stage, for the sake of harmony. The two delegations would invite the delegations of El Salvador, France, Liberia, Japan, the Philippines and Turkey, which had been sympathetic to the idea, to support it at the fifteenth session. There should be no further procrastination. He hoped the Asian and African delegations would obtain the representation to which they were entitled.

8. Mr. BAIG (Pakistan) said that his delegation had voted for the nine-Power amendment, since the deletion of the two paragraphs in question would have brought the Salvadorian draft resolution into line with the twelve-Power draft and thus made it more widely acceptable. His delegation was not convinced that the proposed committee would necessarily advance matters, although it did not seem likely to do much harm. Hence it had voted in favour of the Salvadorian draft resolution. The two resolutions had not seemed irreconcilable and it had been a matter of great surprise and regret to the sponsors of the twelve-Power proposal that their draft should have encountered so much opposition from the representative of El Salvador and his supporters. His delegation might therefore reconsider its attitude to the Salvadorian draft resolution when the matter came before the Assembly.

9. Mr. MOREAU DE MELEN (Belgium) said that, to avoid prolonging the debate unduly, the delegations of the Netherlands and Luxembourg wished to associate themselves with his statement. The three delegations had abstained from voting on the four-Power amend-

ment (A/SPC/L.36) to the twelve-Power draft resolution because they had already voted in favour of an identical amendment (A/SPC/L.35) submitted in respect of the Salvadorian draft resolution. They had also abstained on the twelve-Power draft resolution, because it expressed the same ideas as those contained in the Salvadorian draft, which they had already supported. It had seemed illogical to repeat a decision. A further reason for their abstention was the imprecise wording of the resolution's preamble, which referred to "the principal organs of the United Nations". That could be interpreted as including the International Court of Justice, and his delegation could not agree to an increase in the number of judges. His delegation reserved the right to reconsider the whole matter in plenary meeting.

10. In his view, the procedure followed at the previous meeting, when a vote had been taken a second time, could not be regarded as a precedent affecting the procedure of the General Assembly and its Committees. Before taking a second vote, the Chairman had asked the Committee whether there was any opposition to that vote and no objections had been raised. In view of that unanimity, reconsideration of the proposal came within the scope of rule 124 of the rules of procedure.

11. Mr. ATTOLICO (Italy) said his delegation had already stated that it favoured the substance and the aims of the twelve-Power draft resolution. It had, however, abstained from voting on that draft because the Committee had previously adopted a resolution concerning the same issues and along the same lines. The text first adopted was, in his delegation's opinion, more comprehensive and practical, and provided for measures which might facilitate progress on the substance of the issues involved. There was a general desire for an enlargement of the two Councils and he hoped the extensive debate just concluded would further that aim.

12. Mr. BEELEY (United Kingdom) said that both the draft resolutions were acceptable to his delegation, though the Salvadorian text expressed better the apparently general feeling of the importance and urgency of increasing the membership of the two Councils. He had therefore voted for that resolution, and had abstained on the second resolution, because it did not appear to add anything, though it would have been entirely acceptable in the absence of the other. The difference between the two texts was one of method, not of objective, and a vote in favour of either demonstrated a similarity of purpose. The occasional acerbities of the debate might be regarded as indicating the zeal of the Committee's members in what was essentially a common cause. He hoped that before the items were taken in plenary meeting the two groups might be able to find some way of helping one another to give the most effective possible expression to their respective views. If the leaders in the debate felt that the United Kingdom delegation might be able to assist them in any way, his delegation would be ready to do so.

13. Mr. CERNIK (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation had voted against the Salvadorian draft resolution, because it conflicted with Article 108 of the Charter by recommending that the matter be studied without the participation of the People's Republic of China. All States whose ratification was needed should have an opportunity to express their views when amendments to the Charter were considered in the General Assembly. The proposed committee could not produce any useful results and was contrary to the procedure laid down for Charter amendment. The essential pre-

requisite for any solution to the present problem was the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations. His delegation had abstained on the twelve-Power draft resolution for the same reasons of principle.

