



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



Distr.
GENERAL

A/6688
11 August 1967

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Twenty-second session

THE POLICIES OF APARTHEID OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA*

Letter dated 4 August 1967 from the Permanent Representative
of South Africa to the United Nations addressed to the
Secretary-General

With reference to your letter of 31 July 1967 concerning my Government's reply to two articles printed in the March and May 1967 issues of the magazine United Nations Monthly Chronicle, I have the honour to request that the letters exchanged by us on this subject, including the annexure, be published as a document of the twenty-second session of the General Assembly.

In motivation of this request, I wish to point out that the correspondence relates to the policy followed in publications of the Office of Public Information, which is a legitimate subject for consideration by the General Assembly during its examination of the Organization's regular budget.

(Signed) M.I. BOTHA
Ambassador, Permanent Representative

A. LETTER DATED 13 JULY 1967 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE
OF SOUTH AFRICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE
SECRETARY-GENERAL

I have the honour to refer to the March and May 1967 issues of the magazine United Nations Monthly Chronicle and to inform you that the South African Government objects most strongly to the inclusion therein of the article (in the March issue) summarizing the report entitled "The Effects of Apartheid on Education, Science, Culture and Information in South Africa", which was prepared by the United Nations

* Item 35 of the provisional agenda.

67-18720

/...

Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, at the behest of an eleven-member Committee of the General Assembly, and the article (in the May issue) by the Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights.

The publication of these two articles not only constitutes an unwarranted intrusion in the internal affairs of South Africa in violation of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, but the articles themselves present a false and distorted picture of South Africa.

My Government has drawn up a reply to the articles, and in accordance with the principle of audi alteram partem I have been requested to ask you kindly to arrange for publication of this reply in the next edition of the Chronicle.

(Signed) M.I. BOTHA
Ambassador, Permanent Representative

Annex

Reply by the South African Government to the publication of

- (a) an article in the March 1967 issue of the United Nations Monthly Chronicle summarizing a report entitled "The Effects of Apartheid on Education, Science, Culture and Information in South Africa" prepared by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and
- (b) an article in the May 1967 issue of the United Nations Monthly Chronicle entitled "The Commission on Human Rights Strongly Condemns the Policies of Apartheid and Repressive Measures in South Africa" by Petr Nedbailo of the Ukrainian SSR.

The South African Government considers the articles in these issues of the Chronicle (which have already been reproduced as separate publications) to be further illustrations of the increasing extent to which the Office of Public Information of the United Nations is being used as a vehicle for the anti-South African propaganda campaign instigated by certain States Members of the Organization, and the South African Government cannot but deplore the departure by this branch of the Secretariat from its basic mandate.

As is known, the policy of the United Nations in its public information activities was initially set out in General Assembly resolution 13 (I) of 13 February 1946, and later revised but not substantially altered in terms of resolution 595 (VI) of 4 February 1952. Resolution 13 (I) established, inter alia, a Department of Public Information, while annex I thereto laid down the principles on which the Department's activities were to be based.

Briefly stated these principles, which, despite the provisions of General Assembly resolutions 2054 (XX) and 2144 (XXI) cannot be said to have been rescinded, stipulate that the Office of Public Information "should be so organized and directed as to promote to the greatest possible extent an informed understanding of the work and purposes of the United Nations among the peoples of the world"; and that the OPI should not "engage in 'propaganda'", but rather that it should "on its own initiative engage in positive informational activities that will supplement the services of existing agencies of information to the extent that these are insufficient to realize the purpose set forth above".

The South African Government does not consider it necessary to suggest comprehensive definitions of the concepts of "propaganda" and "positive informational activities" that might be acceptable to all Members of the United Nations. As the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions stated at the 726th meeting of the Fifth Committee, the views of Member States rarely coincide on the question of informational activities because "the OPI is a department whose activities have repercussions not only on the technical side of communication, of mass information media and so forth, but also political implications" (A/C.5/791).

Thus, the South African Government would prefer to set out its view of what constitutes propaganda in the United Nations context by drawing attention to the Secretary-General's interpretation of the basic policy to be applied by the Office of Public Information.

For example, the Secretary-General stated at the 682nd meeting of the Fifth Committee, on 13 November 1958, that -

"I would guess that there is full agreement on two basic principles. In the first place, the United Nations information activities must be strictly objective in the presentation of facts regarding problems facing the United Nations and regarding the treatment of those problems within the United Nations or through United Nations actions... Several important conclusions can be drawn from the principles to which I have referred. The United Nations should not indulge in propaganda for itself or for any of the positions taken within the Organization. Thus, the public information activities are information activities in the true sense of the word, not a selling operation in any kind of disguise. One sometimes hears it said that there is nothing wrong in making propaganda for something that is good. The argument seems to me to be a very dangerous one, as everyone resorting to propaganda certainly feels that he is serving a good purpose, whatever his aim may be." (A/C.5/764)*

A similar interpretation is contained in the report of the Committee of Experts on United Nations Public Information which was appointed by the Secretary-General in terms of General Assembly resolution 1177 (XII) of 26 November 1957:

"Utmost objectivity and impartiality must be observed in presenting information about the United Nations and its activities. Special care should be exercised concerning controversial issues before United Nations organs." (A/3928, para. 227 (a))*

* Author's italics.

The Secretary-General also submitted his own comments on the Expert Committee's report. These are contained in document A/3945. Here he referred to the OPI's mandate in the following terms:

"As to the 'positive informational activities that will supplement the services of existing agencies', it has been accepted that these activities should not consist of 'propaganda' but that they should reflect the role of the Secretariat as defined in Article 100 of the Charter."

It need hardly be stressed that the South African Government subscribes to the basic policy of the United Nations in its public information activities as approved by the General Assembly in resolutions 13 (I) and 595 (VI), and as interpreted by the Secretary-General in the statements quoted above. The South African Government is convinced that this is the only policy which an inter-governmental organization can follow in the information field, and if the Office of Public Information is to perform a useful purpose, it is essential that the functions of that office be kept constantly in mind.

