



**Tuesday, 7 December 1954,**  
**at 10.50 a.m.**

**New York**

**CONTENTS**

|   | <i>Page</i> |
|---|-------------|
| Allocation to the Committee of two additional agenda items .....  | 215         |
| Agenda item 23:   |             |
| The question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of <i>apartheid</i> of the Government of the Union of South Africa: report of the United Nations Commission on the Racial Situation in the Union of South Africa ( <i>continued</i> ) ..... | 215         |

**Chairman: Mr. Thor THORS (Iceland).**

**Allocation to the Committee of two additional agenda items (A/AC.76/1/Add.2)**

1. The CHAIRMAN communicated to the Committee a letter (A/AC.76/1/Add.2) received from the President of the General Assembly informing him that at its 504th plenary meeting the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the General Committee, had decided to transfer items 70 and 71 of the agenda of the session from the First to the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, and asking him to add to the Committee's agenda for consideration and report to the General Assembly two items entitled: "Complaint of acts of aggression against the People's Republic of China and responsibility of the United States Navy for those acts", and "Complaint of violation of the freedom of navigation in the area of the China seas".

**AGENDA ITEM 23**

**The question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of the Union of South Africa: report of the United Nations Commission on the Racial Situation in the Union of South Africa (A/2719, A/AC.76/13, A/AC.76/L.20) (*continued*)**

2. U KHIN MAUNG (Burma) said that his country had been among those which had requested that the General Assembly should examine the question of race conflict in the Union of South Africa, and that his delegation had been one of the sponsors of resolution 616 (VII), by which the General Assembly had established the United Nations Commission on the Racial Situation in the Union of South Africa. Despite the obstacles it had encountered, the Commission had done admirable work. Nevertheless, the Government of the Union of South Africa was still pursuing and even intensifying its policy of racial discrimination. He did not propose to refer in detail to the new discriminatory laws which had been enacted in the Union of South Africa; they had already been cogently analysed by the Indian representative (43rd meeting). That legislation was a manifest violation of the principle of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms laid down in the United Nations Charter.

3. The question of the competence of the United Nations to examine the problem had again been raised by the Union of South Africa (42nd meeting) although the General Assembly had already decided it by an overwhelming majority. The obligation Member States had assumed, under Article 55 c of the Charter, to promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, entitled the General Assembly to look into any evasion of that obligation. The *apartheid* policy pursued by the Government of the Union of South Africa constituted such evasion and the General Assembly was therefore competent to study the situation resulting from that policy.

4. The joint draft resolution (A/AC.76/L.20), which Burma had joined in sponsoring, again invited the Government of the Union of South Africa to conform to its obligations under the Charter. Such an invitation in no way constituted interference in the domestic affairs of the Union of South Africa. The sponsors of the joint draft resolution did not question the Union's right to adopt such laws and regulations as it considered to be in the interests of its people. The draft resolution was merely an appeal to the Union of South Africa to ensure respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms in its territory.

5. The Burmese delegation hoped that the Government of the Union of South Africa would respond to that invitation and would at last agree to co-operate with the United Nations Commission in seeking a solution to the problem.

6. Mr. DE SOUZA GOMES (Brazil) said that the Union of South Africa and Brazil were both multi-racial countries; but their racial practices were poles apart. While the Union of South Africa had adopted a policy of racial segregation, Brazil applied the principle of racial equality and integration. Racial equality had not been imposed in Brazil by compulsory legislative action, but was the product of an ancient tradition of human brotherhood, which the Brazilian people had inherited from their Portuguese forbears and had been able to maintain through the centuries. Of course, the delicate problem of the coexistence of several races within one country did not take the same form everywhere. In point of fact the happy racial situation existing in Brazil was the result of very complex social, religious and psychological factors; and similarly, the racial situation in the Union of South Africa was due to circumstances not all of which had been brought about by the South African Government as a matter of deliberate policy. Prejudices usually grew very deep roots, and it was clearly impossible for the Government of the Union of South Africa to reverse its policy at short notice without creating great social unrest. It was reasonable, however, to hope that it would not continue to intensify its *apartheid* policy and would endeavour, like the Governments of other countries, gradually to

ease the racial conflict which divided its people and was causing concern to all nations.

7. Without wishing to embark on a legal examination of the question whether certain Articles of the Charter imposed on the Union of South Africa a legal obligation to remedy the situation, he could not refrain from pointing out that the States signatory to the Charter had decided that one of the purposes of the United Nations was to promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race.