14. Mr. TULIO ALVARADO (Venezuela) said that his delegation supported an increase in the membership of the two Councils and would have favoured any substantive resolution which proposed such an increase. Neither of the draft resolutions submitted to the Committee fully met the wishes of his delegation. He had voted in favour of the Salvadorian draft, because it went further than the other and provided for the setting up of a study committee, which was a further step towards the amendment of the Charter. Such a committee would make good use of the interval before the next session of the General Assembly and might accomplish very useful work.

15. The four-Power amendment in document A/SPC/L.35 also accorded with his delegation's views and had therefore received its support. Once the Salvadorian draft resolution had been adopted, it had not seemed necessary to vote on the substantially similar twelve-Power draft, but when it was decided to vote on the twelve-Power draft, his delegation had voted in favour of both the draft, as being a repetition of part of the Salvadorian resolution, which it had already supported, and the relevant four-Power amendment (A/SPC/L.36).

16. Mr. HOLLAI (Hungary) said he had voted against the Salvadorian draft resolution because it contained points with which his delegation strongly disagreed, especially the proposal to set up a committee. He had abstained on the amended twelve-Power draft for the reasons given in his statement during the general debate. He was pleased to note that, despite some opposition, that resolution had finally been put to the vote. He wished to state that he had not intended to take any improper advantage, as had been alleged. The second vote on the Salvadorian motion had revealed the prevailing view in the Committee.

17. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) said he had voted against the nine-Power amendment to his delegation's draft resolution, as its adoption would have eliminated the most important part of the resolution—the provision for the setting up of a committee. He had voted in favour of the four-Power amendment to the Salvadorian draft, as his delegation considered it timely and useful. The substance of the twelve-Power draft resolution and the relevant four-Power amendment was embodied in the Salvadorian draft; but in a spirit of conciliation he had refrained from voting against them, and had abstained. He hoped that, in view of the close similarity of the two resolutions, only one of them would be adopted by the General Assembly.

18. Mr. SUAREZ (Chile) said he had voted in favour of the Salvadorian draft resolution as being a step towards increasing the membership of the Economic and Social Council. He had abstained on the twelve-Power draft resolution, primarily because it was virtually identical with the Salvadorian draft—except for the additional operative paragraph in the latter, which his delegation regarded as its most constructive element—and also because he considered that the Committee had revised a vote already cast and thus established a dangerous precedent.

19. Mr. TOWNSEND (Peru) said his delegation had voted in favour of the Salvadorian draft resolution,

because it seemed to constitute a step towards increasing the membership of the principal organs of the United Nations. His delegation would have welcomed an operative clause taking a strong line on that point, but in view of the prevailing atmosphere it had supported the text which came closest to its own view. His delegation had abstained on the twelve-Power draft resolution, the substance of which was embodied in the Salvadorian text. His delegation would continue to hope that the Assembly would find a means of increasing the membership of the bodies in question.

20. Mr. CASSELL (Liberia) explained that his delegation had supported the Salvadorian draft resolution because it believed that operative paragraphs 2 and 3 were a step towards securing equitable African and Asian representation in the principal organs of the United Nations. It had not felt able to support the twelve-Power draft resolution, which did not go far enough. His delegation believed that amendment of the Charter to correct inequities of representation should have been undertaken at the current session.

AGENDA ITEM 61

Question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of "apartheid" of the Government of the Union of South Africa (A/4147 and Add.1)

21. Mr. QUAISON-SACKY (Ghana) said that the policies of "apartheid" relentlessly pursued by the Government of the Union of South Africa were an offence against peace and unity, and his delegation, along with a number of others, had requested (A/4147 and Add.1) the inclusion of the item in the agenda of the present session.