The South African Government has also observed that in a recent statement, issued as a press release (Note No. 3358 of 11 May 1967), the Secretary-General referred to the Office of Public Information's treatment of political subjects in the following terms:

"... in this field of political activity, in particular, the Office of Public Information must firmly remain within the limits prescribed for it by General Assembly resolution 13 (I) of 1946 which set out the Basic Principles governing the Office of Public Information and its activities. Thus, in all its output - and more particularly so in its output relating to controversial areas - the Office of Public Information must not permit itself to engage in propaganda, in any guise or in any form. In these areas, while the Office of Public Information of course must carry out the directives of the General Assembly and other organs, its output has to be confined to matter derived from official records".*

While noting the qualification contained in the concluding sentence of the extract quoted, the South African Government would observe that propaganda does not cease to be propaganda if it consists of re-presentation in summary form of propaganda contained in official records and that particularly in what the Secretary-General describes as "controversial areas" it is important that both sides of any controversy should be fairly represented.

* Author's italics.

The United Nations Monthly Chronicle is described in annex II to the 1967 expenditure estimates (A/6305, p. 184) as providing "an objective, comprehensive and documented account of the activities of the United Nations, as well as information on its related agencies". However, by publicizing slanted, preconceived political attacks against a Member State and allowing his magazine to be used as a medium for propaganda, the Editor of the Chronicle, has exceeded the mandate of OPI, thereby doing a disservice to the United Nations and acting in a manner prejudicial to the interests and rights of a Member State.

The Office of Public Information is financed from the regular budget of the United Nations, to which South Africa is annually contributing a substantial sum, and the South African Government has already publicly pointed out that it cannot be expected to continue indefinitely to lend financial support to actions undertaken by the Organization which are specifically designed, directly or indirectly, to undermine the authority of a Member State and to promote attempts to overthrow its Government.

South Africa is in no way obligated to account to any international organization for her internal policies. South Africa's position, based on Article 2 (7) of the Charter is well known. However, apart from South Africa's legal position in this matter, her representatives have often warned that political condemnations of her policies were not based on correct factual information but on mere assertions of fact and on misapprehensions and misrepresentations of the aims of her policies. The two articles in question aptly demonstrate this. Without prejudice to its legal position regarding the scope and effect of Article 2 (7) of the Charter, the South African Government feels constrained therefore to comment on some of the more far-reaching accusations, conclusions and statements in the articles. (As far as the UNESCO report itself is concerned, a detailed rebuttal is being prepared by the South African authorities.)

Turning in the first instance to the article on the UNESCO report on "The Effect of Apartheid on Education, Science, Culture and Information in South Africa", a few general observations are called for by way of preface to the more detailed remarks which follow.

The article - like the UNESCO report - was based on the premise that the only acceptable social structure is an integrated one and, after avoiding all evidence

pointing to the success of South Africa's policy, it proceeded to the untenable conclusion that separate development is "not only an inadmissible answer to racial and group conflict but in itself the major cause of such conflict". Neither the text of the Chronicle's summary nor that of the report itself substantiates this thesis in the slightest degree. Similarly, the reader looks in vain for any substantiation in terms of the United Nations Charter of the assertion that "the practice of apartheid... constitute(s) a threat to international peace and security". No factual nor juridical basis for UNESCO's assertion is provided.

South Africa's policy of autonomous development is designed to benefit all the nations of South Africa. The purpose is to maintain the self-determination of all her peoples, on a basis of equal human dignity. Wherever serious potential friction is encountered in the world, it can be ascribed to some fear of domination of a certain group by another group. South Africa seeks to avoid this potential source of friction by following an evolutionary process which will enable each population group to achieve self-realization within its own sphere. The South African Prime Minister in a national broadcast on 31 May 1967, stated that if he were asked what South Africa's greatest task was, he would immediately reply: "Our attempt to eliminate friction". This, the Prime Minister said, included not only friction between population groups, but also between States and peoples. South Africa's recipe for eliminating friction was clear, and the fruits it was yielding were clear for everyone to see, he said. Internally, everyone must have the right to retain, protect and defend his identity and that of his group or nation or people. Externally the one must not interfere in the domestic affairs of the other and differences in approach to internal policy should not preclude co-operation, the Prime Minister stated.

The basic principles underlying South Africa's policy can therefore be summarized as follows:

(a) The policy is not one of domination but the very reverse thereof. The aim is justice for all without making it possible for any one group to thwart the aspirations of other groups.

(b) The objectives pursued by South Africa are basically those set out in the Charter of the United Nations. The very aim is to build up each people into a self-governing organic entity capable of co-operating with others in the

political and economic spheres in such a manner as may voluntarily be agreed between them in the exercise of their rights of self-determination. The ultimate aim of South Africa's policy is therefore the creation of separate, independent and self-respecting communities which will be free from the more serious prejudices, frictions and struggles which are bound to arise under any policy of attempted forceful integration of the different nations or population groups.

(c) The real point at issue is not one of principle but of method - the way in which these concepts should be put into practice - which of the two methods, attempted integration or separate development, is better calculated to achieve the common ideal. South Africa believes that attempts to force the different peoples of the Republic into one national entity cannot succeed, and that such attempts can only lead to oppression and strife. In this she is supported by the opinions of experts who have studied the problem and have found that events in other parts of Africa and the world amply justify her views.

(d) The policy is not based on any concept of superiority or inferiority, but on the fact that people differ particularly in their group associations, loyalties, cultures, outlook, modes of life and standards of development.

(e) The policy is constructive, not destructive. As stated by the late Dr. Verwoerd: "We want to build up a South Africa in which the Bantu and White man can live next to one another as good neighbours, and not as people who are continually quarrelling over supremacy."

The basic historical facts show that the white South Africans and various Bantu groups converged, as from the seventeenth century, in relatively small numbers, in what was then a nearly uninhabited part of southern Africa - now the Republic of South Africa and Lesotho, Swaziland and Botswana. The white nation came from the Cape in the south and the Bantu from the north. On the whole, the tendency was for each to settle in separate and distinct parts of the country. The various Bantu groups for the most part kept apart from one another as well. Though there were clashes and frontier adjustments in border areas, the South African white man did not use his more modern technological power to deprive the Bantu groups of their territories. Instead, he left these territories to them; but as he could make better use of his own country than they could make of theirs, members of the Bantu groups came into the white man's country for employment.

Each group has long-established moral and legal rights in the country, knowing no other fatherland. Each Bantu nation has its own language, culture and traditional institutions as well as a homeland of its own historical choice.

