



Chairman: Mr. Abdul Samad GHAUS
(Afghanistan).

AGENDA ITEM 34

The policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa: report of the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued) (A/8022 and Add.1, A/8109, A/8117, A/SPC/L.181, A/SPC/L.183-186)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to draft resolutions A/SPC/L.183, A/SPC/L.184, A/SPC/L.185 and A/SPC/L.186, which had just been submitted and stated that Burundi, Cameroon, Ghana, Guyana, Haiti, Kenya, Kuwait, Nepal, Nigeria, Tunisia, Uganda and Yugoslavia wished to join the sponsors of those drafts.
2. Mr. McKENLEY (Jamaica) said that there would have been some cause for rejoicing at the advent of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, had any progress been made in solving the problem of *apartheid*. Unfortunately, the situation was steadily deteriorating and the responsible States had not even been present during the discussion. Within the context of the three principles—peace, justice and progress—laid down in the Charter, resolutions had been adopted which should have been adequate to solve the problem. A solution could still be found if the international will was given precedence over temporary economic advantage. Despite the reports produced by OAU, by the Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held at Lusaka, and by the World Council of Churches and two reports (A/8022 and Add.1, A/AC.115/L.279¹) of the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa, there was no change for the better. Certain founder-Members of the United Nations were now undermining it by providing economic support for the *apartheid* régime. It could be said that the United Nations had not only failed to make progress in the question of *apartheid* but had actually retrogressed.
3. His delegation therefore proposed that all Member States should affirm their willingness to abide by the resolutions of the General Assembly and the principles of the Charter, which upheld the human rights of individuals and the dignity of the human race. Many countries which could have changed the situation in southern Africa had not implemented the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council and held them up as examples of the United Nations propensity to waste its time by passing ineffective resolutions. *Apartheid* had consistently been condemned by his own Government and by many other States of varying faiths and ideologies and, in the twenty-fifth anniversary year of the United Nations, it would be a fitting tribute to its principles if a beginning could be made towards the implementation of the many resolutions adopted. The situation in southern Africa not only affected the Africans, but weighed heavily on the conscience of human beings throughout the world and constituted a threat to good relations among States and to international peace in general.
4. Despite General Assembly resolution 2307 (XXII), which condemned the actions of the main trading partners of South Africa and the activities of the foreign financial and other interests which, through their political, economic and military collaboration, encouraged the Government of South Africa to persist in its racial policies, there had been a steady increase in the volume of trade with that country. The only way to maintain the astronomically high interest on those investments was through cheap labour. White workers in various South African industries were paid from four to ten times as much as African workers. Economic growth in South Africa had therefore produced little benefit for the Africans. Perhaps that country's trading partners were unaware of those facts. A study (A/AC.115/L.276)¹ prepared at the request of the Special Committee by a senior research officer at the Institute of Commonwealth Studies at Oxford University quoted statistics showing that South African trade with Western countries had grown considerably and that foreign liabilities in that country had increased by 65 per cent between 1956 and 1968. Such flagrant disregard by foreign investors for the provisions of General Assembly resolutions continued although it had been proved that peaceful change could most effectively be achieved through economic pressure, which the great Powers could and should apply if their call for peaceful change was to be taken seriously.
5. *Apartheid* was no less reprehensible than the worst forms of colonialism. The Government of South Africa had now extended its policy to Namibia. As the Prime Minister of Jamaica had said before the General Assembly at its commemorative session (1875th plenary meeting), *apartheid* in a territory for which the United Nations had responsibility was an international disgrace.
6. Mr. AMMAR (Tunisia) said that, although the question of *apartheid* had appeared on the agenda of the General Assembly for many years and despite the numerous reports written on the subject and the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council, the Government of South Africa was still defying the Organization and world conscience by denying the legitimate rights of the

¹ Mimeographed.

vast majority of the population. Helped by powerful and unscrupulous allies, it had continually increased its repressive measures, thus seriously threatening the future of the African continent, which so greatly needed a true and lasting peace in order to devote itself to the task of national reconstruction and general development. That sad reality, however, was an incentive to countries to increase their efforts to change that reality. The way would be long and difficult, but his country had learnt that strength was powerless against the will of peoples. The sufferings endured during a fight for liberation were very different from those of a subject people. The present discussion was therefore not mere routine but was vital to peace in the whole of southern Africa. The General Assembly had recognized that the policy of *apartheid* was not, as some countries stated, only the internal policy of a Member State but a real threat to international peace and security, the maintenance of which was, as President Bourguiba had said in his commemorative message addressed to the General Assembly (1874th plenary meeting), the essential task of the United Nations.