22. One significant feature of the present situation was that Mr. Louw, Minister of External Affairs of the Union of South Africa, had himself spoken on the subject of race conflict in his speech on 28 September 1959 in the general debate in the Assembly (811th plenary meeting), thereby acknowledging that his Government's policy was a matter of international concern and not of domestic jurisdiction. Mr. Louw had reviewed the history of South Africa to emphasize its traditional policy of separate development and had even quoted the late Field Marshal Smuts to support his case. He claimed that his Government was implementing the policy of peaceful coexistence and of a separate European community controlled by South Africans of European descent. The delegation of Ghana could scarcely consider as "peaceful coexistence" the fate of the ten million African victims of a policy on which they had never been consulted. He quoted an editorial from The New York Times of 30 September 1959 as echoing that view.

23. In his statement Mr. Louw had claimed that the Bantu Authorities Act, No. 68, 1951, was intended to safeguard the Bantu's traditional and essentially democratic system of self-government, centred in the authority of the Bantu Chief advised by his Council, and had been welcomed in all the Bantu territories. If that were so, he wondered what accounted for all the subsequent riots and hunger strikes. Again, the Bantu Education Act, No. 47, 1953, ostensibly gave to Bantu parents the power to control their own schools, by means of school committees and boards which according to Mr. Louw were functioning with excellent results; but in actual fact there was no independence whatever, since the Act also gave the Minister of

Native Affairs unlimited power to determine the nature and extent of Bantu education. During the current year the Governor-General of South Africa had approved the Extension of University Education Act, No. 45, 1959, which prohibited non-whites from attending universities other than those created for their own racial group, and which British lecturers in South Africa and even distinguished Afrikaner university professors had condemned.

24. The climax of the "apartheid" policy had been reached recently with the passing of the Promotion of Bantu Self-government Act, No. 46, 1959, which, it was claimed, would help the Bantu territories to progress along the road to self-government and eventually to form part of a South African Commonwealth, together with the Union of South Africa, which would during the intervening period act as the guardian of the emergent Bantu self-governing states. In each of the eight Bantu territories a Commissioner-General would act as a link between the territory and the white Nationalist Government, but the Commissioner-General was to be appointed on such conditions as the Governor-General might determine and would hold office at the pleasure of the Governor-General. The delegation of Ghana failed to see how such a scheme could possibly lead to self-government for the Bantu. If Mr. Louw claimed that it would progressively give the Bantu control of his own homeland, he was admitting in those very words the right of the African to have a say in the affairs of his country.

25. His delegation felt that the Union Government was trying to put into operation a policy of complete separation of the races which had failed elsewhere, even in the United States of America, and it appealed to that Government to be guided by the example of Brazil, where different peoples of African, European and Asian descent lived together in mutual toleration and respect. Mr. Louw had spoken of South Africa as an independent African State; if it were, then the majority should rule, whereas a minority was ruthlessly oppressing an indigenous majority.

26. The delegation of Ghana wondered what was the reaction of the Union Government to the resolution on racialism unanimously adopted at the Conference of Independent African States held at Monrovia in August 1959. The resolution condemned the practice of racial discrimination and segregation in all its aspects all over the world, especially in the Union of South Africa, and called upon all Members of the United Nations and all peoples of the world to associate themselves with the resolutions passed by the United Nations and the Bandung and Accra Conferences condemning that inhuman practice. He wondered if the Union Government realized how wide-spread was the anxiety caused by its "apartheid" policy when it heard that the East, Central and Southern Africa Area Committee of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions had adopted a resolution condemning its racial policies, and deploring the compulsory flogging of children and adults for minor offences, the arbitrary arrests, the shocking labour conditions, the repressive laws, and the deplorable conditions in African locations. The same committee had appealed to the Governments and organizations concerned to stop the flow of migrant workers into the Union of South Africa and to boycott all South African goods—which some Governments had already done. He would urge the Union of South Africa to take heed of such expressions of world opinion.

27. His delegation had certain concrete proposals to put to the Union Government, among them that it should give the vote to educated Africans and permit Africans to stand for election to the Union Parliament; that there should be equal educational facilities and equal opportunities for apprenticeship in industry for all races; and that no legal barrier should prevent the different races from coming together socially.