Relations between the various nations or groups have been regulated, since the early contacts were made, on the basis of separate and parallel institutions in various fields - as regards land ownership, land settlement, self-government, traditions, cultures, languages, etc. The divisions which exist in South Africa exist naturally and historically and not as the result of an ideology or policy. The South African Government recognizes the divisions which exist and is influenced by them - but it did not create them. The real issue is whether, seen as a whole and in their practical effect, the advantages of the system for all the groups outweigh or are likely to outweigh the disadvantages that are or may be offered in the implementation of the system. Policy and its results are inseparable. It is generally accepted that the results achieved in South Africa in the various fields of economy, education, health, etc., for all the groups are indeed spectacular. Can it be maintained that all these achievements were the result of a destructive, oppressive and negative policy? But not only can South Africa rely on the results achieved as a criterion for evaluating her policy - she can do much more: she insists that the solution offered by her policy is a viable and equitable one, also as far as future development is concerned.

The South African Foreign Minister, in his statements made to the United Nations, has consistently emphasized that the objective of South African policy, a principle to which the South African Government is fully committed, is one of advancement of the nations presently under its care to the stage where they can themselves exercise full self-determination and that in the meantime every encouragement should be given to them to preserve in accordance with their own wishes their separate identities, culture and heritage.

That such a policy is considered in countries faced with a similar problem or situation to be a desirable aim should be apparent from the following conclusion of the United Nations Seminar on the Multi-National Society, which was held in Yugoslavia from 8 to 21 June 1965:

/...

"There was general agreement that all Governments should promote and protect the rights of ethnic, religious, linguistic or national groups, not only through the adoption of constitutional and legislative provisions, but also through the promotion of all forms of activities consistent with the political, economic and social conditions of the State or country concerned." (ST/TAO/HR/23, para. 144)

Similarly, the report of the Seminar summarizes the discussion of the right of groups to develop their own traditions and characteristics autonomously in the following terms:

"A number of those taking part in the debate drew attention to the need for protecting ancient values in the developing countries; in the past, many of their inhabitants had been caught in the cross current of an officially discouraged traditional way of life and of an alien culture to which they could never fully adjust. Today, therefore, every effort had to be made to awaken the masses to the needs of respect for their national or continental personality, while simultaneously striving for the attainment of modern objectives and the elimination of anachronisms or stultifying superstition. Some of these participants added that the maintenance of indigenous traditions was greatly assisted in their countries by a policy of strengthening tribal institutions, such as the authority of the local chiefs, or by an enlightened codification of customary law." (ST/TAO/HR/23, para. 111)

It is stated in the Chronicle summary that the UNESCO report is "based essentially on various official texts of the South African Government, reports from other organizations of the United Nations system and from scientific research institutions inside and outside South Africa".

While it is true that UNESCO drew heavily on "reports from other organizations of the United Nations system" - mainly to fit in with preconceived conclusions of a political nature - the compilers of the UNESCO report interpreted South African sources according to the pattern of thought and conclusions which they wished to reach. Furthermore, other material was quoted in part or out of context, with the possible implications of suppressio veri thereby entailed; the report also failed to present the existing situation in South Africa against the local background and history, preferring to compare South African conditions with those in countries of Western Europe and elsewhere, rather than with the only comparable situations, those in other African States. Comparisons were made between culturally homogeneous countries and heterogeneous South Africa, without taking into account the diversity of South Africa's population and the consequential unavoidable implications. The report also ignored the basic fact, stressed above, that the South African situation must be seen as a multinational one.

For instance, in the field of education, South Africa's contention is that particular conditions and circumstances in South Africa create, as they do elsewhere in Africa, peculiar problems and difficulties which hamper or retard educational advancement, and, in an evaluation of South Africa's achievements in the educational field, conditions and practices in other States with comparable conditions and problems are highly relevant. For example, if vast distances and low density of population hamper the development of education in other countries in Africa, it is logical to expect similar conditions in South Africa to retard development. If school attendance in other African countries is adversely affected by attitudes which seem to be common amongst people who have little tradition of modern education, it is only logical to expect that similar attitudes in South Africa will have a like influence. If an attendance figure is reached in South Africa which compares favourably with that reached in territories with more or less similar circumstances, such result can fairly be taken to reflect favourably on South Africa's efforts to extend education. If it is sound educational policy in an African State to use textbooks which "illuminate the familiar environment of pupils and reflect their cultural history"^{a/} and which are "more relevant to African life and culture"^{b/} than those used in European schools, such policy cannot become unsound merely because it is applied to African education in South Africa. If Africans in an African State consider it a matter of pride, and a matter of cultural importance, to study African languages and to establish an African language study institute for the purpose,^{c/} the establishment of a Bureau for Bantu Languages in South Africa for similar purposes cannot be wrong because it is done in South Africa. And it is surely relevant to point out that it has elsewhere^{d/} been recognized that "language barrier(s)" and "very large differences in the children's ages, curricula, and cultural backgrounds" make the teaching of such children "in the same school and classes ... impracticable".

a/ Report on the Proceedings of the Conference of African States on the Development of Education in Africa held at Addis Ababa from 15-25 May, 1961 (UNESCO/ED/181, paras. 24-25, p. 7).

b/ Ibid., para. 12, p. 5.

c/ UNESCO/ED/191, para. 73, p. 17 and para. 76, p. 18.

d/ Statement with regard to education in Liberia, W.C. Taylor, The Firestone Operations in Liberia, (1959), p. 76.

South Africa has had experience of a system of joint education. Attempts made in the early days in certain parts of South Africa to conduct mixed schools proved that such a system was impracticable. They served to accentuate differences between the population groups rather than to eliminate them.

Much of the data used in the UNESCO report is out of date, and its use, in place of the latest available material, does not do justice to South Africa's progress in the fields concerned. The South African sources of the report are also of a very limited and selective nature, often concentrating on expressions of opinion by critics of the Government, sometimes going so far as to present them as "facts". Finally, the report suffers from a marked lack of appreciation of the facts of history in South Africa, of the past and present of the different nations and their customs, languages, cultural systems and standards of development.

Some typical illustrations of the shortcomings of the report follow.