8. He wished the South African representative to understand that he had participated in the debate solely because of his delegation's desire to co-operate in seeking a solution to the problem. His delegation fully appreciated the Union Government's difficulties in the matter; clearly, it was for the Union of South Africa alone to decide whether it wished to use the good offices of the United Nations in solving the problem. The United Nations, at all events, could not dictate any solution to the Union Government. As the United Nations Commission had stated in its report (A/2719), any measures to reduce racial conflicts in the Union of South Africa must be adopted by the Government of the country. Accordingly, it behooved the Committee to study the joint draft resolution before it (A/AC.76/L.20) with the greatest care, lest it should aggravate the situation or even stir up discord among Member States. Above all, it should bear in mind the United Nations Commission's conclusion that it was for the South African people themselves to solve their problem.

9. With regard to the other conclusions reached by the Commission on the racial situation and the question of continuing the Commission, he would state only that it was useless to offer the Government of a Member State assistance which that Government was unwilling to accept.

10. He reserved his delegation's position on the draft resolution before the Committee. The Brazilian delegation's vote on the draft resolution would be based on the considerations he had just outlined and the relevant principles of the Charter.

11. Mr. VILOVIC (Yugoslavia) noted with regret that although the General Assembly had been considering the question of race conflict in the Union of South Africa for eight years and had adopted several resolutions condemning the *apartheid* policy pursued by that country's Government, the Union of South Africa had taken no steps to assuage the conflict. Far from improving, the situation in the Union of South Africa had indeed worsened, as the United Nations Commission had pointed out in its report.

12. The Yugoslav delegation wished to pay tribute to the Commission and its Chairman on the outstanding report which had been submitted to the General Assembly. He was glad to note that in preparing its report the Commission had acted on the suggestions his delegation had submitted to the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee at the eighth session (36th meeting) with regard to the study of the effects of the *apartheid* policy on economic conditions in the Union of South Africa.

13. The South African representative had again objected to the examination of the question by the General Assembly on the grounds that the Assembly was not competent to deal with it. The Yugoslav delegation had already stated its position on that issue. Without misinterpreting or underestimating the importance of

Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter, the Yugoslav delegation felt that the provisions of that paragraph did not apply in the present case, and that a Member State was not entitled to use Article 2, paragraph 7 as a pretext for the evasion of certain other Articles of the Charter, particularly Articles 55 and 56. Moreover the Yugoslav delegation was convinced that the *apartheid* policy pursued by the Government of the Union of South Africa was contrary to the obligations that State had assumed as a signatory to the Charter; that it was responsible for a situation which was steadily deteriorating and represented a grave threat to peace; and that, in consequence, the United Nations was in duty bound to do all in its power to improve matters.

14. Some delegations had pointed out during the discussion that social problems were highly complicated and that therefore the problem could be solved only by a process of slow evolution. That did not apply to the situation in the Union of South Africa, for far from seeking to solve the problem in accordance with the provisions of the Charter, the Government of the Union of South Africa was intensifying its *apartheid* policy, which victimized 80 per cent of the country's population. The conflict had assumed such magnitude in the Union of South Africa that it might spread to other countries, arousing antagonism between different ethnic groups and thus forming a barrier to co-operation between peoples of different race. Accordingly, it was important that the United Nations should take adequate steps to solve the problem.

15. The Yugoslav delegation was a co-sponsor of the joint draft resolution (A/AC.76/L.20), and would take the opportunity to comment on that draft in detail at a suitable point in the debate.

16. Mr. AL GAYLANI (Iraq) said that no one should underestimate the gravity of the problem posed by the racial situation in South Africa, which was a veritable challenge to the United Nations. He would not revert to the question of competence, which had been dealt with at length at previous sessions. The General Assembly's competence had been definitely established and the Assembly had rejected the objection of non-competence which the Union of South Africa had advanced in a draft resolution (A/AC.72/L.13) submitted at the eighth session.

17. The second report of the United Nations Commission on the Racial Situation in the Union of South Africa (A/2719) was an objective study of the facts and a valuable contribution towards the solution of the problem. It was an admirable document, full of political wisdom and moderation. Because of the South African Government's refusal to co-operate with it, the Commission had had to turn to other sources of information in order to discharge its task. In that connexion, attention should be drawn to the inadmissible attitude of the International Labour Organisation, which had informed the Commission in a letter sent by its Director-General and reproduced in paragraph 28 of the report that it was unable to accede to the Commission's request for information. That attitude was contrary to the terms of the agreement between the United Nations and the International Labour Organisation. The Iraqi representative asked the Chairman to bring the matter to the notice of the Secretary-General with a view to suitable action.