28. The Africans of South Africa had had enough of "apartheid" and all the inequalities and injustices it represented, but they had been heartened by the resolutions of the United Nations and were pleased with the affirmative vote the previous year of such countries as the United States, Canada and New Zealand. They now appealed through the delegation of Ghana to the United Kingdom and Australia not to vote against any draft resolution appealing to the conscience of the few Europeans in South Africa who were making a mockery of Western civilization. To the latter he would issue a word of warning: if the Union of South Africa continued to pursue its own ostrich policy of separatism the white minority would receive its due measure of justice when the great and terrible day of judgement arrived.

29. Mr. LONCAR (Yugoslavia) said that the General Assembly had repeatedly called upon the Government of the Union of South Africa to abandon its policy of "apartheid", and to guarantee the elementary rights of the non-white population of the Union, but without result. There was no improvement in the situation of the non-white population, and legislation such as the Promotion of Bantu Self-government Act and the Extension of University Education Act showed that the policy of racial discrimination was being pursued and intensified. By the latter Act, according to The Economist of 13 June 1959, the Nationalists had not only struck at academic freedom but had taken a decisive step towards isolating the races at the level at which understanding had its best chance of developing.

30. The United Nations must not be deterred by the lack of success from continuing to press for respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms as laid down in the Charter. The policy of racial discrimination and segregation in the Union of South Africa could not but impede the progress of that country, since the majority of its population were non-whites, and it was absurd that while the inalienable rights of the African peoples were being recognized, and Africans were beginning to play a prominent role in international life, the Government of the Union of South Africa was striving to arrest the progress and thwart the aspirations of the population of its own part of Africa. It had failed to show the necessary understanding of the good intentions of the United Nations. Far from interfering in the domestic affairs of the Union of South Africa, the United Nations had in the past shown zeal and patience in its efforts to convince the Union Government of the absolute necessity of co-operating and accepting the assistance offered for many years with the sole desire of freeing the Union from the heavy burden of "apartheid"—a policy incompatible with the Charter and untenable under present conditions in the international community.

31. Mr. GUERRERO (Philippines) expressed regret that the Government of the Union of South Africa had disregarded the last resolution of the General Assembly on "apartheid" (resolution 1248 (XIII)) and had in fact extended that tragic policy. Recent legislation, such as the so-called Promotion of Bantu Self-govern-

ment Act, showed that the "apartheid" policy was now being applied to entire communities instead of individuals. If the Act was intended to give the Africans experience in self-government it might be described as self-government through segregation. Some such idea was behind the removal of communities to distant places, the argument being that if the Africans and the Europeans could not enjoy the fundamental rights and freedoms together it was surely better that they should enjoy them separately, but equally, than that the Africans should not enjoy them at all.

32. The American Committee on Africa had discovered, however, on analysing the Promotion of Bantu Self-government Act, that the Africans would have even less self-government than before. They would not be represented, even indirectly, in the Government of the Union, and in local self-government the Bantu authorities would not be elected by the people and would be strictly controlled by the national Government. In fact the whole new system had been described by the former Chief Justice of the Union as a return to tribalism.

33. His delegation felt that it was not for the Members of the United Nations to pass judgement on the moral and political issues of a country's domestic affairs; but it was their duty to make another appeal for conformity by all Members to the principles and purposes of the Charter.

34. It had therefore agreed to join other delegations in sponsoring a draft resolution which would be submitted to the Committee in due course.^{1/} In that draft resolution the Assembly would call upon all Member States to bring their policies into conformity with their obligation under the Charter to promote the observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Such an appeal recognized that the driving force behind "apartheid" was fear on the part of the minority as to what the majority might do if it achieved racial equality. The only way to dispel that fear was to show that in actual practice it was unfounded, and to prove by example, for instance in Member States where a non-European Government in full exercise of sovereignty was required to deal with a European minority, that nationalism did not imply racial discrimination, that in fact all citizens were equal, regardless of race, sex, language or religion.

35. In addition, the preamble of the draft to be submitted would express the view that government policies which accentuated or sought to preserve racial discrimination were prejudicial to international harmony. Even if the threat to peace did not seem immediate it was none the less real. He wondered whether the Union of South Africa realized what the effect might be of creating such Bantu reserves—lands of poor Africans in a rich European sea—and where the reactions of resentful or envious Africans might eventually lead.