In discussing the objectives of the South African Government with respect to education, it is said that "the spokesmen of the political party now in power advocated, inter alia, that the education for the African should be based on his culture, background and his whole life in his tribe; that it should be in accordance with the policy of the State, not bedevilling race relations by resulting in the creation of frustrated people, and that those receiving it should know that to a great extent they must be labourers in the country". In the full UNESCO report, in substantiation of this contention, two statements made in 1945 "by members who were to become prominent in the Nationalist Governments" are quoted as emanating from such "spokesmen", viz., Mr. M.D.C. de W. Nel and Mr. J.N. le Roux. The foot-notes describing these quoted sources refer to them as "Mr. M.D.C. de Wet Nel, present Minister of Education" and "Mr. J.N. le Roux, present Minister of Agriculture".

Both these statements are false. Mr. de Wet Nel is not the "present Minister of Education" as mentioned in the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization's report. He was Minister of Education, Arts and Science for a brief spell in 1958 only and was in any event not in that capacity responsible for Bantu education. Mr. J.N. le Roux was Member of Parliament for the constituency of Ladybrand only from 1943 to 1948, and never was a member of the South African Cabinet. Furthermore, the quotation given of Mr. de Wet Nel's statement is a distortion. A few sentences were carefully selected from his statement to fit into

1

the picture of the National Party policy which the compilers would like to convey to their readers. The following quotation from the speech by Mr. M.D.C. de Wet Nel in 1945 on the subject of education conveys the speaker's real sentiment, rather than the distorted one offered in the UNESCO report:

"... I say that there should be reform of the whole educational system and it must be based on the culture and background and the whole life of the Native himself in his tribe, on which development may take place. If that is done, the Native's own life will be developed and possibly we may also find this, that he will take the best out of western civilization and apply it to his own life. But what is the result of the education system we have at present? It is that the Native retains only the worst of his own civilization, and on the other hand, he absorbs only the worst of European civilization, because the civilization of the European at present is simply something which is applied to him from the outside."

For a proper concept of the basic objectives of the South African Government with respect to education, the UNESCO report could, for example, have quoted the statement made in the Senate by Dr. H.F. Verwoerd, then Minister of Bantu Affairs, in which he stressed the fact that the Government's Bantu education policy involved a new approach and aimed at a new ideal, viz., that of building up a Bantu community (U. of S.A. Deb. Senate, Vol. III, (1955), Col. 5431). He indicated that Bantu education was part of a general plan for the development and upliftment of the Bantu, and stated that Bantu leaders and Bantu schools had an important role to fill in the progress of the community. The approach to the task of community development, he said:

"... is governed by the idea that the development of a community can actually be encouraged from outside but can only take place from within, that it is a process of growth which in the main always rests upon inherent growing power. That means that there can be no mention of progress unless the bearers of the progress are found within the community itself." (Ibid., Col. 4528)

The role of the school was referred to by him in the following terms:

"The influence of the school can and should be two-fold. There is firstly the moulding of the individual child according to aptitude and talent, and secondly there is the moulding of the underdeveloped community by means of the school. On the one hand by the ploughing back of the good products to fertilize the community, a long term benefit, therefore, and on the other hand, a benefit which is immediately obtained, or can be obtained by making the parents and the Bantu authorities school-conscious and school-responsible and vice versa by also making the teacher school-conscious and responsible to the community." (Ibid., Col. 4529)

On the question of control of education for the Bantu nations the UNESCO report states, inter alia: "In an attempt to achieve greater co-ordination a Union Advisory Board for Native Education was set up in 1945 and in 1949 it had two African members ...", and "African participation in important policy decisions which had been effected through the Union Advisory Board for Native Education, had now been effectively abolished". This is not true. Instead of two African members on the Union Advisory Board for Native Education there is now an Advisory Board of Bantu Education with fifteen members, all of them Bantu from the various Bantu nations, under the chairmanship of a Bantu professor in Education, Prof. W.M. Kgware, of the University College of the North. Moreover, the process of self-government - on the road towards full independence - had already advanced in the Transkei, the homeland of the Xhosa nation, to such a level that responsibility for education of the Xhosa nation could be handed over in 1963 to the Transkeian Government, which is running all primary, secondary and vocational educational matters independently under its own Minister of Education.

It is further mentioned in the summary of the UNESCO report that after passage of the Bantu Education Act in 1953 "African education was to be closely co-ordinated with other aspects of African development, and in line with the policy of the State, which could not be achieved with the system of divided control hitherto in existence". This pattern of development, however, is not exceptional in Africa. On the contrary, it has been the pattern in most African countries. In a UNESCO publication, The Legal Framework of Educational Planning and Administration in East Africa (1966) by J. Roger Carter, it is mentioned that education in the countries of East Africa has passed through three well-defined stages of development; the period of private enterprise, principally associated with the activities of the Christian Missions, the period of State-supported private enterprise and the period of State responsibility and planning.

The article on the UNESCO report glossed over the remarkable progress in education made in South Africa for all her nations and population groups, which offers opportunities, facilities and scope, second to none on the African continent, and which also compares favourably with many countries outside Africa.

The modern educational system of South Africa for her developing nations has brought about a phenomenal increase in enrolment during the last thirteen years. The number of pupils doubled during the first ten years of the new centralized educational system and is now growing at a rate of more than 100,000 per year.

Of all the children in the age group 7 to 14 about 85 per cent are at present attending school. In 1966 the enrolment was, in round figures, 2,064,000 as against 870,000 in 1953 - a mere thirteen years ago.

The number of schools has increased by 3,145 during the past twelve years, and during recent years new schools have been registered at a rate of one per day. The number of teachers has grown from 21,150 in 1953 to 36,554 in 1966 (Transkei included); Bantu teachers are appointed to the highest posts - principals, assistant inspectors and inspectors. Thus in 1967 there were already 58 Bantu inspectors of schools and 200 assistant inspectors/supervisors (Transkei included), apart from Bantu principals for almost all Bantu schools.

The percentage of the total Bantu population in schools was 16.07 in 1965 - comparable with the highest in all Africa.

This success was possible because a modern education system was evolved for the developing nations in South Africa, taking into consideration the desires and wishes of each of these nations for a separate identity, within the framework of their cultural and historical backgrounds and placing emphasis on education for the masses so as to enable them to co-operate in the evolution of new and modern social patterns.