18. Careful study of the Commission's report made it clear that the Government of the Union of South Africa had not taken, and did not intend to take, any steps to

ease the tension prevailing in the Union of South Africa as a result of racial conflict. On the contrary, the Union Government had intensified its *apartheid* policy and had passed further discriminatory laws in 1953 and 1954, laws which the Commission had analysed in paragraphs 54-98 of its report. It was interesting to note that some sections of the population had opposed the policy of *apartheid*. Of particular interest in that connexion were the joint statement of the Bishops of the Anglican Church in South Africa and the speech by Mr. Strauss, the leader of the United Party in the South African Parliament, reproduced in paragraphs 138 and 282 of the Commission's report.

19. Tension among the various ethnic groups was increasing, and there could be no doubt that it might take on a very serious form in the near future. That would mean that the Government would have to take repressive measures, which would not be based on justice, and would therefore in their turn engender further tension in the relations between the different ethnic groups. Moreover, a very serious aspect of the problem was the fact that extremist doctrines were spreading among the non-European population and an underground movement was developing which might be a serious threat to public order in the Union of South Africa. Finally, the *apartheid* policy was having an adverse effect on the country's economy.

20. The Iraqi delegation thought that the most interesting part of the report was that dealing with solutions proposed in the Union of South Africa itself and with the relevant experience of other countries. The entire body of segregation legislation, especially that most recently enacted, had been shown to be contrary to the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The dangerous and inhumane policy pursued by the South African Government was based on fallacious ideas, as the Indian (43rd meeting) and Ecuadorian (44th meeting) representatives had shown. Any form of racial segregation was abhorrent to all believers in a divine power. The Ecuadorian representative had pointed out that it was contrary to the teachings of Christianity, and the Iraqi representative could say in his turn, that the Moslem religion was based on the equality of all men and tolerated no discrimination.

21. Moreover, the question had very serious international implications. The United Nations was doing the Union of South Africa a great service by bringing home to it the reactions of other peoples to its racial segregation policy. The coloured peoples of Africa were now prepared to fight to defend their rights and freedoms. That fight might assume a violent form. Africa should be spared the tragedy of racial warfare. It was therefore in the interests of the Europeans living in Africa to reconsider their policy and their discriminatory legislation directed against the people of African origin. The United Nations for its part, should persist in its endeavours to bring about a solution of the problem and should welcome any co-operation which the South African Government might wish to offer.

22. The Iraqi delegation, true to the principles of justice, freedom and equality which governed its country's policy and faithful to its obligations as a Member State, had co-sponsored the draft resolution now before the Committee. Its prime concern was to promote peaceful relations among nations and communities.

23. Mr. NIETO (Mexico) said that the human rights and fundamental freedoms enshrined in the Charter had

to be defended, and that the question of racial discrimination in the Union of South Africa was clearly an international one. That had been the view supported by the Mexican delegation at the eighth session (37th meeting). Moreover, the General Committee, the General Assembly and the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee had asserted the Assembly's competence after a careful consideration of the problem and of the arguments advanced by those delegations which took the opposite view. Articles 55 and 56 and Article 1, paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Charter left no doubt as to the Assembly's competence.

24. After studying the Commission's report, the Mexican delegation endorsed its conclusions that the *apartheid* policy was having serious repercussions on the economic life of the Union of South Africa, was an obstacle to the development of friendly relations between South Africa and other countries and promoted discord among the different ethnic groups comprising the population of the Union of South Africa.

25. The Mexican delegation had studied with great interest that part of the report which dealt with the relevant experience of other countries in similar situations. It was true that the special conditions prevailing in South Africa made its problem more complex, but the experience of other countries might be of help both in analysing the situation and in finding a solution. In that connexion, he drew the Committee's attention to paragraph 313 of the report, and said that in Latin America the integration of various ethnic groups, far from sapping the basic principles of European civilization, had helped to promote them. The Constitutions of the Latin American countries proclaimed the equality of all their citizens before the law without any distinction and particularly without any discrimination based on race.