36. He had not referred lightly to the threat to peace—that was inherent in the "apartheid" policy of the Government of the Union of South Africa. In the past there had been wars of religion or independence, but none was so frightful as a racial war would be. It was possible to satisfy a religious man by allowing him to worship in his own way, or a nationalist by giving his country independence; but racial feeling was a deep current which once set loose would be difficult to stem or arrest.

37. The draft resolution to be submitted would express the very real anxiety of his delegation at the threat to peace inherent in the "apartheid" policy. It was doubly unfortunate at a time when such hopeful developments had taken place in other regions of Africa that the Union of South Africa should seek to maintain a policy of "apartheid" in a continent soon to consist entirely of sovereign African States, ruled by African Governments and responsive to the will and emotions of African peoples.

38. He would ask the Government of the Union of South Africa and the European inhabitants who supported it and its policy of "apartheid" whether, in the interests of all nations and in their own best interests, it would not be more desirable to make the Union of South Africa a real and equal "Union", and to help to make the United Nations an organization truly united in the promotion of human rights and freedom for all men.

39. Mr. TALAAT (United Arab Republic) said that the item under discussion had come before the Assembly on eight successive occasions, and several resolutions had been adopted deploring the attitude of the Union Government and stating that its perseverance in its "apartheid" policies was inconsistent not only with its obligations under the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, but also with the general trend of progress and the requirements of international co-operation.

40. The Union Government had not responded to the General Assembly's latest appeal, made in resolution 1248 (XIII). On the contrary, it had recently adopted measures intensifying its policy of racial discrimination; one of such measures was the mass removal of non-whites from their homes to isolated areas. The United Arab Republic had therefore joined once more in requesting the inclusion in the agenda of the question of "apartheid", so that the General Assembly could again discuss the problem and make recommendations for the observance of the provisions of the Charter.

41. The recognition of the fundamental rights and freedoms of all human beings was one of the greatest achievements of the age. The principle of respect for human rights was gaining ground constantly and the concept of racial superiority was quite out of date. The policy of "apartheid" had been recognized by Church leaders in the Union of South Africa as a doctrine of white supremacy and privilege, seeking to maintain Africans in a permanent state of subservience. The Archbishop of Cape Town had objected to it as fundamentally anti-Christian and self-destructive.

42. The Asian-African Conference at Bandung in 1955, at which more than half the population of the world had been represented, had deplored the policies and practices of racial segregation and discrimination which constituted a gross violation of human rights and a denial of the fundamental values of civilization. The Conference of Independent African States, meeting at Accra in 1958, had adopted a resolution condemning the evil and inhuman practice of racial discrimination wherever it occurred, especially in the Union of South Africa—where it was an instrument of government policy—and calling for intensified efforts to eradicate that degrading form of injustice. At a special session of that Conference, held at Monrovia in August 1959, the participants had recommended that steps should be taken to try to persuade the Union Government to implement the resolutions adopted by the General

^{1/} Subsequently distributed as document A/SPC/L.37.

Assembly. It was the duty of the Government of the Union of South Africa to reconsider its policy and to stop ignoring world opinion and opposing the aspirations of the majority of its population. It was the duty of the United Nations to continue its efforts to persuade the Union Government to end its discriminatory practices.

43. The United Arab Republic earnestly hoped that in the light of the views expressed on so many occasions the Union Government would revise its policy and agree to co-operate with the United Nations. He would support any resolution designed to bring about a just and peaceful solution of the problem.

44. Mr. URRUTIA APARICIO (Guatemala) said that there was nothing in human relations so unjust and repugnant as racial prejudice and discrimination. The constitutional history of Guatemala, from the declaration of independence in 1821 to the adoption of the present Constitution in 1956, was full of instances of the rejection of discrimination, as was appropriate in a nation which was the product of two great civilizations and of the mingling of two races. Despite changes of government, Guatemala had maintained a consistent position in the various organs of the United Nations on the question of racial discrimination, from the San Francisco Conference in 1945 to the present day.