While it is true that the first priority tackled was to establish a broad base of primary education and to abolish illiteracy, secondary, higher and vocational education was not neglected, as inferred in the article. Enrolment returns in the last three years reveal that 80 per cent of the pupils completing the lower primary school course are successfully continuing to higher primary school, **that the growth** of secondary education is at a much higher rate than primary education and that the enrolment figures at the Bantu University Colleges have, over the years, shown a steady increase. Thus the statement in the UNESCO report that "the Government's claim that the ethnic group colleges have provided increased university facilities for non-Whites is not justified either by enrolment or degrees awarded" is an allegation which cannot be substantiated by the facts. The compilers of the UNESCO report, for reasons best known to themselves, have not given comparative figures for enrolment for the period 1959 to 1966, which show that the total number of Bantu students enrolled at South African universities was 1,871 in 1959, compared to 2,928 in 1966. For Coloureds the enrolment was 822 in 1959 and 1,298 in 1966, and for Asians the respective figures were 1,516 and 2,916.

The importance of attuning education to the wishes and needs of the Bantu societies has received the attention of the South African authorities over many decades and in every single instance the Bantu communities and nations are taking an increasing interest and pride in these new institutions belonging to them and established specifically for their development towards full nationhood. It is unfortunate that the UNESCO report should ignore this grand and shared design of the various nations living in South Africa, and neglect a wealth of solid achievement in the educational field in South Africa.

The South African Government's policy in education and in all other matters concerning the various nations at present living in South Africa does not rest on any concept of inequality, but rather on the realization of the substantial and historical differences between the diverse nations and population groups into which mankind is by nature divided, differences accepted by the whole world, and differences which the various nations and population groups in South Africa also wish to retain for themselves, and desire that others shall respect. UNESCO on the other hand, decries these differences among the peoples of South Africa and would deny them the right to their separate identities and individualities, thereby showing up the lack of depth of its report on educational and other matters in South Africa.

The May 1967 issue of the Chronicle carries an article entitled "The Commission on Human Rights Strongly Condemns the Policies of Apartheid and Repressive Measures in South Africa" by Petr Nedbailo of the Ukrainian SSR, Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights at its twenty-third session. The extravagant language and inaccurate, malicious allegations in the article follow the pattern of prejudice and hostility set during the Commission's session.

Typical of the statements in the article are those in the opening paragraph, alleging that apartheid is a form of genocide intended to destroy racial and ethnic groups of the indigenous population of South Africa and that "about thirteen million Africans in South Africa are doomed to extinction". If anything serves to discredit the objectivity of the article, it is this statement. With the exception of the Bushmen, all the peoples of South Africa are equally indigenous in so far as their approximate date of occupation of the country is to serve as the yardstick.

The word "genocide", as normally used, conveys the impression of decimation and extermination of a population group. South Africa has been holding censuses since the beginning of the present century, during which period all the population groups have registered a phenomenal increase. The death rate has greatly decreased, creating a corresponding increase in life expectancy for all its peoples. This trend has in no way been affected by the implementation of a policy of separate development.

Official statistics, generally available and accepted, show that the Bantu population of South Africa has increased from just over four million in 1911 to just under twelve and a half million in 1966. The highest rate of increase per cent during that period (2.65 per cent) was experienced in the decade 1951-1960 (the present decade being incomplete).

One of the principal preoccupations of the Human Rights Commission at its twenty-third session was the administration of prisons in the Republic of South Africa, despite the fact that this trespassing on South Africa's domain is in direct conflict with the provisions of the Charter.

The accent of modern prison administration is on rehabilitation of the offender rather than on unmitigated punishment. Modern prison management is the result of a high economic and educational level which enables developed countries to sustain a suitably trained cadre of specialist prison administrators, who are able by continual exchange of ideas, to keep abreast of the latest enlightened trends in their field. South Africa is among the leaders in this respect and her prison system is among the most modern and humane in the world today and considerably superior to many other countries.

It is an easy matter to verify these claims. One criterion is South Africa's attitude to international instruments relating to prisons. South Africa has accepted the International Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Offenders, adopted by the First United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders in 1955. These rules are incorporated in South African legislation - the Prison Act, Act No. 8 of 1959, and subsidiary regulations. Another criterion is the body of prison legislation itself, together with regulations and service orders. This legislation compares favourably with contemporary legislation anywhere, due allowance being made for differing social, economic and geographic conditions.

Provision is, inter alia, made for the prevention and punishment of abuses, and disciplinary action has been taken in the case of infringements which, as in all countries, occur from time to time.

Apart from casual inspections by persons with a bona fide interest, including visitors from abroad, the South African Government has opened its prisons - twice to extended and thorough inspections - by the International Red Cross. The Government's confidence has been vindicated by the generally satisfactory report submitted by the Red Cross, and subsequently made public. The second wide-ranging inspection has recently taken place but the report has not yet been received.

Inspection is also undertaken by judges of the South African Supreme Court who regularly exercise their prerogative to inspect prisons.

Finally, South Africa has a responsible parliamentary opposition, to whose members facilities for the inspection of prisons have also been extended. These visits have not disclosed serious irregularities, let alone atrocities of the nature of which South Africa is being accused.

In view of the above, the adoption by the Human Rights Commission of resolution 2 (XXIII), firstly condemning practices in South Africa on little else but hearsay evidence and then establishing a committee to ascertain what conditions in South African prisons, already condemned, are, would appear to be illogical.

The article claims that government regulations inhibit the South African Press and public from probing prison conditions, conferring on the Prisons Department virtual immunity from exposure and public criticism. This accusation is presumably based on sub-paragraphs (e) and (f) of clause 44 of the Prisons Act.

Sub-paragraph (e) provides broadly that no photograph of a prison or prisoners may be published without written authority. Sub-paragraph (f) makes it an offence to publish false information concerning prisoners and prison administration knowing it to be false or without taking reasonable steps to verify it. Sub-paragraph (f) is self-explanatory. The principle underlying the enactment of sub-paragraph (e) is as follows;

(1) Apart from the basic presumption in the administration of justice, applicable under normal conditions, that an accused person is innocent until, on trial by a Court of competent jurisdiction, he is proved guilty of the charge beyond reasonable doubt, publication of photos or sketches of any such person, while under detention or sentence of imprisonment, can be prejudicial to him or his family;

(ii) Publication concerning a prisoner or prisoners, sentenced to imprisonment, has no deterrent value. If anything it only aggravates the situation of the prisoner and is detrimental to the members of his family;

(iii) Uncontrolled publicity often **overemphasizes** crime and gives glamour to the notoriety of the perpetrators to the detriment of prevention of crime.