26. The Mexican delegation had been particularly interested in the suggestions in paragraph 384 of the report, and hoped that the report would assist the Government and the people of the Union of South Africa to find the best way out of their problem. In the sphere of human rights, which were essentially a matter of conscience and of ethics, legal objections had no validity. If the Assembly decided to interfere in the domestic affairs of the Union of South Africa or of any other State, Mexico would be the first to object; but that was not the case, and the Mexican delegation could not close its eyes to a situation which offended its unshakeable faith in racial equality.

27. Mr. RIBAS (Cuba) said that when, in 1868, the Cuban people had begun the national liberation movement, the first steps taken by the revolutionary Government had been the suppression of slavery, the abolition of all discriminatory measures enacted by the former colonial government and the proclamation of the equality of all inhabitants. The principle of the equality of rights of all men, of whatever race, had been written into the Cuban Constitution of 1902, which provided that the Republic recognized no privilege in any form, and made any discrimination based on distinctions of race, sex, social class and the like a criminal offence.

28. The Cuban delegation was fully aware that in the delicate matter of racial prejudice no country was completely blameless, and that such factors as the living conditions and cultural levels of the various races had to be considered. It was clear, however, that when a country applied discriminatory measures amounting to

persecution, that was unjust and contrary to the purposes of the United Nations. Those groups of human beings who regarded themselves as under-privileged saw their last hope in the United Nations. Its Members must join forces in assisting the Union of South Africa to solve its problem satisfactorily.

29. The Cuban delegation felt only respect and friendship for the Union of South Africa. It wished neither to condemn that country nor to intervene in its domestic affairs, but it considered it its duty to defend principles which accorded with the historical traditions of Cuba and with the obligations it had assumed towards the United Nations.

30. In view of those considerations, the Cuban delegation expressed the hope that the General Assembly would find a formula which would make it possible to settle the problem in a satisfactory and honourable way.

31. Mr. SLIPCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that although the Commission had been obliged to work under difficult conditions and no co-operation had been forthcoming from the South African Government, it had succeeded in collecting a great deal of information which offered further proof that the policy of *apartheid* was not only a violation of the fundamental human rights proclaimed by the Charter, but also a threat to peace and security. His delegation shared the view, reaffirmed by General Assembly resolution 721 (VIII), that genuine and lasting peace depended upon the observance of all the principles and purposes established in the Charter and especially upon respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all. That was one reason why the racist ideology reflected in the Union Government's official policy must be condemned. As the Commission's report had pointed out, the policy of *apartheid* led to a deadlock and gave rise to serious conflicts. The Commission had adduced many facts proving that the recent laws enacted in the Union of South Africa constituted new violations of the rights and fundamental freedoms of the African population. In all spheres — parliamentary representation, family and social life, education, labour, rights of movement and residence — the principle of segregation was being enforced with increasing severity. Examples of the discrimination practised were to be found in almost every page of the Commission's report.

32. The South African representative had asserted that the information in the report which gave an unfavourable picture of the racial situation had come from public and political organizations opposed to the Government. The Ukrainian representative drew attention to some statements the Commission had reproduced which, in view of their authors' opinions on racism, could hardly be regarded as coming from persons opposed to the Government. That applied for example to the statement by Mr. Steyn, member of the South African Parliament, which appeared in paragraph 282. Mr. Steyn had said that his party wanted the white population to retain power in South Africa and that he opposed equality between Europeans and non-Europeans. The statement, cited in paragraph 302 by Mr. Keppel-Jones, the author of the plan for a federation by ethnic groups, was also very significant. As for the statement by the Minister of Native Affairs which was cited in paragraph 360, comparing natives to asses and oxen, the Ukrainian delegation fully shared the indignation felt by other delegations.

33. Such examples illustrated the suffering that racism had brought upon humanity and its grave re-

percussions on international relations. Yet, as had been apparent during the debate on the question of the prohibition of propaganda in favour of a new war, the Union of South Africa did not hesitate to set itself up as a defender of democracy, to profess a touching concern for human rights and to release a flood of slander against the USSR and the peoples' democracies. The South African representative would do better to concern himself with the elimination in his country of racism which mankind so categorically condemned. The United States representative, while he had criticized the fascist measures enacted in the Union of South Africa, had actually come to the defence of the South African representative by appealing to the Committee to adopt a cautious approach in proposing solutions to the problem. His attitude could be ascribed to the fact that the racial situation in the United States was far from perfect, despite the picture which he had tried to draw. Indeed, the President of the United States had quite recently stated that the United States still knew the shame of racial discrimination and that there was still prejudice against people on religious grounds. The United States representative had once again seen fit to make slanderous charges against the USSR, in order to divert the attention of representatives from the situation which existed not only in the Union of South Africa but also in the United States.