45. In the matter of human rights and fundamental freedoms, at home and abroad, Guatemala was bound by the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and that of the Organization of American States, as well as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—the most important United Nations document after the Charter—and its OAS counterpart, the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. It could not understand how, in the face of those clearly proclaimed and internationally accepted principles, any Government could put into effect so arbitrary and degrading a system as "apartheid". For the State itself to foment racial prejudice and discrimination among its citizens in the twentieth century was a disgrace.

46. The origin of "apartheid" lay in colonialism. It was the social and religious exclusiveness of the first Boer settlers that had laid the foundation for present-day discrimination against Africans and other non-Europeans. In his book *Race and Society*, published in 1952 by UNESCO, Professor Kenneth Little of the University of Edinburgh made it clear that the Union Government's policy had an economic and political basis. The European minority feared that the overwhelming majority of the population the non-whites, would one day submerge the white population, and that was why they refused them equal rights. UNESCO was to be congratulated on the splendid research it had done into the race question. Among its many publications on that topic were the two important statements of 1950 and 1951^{2/} on the nature of race and race differences, signed by distinguished physical anthropologists and geneticists from many different countries. The 1951 statement had made the point, among others, that the superficial differences between national groups were to be attributed to their social and historical background and not to inherent characteristics.

47. The position of the Catholic Church in regard to racial discrimination had recently been reaffirmed in

South Africa by the Archbishop of Durban, who had stated that integration was the only solution to the racial problem and that sooner or later, despite the actions of politicians, it would come about. The Anglican Archbishop of Cape Town had adopted a similar position, and had declared that since the Government had impugned certain of the theological principles which his Church maintained, the most important being the equality of all men before their Creator, the Church would have no alternative but to resist the interference of the Government. Other events in South Africa, with their evidence of disturbance and ill-feeling, showed the danger which the Union Government was running in its organized and systematic denial of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of the non-white population.

48. The Guatemalan delegation had studied the statement made in the General Assembly (811th plenary meeting) by the Minister of External Relations of the Union of South Africa with the greatest care. It could find in it no justification—social, economic or other—for the maintenance of the policy of "apartheid". Unlike the Governments of other countries which were experiencing racial problems, the Union Government was maintaining and strengthening its programme of discrimination. While other Governments were declaring the unconstitutionality of the doctrine of separate but equal facilities, the Union Government persisted in its absurd and inhuman policy. When the United Nations tried to take the matter up, the Union delegation refused to participate, on the grounds that the United Nations could not intervene in matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State. The Guatemalan delegation firmly believed that the question of "apartheid" was not exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Union Government. The fact that that Government ignored its resolutions and refused to yield to world public opinion did not mean that the United Nations had no jurisdiction over matters relating to the safeguarding of human rights. Any State which ratified the Charter of the United Nations automatically incorporated into its legal system the precepts which the Charter contained. A State which officially and systematically violated those precepts was failing in its freely contracted international obligations and was open to severe sanctions from the international community. Such continuous and systematic violation threatened the existence and integrity of the whole Organization and was of concern to all the nations which had signed and ratified the Charter.

49. The Union Government's policy was proving detrimental to international harmony among the States directly affected. The situation had been deteriorating ever since 1952 when the item had first been placed on the agenda at the instigation of thirteen Member States. The Guatemalan delegation could not say whether there was a danger that the policy of racial supremacy might contaminate other parts of Africa or whether the defrauded Africans might one day rise up and take the law into their own hands. It could, however, emphasize the devastating implications of the problem and urge all concerned to display the utmost judgement and good will. In accordance with its policy of conciliation, it renewed its plea to the Government of the Union of South Africa to reconsider its racial policy. When that came about, as infallibly it must, it would bring a more united and just world.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.

^{2/} Statement on Race, dated 18 July 1950; Statement on the Nature of Race and Race Differences, dated 8 June 1951 (Appendix II and Appendix III, respectively, in: UNESCO, *What is Race?*, Paris, 1952).