The legislation is in the interests of the prisoner and his family and facilitates his rehabilitation, for which South Africa has a developed programme. Authority is, however, given for the publication of photographs or sketches if in the interests of the State or public safety or that of the prisoner.

Mr. Nedbailo's article abounds with references to political prisoners and persons detained or imprisoned for their "opposition to apartheid". South Africa is a parliamentary democracy and has a free Press. All major political points of view are continually being expressed in Parliament and reported in the Press. Furthermore, institutions ranging from Territorial Authorities to the Parliament of the Transkei, through which the non-White nations can progressively handle their own affairs, are being further developed. It is envisaged that eventually parliaments for all the Bantu nations of South Africa will be established. South Africa attaches great importance to the factor of evolution as opposed to revolution. It favours a course of seeking the co-operation of the relative groups in the matter of their political advancement and, as far as is practicable and equitable, of giving effect to the wishes of the groups themselves as to the forms which successive stages of advancement are to take. This has been strikingly illustrated by events in the Transkei. The traditional institutions of government and modern principles of representative government have been combined in the constitution of the Legislative Assembly which has been granted important powers of legislation, including powers regarding direct taxation, education, agriculture, the establishment, administration and control of certain courts, the protection of life, persons and property, land settlement, public works, roads and bridges, local authorities, road traffic, labour, welfare services and civil service. The executive vests in a Cabinet which consists of a Chief Minister and five other Ministers, all elected by the Legislative Assembly. The other Bantu nations are moving in the same direction. Where, through a system of evolution, political rights are being provided for all the population groups, unlawful and subversive

action against the State cannot be tolerated. In practice such subversive action emanates from a very small section, **inspired, guided and financed from outside the country.**

Concern for the political rights of South Africa's non-White peoples has been used as the pretext for launching a campaign of terrorism and sabotage against South Africa, for example by individual African countries. In this they are encouraged and assisted by the Communist world as is evidenced by the Communist arms in the possession of intercepted terrorists and uncontroverted facts before the courts in sabotage and similar cases. These terrorist activities are directed indiscriminately at members of all the population groups. The majority of victims so far are those who can least protect themselves including women and children. In circumstances of this nature exceptional measures are imperative to protect the State and the civilian population from this cloak and dagger type of aggression.

South Africa subscribes to the ideals of the rule of law. She is as much concerned as any other civilized State about fundamental rights. However terrorist movements can do incalculable harm unless nipped in the bud. Measures were therefore applied which could be withdrawn as soon as they had served their purpose. Should renewed terrorist activities again threaten the safety of the State and her peoples, the South African Government, like any responsible Government, would not hesitate to introduce commensurate measures.

The circumstances which have called forth these measures will probably continue to exert their influence for some time to come, at least until the current political and social revolution in Africa has abated and made way for greater stability. Until such time, it will remain necessary to combat the evil of subversion by appropriate steps. In this context it is worth remembering that there exist many infringements on personal liberty in most States of the world - States which today so glibly accuse South Africa of violation of human rights.

An allegation is made that many prominent members of the Liberal Party were held in solitary confinement. Later a statement to the effect that all 90-day detainees were kept in solitary confinement is quoted. What was the true position? No 90-day detainee was subjected to "solitary confinement". While some detainees may have been the sole occupants of cells for some period of their detention - a procedure provided for in the International Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Offenders -

this is very different from solitary confinement, which in South Africa is a prescribed form of punishment with specific disabilities attached to it, controlled by regulation. No member of the Liberal Party was detained on the basis of that membership. A number of White and non-White members of a terrorist organization known as the African Resistance Movement were, however, detained. This organization was guilty of twenty-two known acts of sabotage, the most notorious of which was the detonation of a time-bomb in the Johannesburg railway station, resulting in the death of a 77-year-old woman and the serious injury of twenty-three men, women and children, all of them innocent passers-by. A number of the detained members of A.R.M. were also leading and self-professed members of the Liberal Party. This was acknowledged by the Party, whose remaining leadership disassociated itself from the terrorist wing and disavowed violence.

Only in cases where new and possibly incriminating information about detainees was obtained by the expiration of the period of ninety days, was a further period of detention authorized. It must also be emphasized that the release of a detainee did not prove his innocence. As in most legal systems the Attorney-General has the function of deciding whether or not to prosecute in a given case and may exercise his prerogative not to prosecute for a variety of reasons, including the giving of evidence for the State.

The provision authorizing a commissioned police officer to detain certain persons for interrogation (section 17 of the General Law Amendment Act No. 37 of 1963 - the so-called 90-day clause) was also intended as a temporary measure to meet a particular emergency and, as correctly stated in Mr. Nedbailo's article, was withdrawn by proclamation as from 11 January 1965. This was not however done for the reasons suggested by Mr. Nedbailo but because subversion and sabotage in the country had been successfully combated. Nobody is at present detained under this legislation.

Section 215 bis of the Criminal Procedure Amendment Act of 1965 (the so-called 180-day law) was enacted principally with the object of protecting State witnesses from murder, intimidation and injury. Experience has shown that witnesses often had a real need for protection.

Under Section 10 (1) (a) bis of Act No. 44 of 1950 (inserted by 4 (a) of Act No. 37 of 1963) the Minister of Justice may, if he is satisfied that a person serving a sentence which was imposed for certain acts committed against the safety

of the State, is likely to advocate, defend or encourage the achievement of any of the objects of Communism, cause that person to be further detained. This provision came into force in 1963 and originally remained in force for one year. It requires specific re-enactment by Parliament each year, if it is to remain in force, which means that the need for its existence is reconsidered annually. Parliament has thus far deemed re-enactment to be necessary. The measure nevertheless remains in essence a temporary one and has in any event, so far been applied to one person only.