34. Although it was the General Assembly's manifest duty to condemn the Union of South Africa's racist policy, some delegations continued to oppose the adoption of positive measures and supported the South African Government's view that the General Assembly was not competent to deal with the question; that, for example, had been the position of the United Kingdom representative (43rd meeting). That argument was untenable. It could hardly be claimed that a policy which the General Assembly had characterized as likely to endanger friendly relations among States was within the domestic jurisdiction of a State. The debate on the question of the treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa had shown that the General Assembly's position was completely justified.

35. The South African representative claimed that his Government had not assumed any international obligations to respect the rights of its own people, and that as those rights had never been incorporated in specific provisions it could not be argued that any provision had been contravened. Perhaps that statement explained the silence of the South African delegation and certain other delegations in the meetings of the Third Committee at the present session devoted to the consideration of the draft covenants on human rights. However, their opinion notwithstanding, those rights were very clearly laid down in the Charter, particularly in Articles 1, 13 and 55; Article 55 in particular brought out the international aspect of the problem under discussion. The General Assembly was authorized to make such recommendations to Member States as it considered desirable to ensure the implementation of the principles of the Charter and particularly of human rights, which occupied an especially important place in the Charter. In carrying out such duties, therefore, the General Assembly was in no way intervening in matters which were essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of States, within the meaning of paragraph 2, paragraph 7; that had been demonstrated by the Indian representative (42nd meeting). Furthermore, the policy of racial discrimination practised by the South African Government offended the sense of human



dignity of the peoples in other parts of the world and thus had unfavourable repercussions on international relations; accordingly that policy was a matter of international concern. He emphasized in passing that given the opportunity non-European peoples were as capable as Europeans of scaling the heights of culture and civilization; that was proved by history.

36. In coming to the defence of the Union of South Africa, some delegations had destroyed the myth of the so-called "free" Western world. The policy of racial discrimination and *apartheid* could result in the dispersal and consequently the destruction of entire African tribes. If it wished to defend its high principles by deeds, the United Nations should categorically condemn that policy. Its duty under the Purposes and Principles of the Charter was clear and the only equitable solution to the problem was the elimination of racial and all other forms of discrimination.

37. Mr. SUDJARWO (Indonesia) regretted that the Government of the Union of South Africa had refused to co-operate with the United Nations in seeking a solution of the problem before the Assembly, and had continued its *apartheid* policy. That policy sharpened the tensions between the various ethnic groups in the Union of South Africa and endangered peaceful relations among the races of the world.

38. The Indonesian delegation had always considered the racial conflict in the Union of South Africa in the light of its international repercussions. For that reason, it had shared the view of the majority of the Assembly that in considering the problem the United Nations was not interfering in the internal affairs of the Union of South Africa within the meaning of Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter. Indonesia was perfectly well aware of the difficulties confronting a multi-racial society; it felt, however, that the Union Government had aggravated the situation by its policy.

39. It was evident from the documentation assembled by the Commission on the Racial Situation in the Union of South Africa that the laws and treatment of the non-white population in that country humiliated not only the victims, but mankind as a whole, and degraded the very principles of the United Nations. Such measures could not be justified by invoking the South African Government's difficulties or the principles of Christianity, as Mr. Malan had recently done. Most of the Christian leaders in the Union of South Africa and elsewhere, moreover, had condemned the Union Government's racial policy. In that connexion, he drew attention to the statements of the Archbishop of Canterbury and a group of bishops of the Anglican Church of South Africa.

40. The Indonesian delegation was following the development of the situation in the Union of South Africa with great concern. It felt that it was the duty of all Members of the United Nations, including the Union of South Africa, to settle that racial problem. In the period of more than three years during which the United Nations had been considering the question, the Indonesian delegation had always taken part in the debate in the hope that the Union of South Africa would finally consent to render the United Nations the necessary co-operation. The United Nations Commission on the Racial Situation had worked in that spirit. After thorough study, it had formulated conclusions and recommendations which were worth the serious attention of the Government of the Union of South Africa.