7. The South African Government's assertion that *apartheid* was a question of internal policy was similar to the French Government's former assertion that the Algerian fight for liberation was a mere "rebellion" and to the attitude of Portugal towards its overseas Territories. It was the duty of the United Nations to help subject peoples to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and human dignity, wherever they might be. So many men, women and children could not continue indefinitely to live in poverty and to be exploited by European racists. Strong in the defence of their legitimate rights, they would redouble their endeavours to obtain their freedom, the white racists would intensify their violence and would not hesitate to attack independent African territories, and there would eventually be war in southern Africa.

8. A few years before, the people of Palestine, who for over twenty years had been enduring the same suffering, as victims of Israeli imperialism and zionism, had apparently been resigned to stagnating in refugee camps, yet they were now a perfect example of a people resolved to fight to regain their dignity.

9. Mr. EILAN (Israel), speaking on a point of order, asked the Chairman if he considered the statement by the Tunisian representative appropriate to the current discussion. The Middle East question was being discussed in plenary session.

10. The CHAIRMAN requested the Tunisian representative to confine his remarks as much as possible to the subject under discussion.

11. Mr. AMMAR (Tunisia) explained that he was comparing the situation in South Africa with that elsewhere. He had referred to Algeria and other countries without meeting with any objection.

12. Continuing his statement, he said that the support of the people of Palestine was now essential to any action to re-establish peace in the Middle East. Like South Africa or Portugal, Israel did not merely attack centres of Palestinian resistance; it also attacked neighbouring Arab countries and

occupied territories belonging to sovereign Arab States Members of the United Nations.

13. Mr. EILAN (Israel), speaking on a point of order, regretted that the Tunisian representative had failed to heed the Chairman's request. His explanation was not valid because the subject of Algeria was not now being discussed in another forum, whereas that of the Middle East was being discussed by the General Assembly.

14. The CHAIRMAN said that it was sometimes difficult for representatives to refrain from quoting what they considered appropriate parallels. His aim was to conduct the work of the Committee in a flexible manner which, if all representatives co-operated, would certainly not be detrimental to its work. He once more appealed to the representative of Tunisia to confine his remarks as much as possible to the subject under discussion. The representative of Israel could avail himself of his right of reply at the end of the meeting, should he so desire.

15. Mr. AMMAR (Tunisia) said that he thought the representative of Israel was not so much speaking on point of order as trying to obstruct the work of the Committee.

16. Continuing his statement, he said that the United Nations resolutions concerning the re-establishment of peace in the Middle East had been of no more effect than the resolutions appealing to the Governments of South Africa and Portugal to act according to the principles of the Charter and to recognize the African peoples' rights to dignity and self-determination.

17. It was to be wondered how much longer the United Nations would tolerate such a situation. Permanent members of the Security Council were the first to encourage Governments such as those of South Africa and Portugal to continue to defy the Organization. Their economic and military co-operation had enabled South Africa to annex the international territory of Namibia. By their violation of the Security Council's arms embargo on the sale of arms to South Africa, they were harming the prestige of an organization of which they were founders and violating the Charter, signed in San Francisco twenty-five years before, which had aroused hopes of a new international order.

18. Tunisia remained strongly committed to the United Nations despite the Organization's inability to solve present-day problems which were seriously threatening world peace. The efficacy of any institution depended on the men which it served. The Organization's role in national liberation was only a necessary complement to the endeavours and sacrifices of peoples fighting for their independence. His country continued to believe that South Africa's partners might some day become more far-sighted and use their influence to persuade South Africa and Portugal that it was in their own interests that the African people might obtain independence through their help, rather than against their will. There were many examples of useful co-operation between ex-colonies and former colonizers.

19. His delegation approved the report (A/8022 and Add.1) of the Special Committee and hoped that the Government of South Africa would respond to the appeals made in it.

20. Mr. HELLE (Norway) said that the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations was the time for taking stock of past accomplishments and considering future policies. Little had so far been accomplished in the Organization's efforts to abolish *apartheid*, but it could not remain unmoved by the many personal tragedies which that policy was inflicting upon the non-white populations in South Africa. His delegation had unfortunately no patent solution to a situation which seemed to become ever more fraught with danger. The United Nations could not remain inactive, either on moral or on practical grounds. The policy of *apartheid* might pose a threat to peace and security in the area; it was a challenge to man's conscience and a clear violation of all the basic principles of an orderly and democratic society.