There are no political trials in South Africa. It is no crime to oppose the Government's policies. It is, however, a crime to murder, or to plan murder and violence, as the laws of all civilized States agree. Mr. Nedbailo quotes statistics of 111 political trials in which 1,315 persons had been charged. It is not known how he arrived at these statistics. However, it is possible that his figure of 44 sentenced to death includes 23 so sentenced for the murder of several persons at the Bashee River Bridge on the night of 4/5 February 1963. The murdered persons were road maintenance personnel, with the wife and children of one of them, who lived in caravans beside the road. The murderers were a terrorist band, members of an organization whose affiliation with Communism has been established beyond question. Spontaneously and without provocation, the terrorist cell decided to murder the innocent members of the road group and made their way at night to the caravans. Finding the road group away, they lay in wait for their return. When the road group returned and entered their caravans, the terrorist gang set fire to the caravans. As the road workers emerged, they were butchered - men, woman and children. And yet Mr. Nedbailo states that any civilized person "would demand to know of what crimes if any are the prisoners accused to warrant such brutality". Is it possible that anybody who professes to uphold the protection of human rights can fail to consider this deed a crime?

Events elsewhere indicated that the Bashee murder was part of a general pattern of vicious action planned by this terrorist group. For instance in the town of Paarl during November 1962 attacks were made not only on the police station but also on private homes and citizens indiscriminately.

The campaign of violence was also directed at non-White persons who were intimidated into joining the organization and terrorized into concealing from the authorities any information they might gather about the organization. The report of

a judicial commission of inquiry into the events at Paarl, lists thirty-six cases of murder, attempted murder, incitement to murder, public violence, sabotage, arson, conspiracy to commit these acts and attacks on public property during the period January 1962 to April 1963, all of them attributable to the terrorist organization. These cases include fourteen murders committed against Bantu. The murders were usually carried out with cruelty and the bodies were mutilated.

Documents discovered when another group of terrorists, the group which has come to be known as the Rivonia group, was taken into custody, prove that it had a blue-print for terror, guerilla warfare and rebellion in South Africa. These documents, the authenticity of many of which was not even disputed by the defence, formed part of the evidence at the "Rivonia trial" mentioned by Mr. Nedbailo. They included notes of conversations with representatives of Communist countries in connexion with the commission of sabotage and creation of chaos in South Africa.

No person has been sentenced to death on the ground of a **contravention of any of** the provisions of the General Law Amendment Act - unless murder, or intent to murder has been proved beyond reasonable doubt in the course of the trial. The trials mentioned above were not held in secret but were widely publicized. The Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights could have obtained the relevant information before publishing his article with relatively little inconvenience, had he so desired. Comprehensive records of all criminal proceedings, recording the charge, the evidence, the verdict and the sentence, are kept in South Africa. They are public documents and facilities exist for their inspection, even where the trial has been held in camera.

Mr. Nedbailo's article mentions, among others, Nelson Mandela and Abram Fischer and quotes extracts from the statements each made at his trial. These statements, prepared beforehand, were made from the dock (as South African law permits) and not under oath in the witness box, thus ensuring that they could not be tested by cross-examination. Fischer was an active Communist and on the Central Committee of the Communist Party of South Africa for many years and his activities were duly recognized with the award to him on 1 April 1967 of the Lenin Peace Prize by the Soviet Union. Mandela, also a self-confessed Communist, was one of the co-conspirators of the Rivonia terrorist group whose main objective, to adapt Mandela's own words, was to "produce an intensity of bitterness and hostility between

the various races of this country which is not produced even by war". In their campaign to overthrow the State, the followers of Fischer and Mandela committed more than 300 acts of sabotage against life and property, using explosives.

As for Robert Sobukwe, does Mr. Nedbailo realize that he is championing the cause of one of the most unabashed racialists of southern Africa? His attitude towards other population groups is best given in his own words:

As regards the Indians, he wrote:

"Their present day politics consist of chasing with the hound and running with the hare.

"They will bribe the oppressor for favours and dole hundreds of pounds to any seemingly powerful organization of the oppressed people so as to avoid disturbing occurrences that may affect them adversely.

"A common practice among them is that of claiming to be of pure Indian blood. Here also you begin to see the influence of their culture. Because of the fact that Indian women must at all times be either expectant or having babies, and because Indian women must always stay indoors, particularly after sunset, the bulls [go] to the market to satisfy their sexual needs on the African women. This is one of the factors that led to the Durban riots of 1949." e/

And regarding Coloureds, he stated:

"... the 'Coloureds' in particular adopt a hostile attitude towards Africans. The majority of these are in the Cape and they regard themselves as superior to the African. Many of them tend to play white, and wish to be regarded as 'Amper Bosses' [nearly bosses]. Their culture of course is that of the Afrikaner - a very backward white tribe." f/

He explained his views on liberal-minded White South Africans as follows:

"There are a few of the European minority who realize that it is later than Verwoerd and Graaf think. They realize that the forces of African Nationalism will soon overpower the clay God known as 'White Domination'. To them the solution lies in making allowances to certain Africans so that once these privileged Africans exist, they will then act as the buffers, if not the shock absorbers. There will then be a division in the liberatory front. This will then remove the eyes of the African from the genuine issues involved to such frivolous matters. This is the attitude of parties like Progressives and Liberals." g/

e/ Sobukwe, R., Unpublished manuscript, 1960. See also Rejoinder filed by the Government of the Republic of South Africa, South West Africa Cases, vol. I, part III, section E, chapter VI, para. 63.

f/ Ibid.

g/ Ibid.

Allegations as to torture of detainees are typical of the tactics used by organizations such as the World Campaign for the Release of South African Prisoners. As far as 90-day detainees were concerned, the law provided that each detainee should be visited weekly by a magistrate and this was done. All complaints of alleged ill-treatment or assault were examined without delay and referred to an Attorney General with a view to prosecution. None was substantiated. Twenty-one detainees gave notice of civil actions against the State on the basis of alleged torture or illegal physical violence against themselves. Although requested by the authorities, no further particulars of the charges have been forthcoming, however, and up to the present, more than three years later, there have been no further developments - a clear indication that the allegations were mischievous.

South Africa claims that despite all efforts to the contrary by foreign instigators and agitators, its policies are achieving ever increasing success and bringing satisfaction to the overwhelming majority of all her peoples. Her Bantu peoples as a whole are contented, and are adapting themselves to the exigencies of a modern world without undue dislocation. This, South Africa ascribes in no small measure to its policies which seek to retain as much as possible of the traditional life of the Bantu whilst at the same time acquainting them with the principles of modern political and economic life. The policy of self-determination for all her peoples provides an opportunity for political self-realization without a complete break with their customs, in other words by evolution as opposed to revolution. At the same time South Africa's policies in the economic, educational and social spheres have resulted in a standard of well-being far exceeding that in any other State in Africa.