41. The Indonesian delegation had joined with nineteen other delegations in proposing a draft resolution based on the Commission's reports and recommendations. It was convinced that the draft might help to settle the problem in a peaceful way and in accordance with the Charter. It hoped that it would be possible to reach such a settlement with the co-operation of the South African Government.

42. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) congratulated the Commission on the way in which it had carried out its duties. The measures it recommended for settling the problem were eminently practical. They were based on the experience of States Members of the United Nations which had succeeded in settling similar problems, and they drew their inspiration from institutions established by the United Nations.

43. The best proof of the impartiality with which the Commission had done its work was the fact that the delegation of the Union of South Africa had been unable to refute its conclusions, which showed that the Union Government was deliberately enforcing a policy of discrimination with respect to the non-white population of the country. At the eighth session of the Assembly the delegation of the Union of South Africa had argued (32nd meeting) that the Commission's first report contained many errors of fact, but had brought no evidence to substantiate that charge. The mere statement that the Commission was an illegal body and that the question was exclusively one of domestic jurisdiction did not dispense the Union of South Africa from the duty of correcting whatever errors there might be, or refuting the charges directed against it.

44. At its previous sessions, the Assembly had decided that it was competent to consider the question of racial conflict in the Union of South Africa, and to make recommendations on it. It was therefore pointless to reopen the issue, unless those who maintained the contrary view wanted the question of competence to be voted on again.

45. The representative of Australia had argued (44th meeting), for example, that the observance of human rights came within the domestic jurisdiction of States, that the United Nations was not competent to deal with it, and that the Commission was therefore an illegal body. To refute his argument, it was sufficient to recall the Australian delegation's position at the Assembly's third session on a similar problem. It was the Australian delegation which had submitted at the third session the question of alleged violations of human rights by Bulgaria and Hungary to the Assembly (A/821). In that connexion, Mr. Inglés cited the arguments put forward by the Australian representatives at the time to prove that the Assembly was fully competent to deal with the matter, and that it was its duty to examine the relevant facts. It had of course been emphasized at the time that the question submitted to the Assembly included the violation of certain specific provisions subscribed to by Bulgaria and Hungary in the peace treaties, which bound them to ensure respect for human rights. But the Australian representative had held that independently of the peace treaties, the United Nations was competent and had duties in the matter.

46. It was interesting to note that the delegations now opposed to any consideration of violations of human rights in the Union of South Africa had vehemently supported the Assembly's resolutions on similar violations in Hungary and Bulgaria. The same delegations

had also, in the Economic and Social Council, supported the establishment of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Forced Labour, the task of which was to be to study conditions in Communist labour camps, on the ground that the camps were a weapon against those who did not agree with the political views of their Government.

47. It was likewise very characteristic to find the South African delegation on the one hand asserting that the Charter defined human rights so nebulously that it imposed no obligation on Member States in that respect, and on the other, when it wished to deny United Nations competence in the question, stating categorically that observance of those rights was a matter for its national jurisdiction.

48. It had also been argued that the South African Government should be free to decide how to ensure respect for the human rights objectives of the Charter in its territory. Even if that were so, it could hardly be claimed that the Union Government was helping to implement the objectives of the Charter by its *apartheid* policy. Far from applying the provisions of Article 56, the South African Government had continued to restrict the meagre rights enjoyed by the overwhelming majority of its people. It had of course been said that equal rights for all races could not be achieved overnight; but surely no progress could be made towards that end when a Member of the United Nations continued to adopt laws aggravating racial discrimination.

49. The South African representative had described as communist certain organizations which had submitted memoranda to the Commission. Even if that were true, there were no grounds for accusing the Commission of adopting communist propaganda slogans. The Union Government had attempted to represent some of its discriminatory laws as "anti-communist" measures. It would be a sad day if the downtrodden peoples were led to believe that they had no champions in the world other than the Communists.

50. Some representatives had said that the present debate might poison relations among Member States and might create international disturbance. They should look for the real source of that disturbance, and recognize that the *apartheid* policy was the cause of that dangerous situation. Those who endorsed South Africa's refusal to co-operate with a view to a peaceful settlement of the problem under the auspices of the United Nations were thereby precipitating social revolution.

51. The Philippine delegation hoped that the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee would support the twenty-Power draft resolution, which was but the logical sequel to resolution 721 (VIII), adopted by an overwhelming majority at the Assembly's eighth session.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.