It will therefore be apparent that not only are the two articles carried in the UN Monthly Chronicle maliciously conceived and factually inaccurate and incomplete, but also that the Office of Public Information has erred gravely and misconstrued its purpose in permitting their publication.

B. LETTER DATED 14 JULY 1967 FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL TO THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF SOUTH AFRICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 13 July 1967, concerning the appearance in the March and May 1967 issues of the magazine UN Monthly Chronicle of two articles which, in the opinion of your Government, constitute an intrusion in the internal affairs of South Africa in violation of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, in addition to presenting a false and distorted picture of South Africa.

The first article summarizes the report entitled "The Effects of Apartheid on Education, Science, Culture and Information in South Africa", prepared by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, at the behest of an eleven-member Committee of the General Assembly, and the second article, contributed by the Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights was entitled "The United Nations Commission on Human Rights Strongly Condemns the Policies of Apartheid and Repressive Measures in South Africa".

These two articles were published in compliance with General Assembly resolution 2054 (XX) which, inter alia, requested the Secretary-General "to take appropriate measures for the widest possible dissemination of information on the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa and on United Nations efforts to deal with the situation" and General Assembly resolution 2144 (XXI) which, inter alia, requested the Secretary-General to "establish a unit within the Secretariat of the United Nations to deal exclusively with policies of apartheid... in order that maximum publicity may be given to the evils of those policies".

Since the articles in question were published in direct compliance with specific General Assembly resolutions, they cannot be regarded as constituting interference in the internal affairs of South Africa but as fulfilling the terms of these resolutions as well as the express mandate of the Office of Public Information itself which, under the general authority of the principal organs of the United Nations, was defined by General Assembly resolution 13 (I) as being the dissemination of information relating to the work and purposes of the United Nations among the peoples of the world.

Under established editorial policies, the material carried in the "Articles" section of the UN Monthly Chronicle is restricted to anonymous contributions by the Office of Public Information itself or to articles signed by senior United Nations officials or elected office holders of United Nations organs. No contributions by the representatives of individual Member States are included in this section.

Accordingly, if Your Excellency wishes to circulate the material transmitted to me along with your letter of 13 July, you could request such circulation under cover of a note verbale. In that event, besides the normal circulation to Member States, the material would also be issued as a press release in the N/V series and distributed in the normal way.

Alternatively, Your Excellency may wish to state your Government's views and comments on the articles in question in some appropriate organ of the United Nations in which case they would, of course, be fully summarized both in the press releases as well as in the UN Monthly Chronicle in the same way as the views of the Permanent Mission of South Africa have always been reported in the past, together with the views of other delegations.

(Signed) U THANT
Secretary-General

C. LETTER DATED 28 JULY 1967 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF SOUTH AFRICA
TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

I have the honour to refer to your letter of 14 July 1967 in reply to my Government's request for publication in the UN Monthly Chronicle, of its reply to two articles printed in the March and May 1967 issues of that magazine.

It is noted that under established editorial policies, the material carried in the "Articles" section of the UN Monthly Chronicle is restricted to anonymous contributions by the Office of Public Information itself or to articles signed by senior United Nations officials or elected office holders of United Nations organs and that no contributions by the representatives of individual Member States are included in this section.

The South African Government wishes to record its objections to this policy, which departs from the elementary principle that rebuttals should appear in the same publication as the original false charges so as to reach the same audience. In this regard, therefore, the editorial policy is arbitrary and discriminatory. By denying Governments the opportunity of refutation before the same audience, this policy in effect sets the Office of Public Information, United Nations officials and elected officers, above Governments - a situation which is obviously unacceptable.

Furthermore, as regards the two articles to which the South African Government's reply was drafted, it is noted that the provisions of General Assembly resolutions 2054 (XX) and 2144 (XXI) are cited as authority for their publication. The South African Government, however, considers these resolutions illegal as being in contravention of the United Nations Charter (including Article 2, paragraph 7, thereof), and consequently cannot recognize that they constitute a legal and proper mandate for the publication of the two articles.

In any event resolution 2054 (XX) which, inter alia, requests the Secretary-General to take measures "for the widest possible dissemination of information on the policies of apartheid" constitutes no sanction for the use of United Nations facilities to spread propaganda and falsehoods about South Africa or to publish purely ex parte views. On the other hand, my Government's reply to the articles in question constitutes information in the clearest terms.

It would accordingly be appreciated if you could arrange for publication in the next edition of the Chronicle of my Government's reply which I forwarded under cover of my letter of 13 July 1967.

(Signed) M.I. BOTHA
Ambassador, Permanent
Representative

D. LETTER DATED 14 JULY 1967 FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL TO THE PERMANENT
REPRESENTATIVE OF SOUTH AFRICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 28 July 1967 concerning articles published in the UN Monthly Chronicle in March and May 1967, to which reference was made in your earlier communication to me of 13 July 1967.

As I had occasion to say in my reply to your communication of 13 July 1967, the two articles in question were published in pursuance of General Assembly resolutions specifically requesting the Secretary-General to take appropriate measures for the widest possible dissemination of information on the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa and on United Nations efforts to deal with the situation. While noting Your Excellency's comments about the legality and validity of these resolutions, I must continue to maintain that they constitute, for the Secretariat, binding instructions by a competent organ of the United Nations.

The editorial policy under which the UN Monthly Chronicle limits the material published in the "Articles" section to anonymous contributions by the Secretariat or to signed articles by senior United Nations officials or elected office holders of United Nations organs was established for the express purpose of ensuring that this section of the periodical would be as representative as possible of views and attitudes of the Organization as a whole. The views of individual Member States, as stated in my earlier communication, are summarized and recorded in the "Record of the Month" section.

In reaffirming this policy, I would draw your attention to my communication of 14 July which set out procedures which Your Excellency may wish to consider for disseminating the reply of your Government to the positions taken in the two articles prepared under General Assembly directives.

(Signed) U THANT
Secretary-General