21. Although there was decreasing optimism about the effects of the resolutions adopted by the United Nations, they were important as the strongest verbal expression of the conscience of mankind. While some South Africans justified the policy of *apartheid*, many fair-minded people within the white South African community sincerely felt that it was wrong and should be ended as soon as possible. The purpose of the United Nations resolutions was to reach and support those people, as well as to influence the official policy of the country.

22. It had been suggested that, in accordance with Article 5 of the Charter, South Africa should be suspended from exercising its rights and privileges as a Member of the United Nations. Apart from any legal considerations, such a decision would cut off the channels of communication which might still influence the South African Government and people. It would also violate the principle of universality so strongly advocated in the current session of the General Assembly.

23. The report of the Special Committee stated that, in view of the rejection by the South African Government of the peaceful means advocated by the United Nations for an equitable settlement of the situation, the oppressed people of South Africa were now convinced that their inalienable rights and freedoms could be achieved only through armed struggle and underground activities. The United Nations could not be a party to violence and the use of armed force. The use of non-violent means might in the long run be more effective, and it should never be forgotten that peace-keeping was the primary task of the United Nations.

24. Many delegations had called for economic sanctions, but they could only be of use if they were compulsory and universally implemented. His delegation had spoken against General Assembly resolution 2506 B (XXIV) which contained provisions for limited sanctions, because resolutions containing such provisions with no binding force did not constitute practicable means of pressure, as called for in the Security Council's communiqué of 21 October 1970.² They might even reduce the moral and political weight of the other provisions in the resolution.

25. Close attention should be paid to chapter III, section F, of the Special Committee's report, which dealt

with dissemination of information. His delegation was in agreement with several of the suggestions made concerning new efforts to expose *apartheid* more effectively.

26. With regard to assistance to the oppressed people in South Africa, the Norwegian Government was contributing financially to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa as well as giving direct financial aid. It had an open mind with regard to various forms of assistance which were in conformity with the provisions of international law. All such activities, as elements in a concerted policy, might have an important bearing upon developments in South Africa.

27. Mr. MAROOFI (Afghanistan) said that during the silver jubilee of the United Nations, most delegations had expressed the hopes and aspirations manifested at its birth, one of which was to protect and secure the rights of peoples to freedom and self-determination. South Africa, one of the founders of the Organization, had paid only lip service to the principles of the Charter. Only through the elimination of all forms of discrimination could the rights of man, as proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, be achieved. The ideals of yesterday must become reality if the ultimate goal of the United Nations, namely peace and security with justice, were to be attained.

28. The South African Government had constantly intensified its *apartheid* policies, one of the most outrageous forms of discrimination, through arbitrary laws contrary to all recognized principles. The efforts of the United Nations to reach a peaceful solution to the problem of South Africa would not bear fruit unless all Member States, and in particular South Africa's main trading partners, most of which had always posed as champions of freedom and human rights, strictly observed the Organization's resolutions and decisions. The current state of affairs clearly could not last.

29. His delegation firmly believed that, after a quarter of a century of frustrating efforts, during which the world had helplessly witnessed the entrenchment of *apartheid* in South Africa, the time had come to embark on more practical and effective measures to eliminate that virulent form of racial discrimination, as recommended by the Special Committee. The constant efforts of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, in which the Special Committee had played an important part, had done much to increase the number of opponents of *apartheid* and were meeting with encouraging support from world public opinion. The United Nations must spare no effort to bring the evils of *apartheid* to the attention of the public, thus making 1971 a true International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. The Mexican representative's analysis of the means available within the Charter to achieve the aims and objectives of the United Nations would strengthen the determination of Member States to curtail the pitiless exploitation of the majority by the racial minority in South Africa. His delegation firmly believed that Member States should not lose faith in the efficacy of the Charter but should consolidate their efforts and employ useful and constructive measures to carry out their obligations. It therefore hoped that the Committee would give serious consideration to the suggestions put

² Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-fifth year, 1555th meeting.

forward by the Mexican representative (693rd and 701st meetings).

30. At the recent meeting at Lusaka, the non-aligned countries had reaffirmed in a resolution (see A/SPC/L.181) their dedication to restoring the rights and fundamental freedoms of the non-white and oppressed people in South Africa.

31. His delegation agreed with the Special Committee that unless Member States re-examined their policies in relation to the Government of South Africa and demonstrated by deeds their condemnation of *apartheid*, they would encourage the Pretoria Government in its policy of racial segregation and thus hamper the efforts of the United Nations to achieve freedom and self-determination for the non-white community in South Africa.

32. Mr. CACERES (Peru) said it was disappointing that after twenty-five years, despite a growing mountain of documents, the United Nations had not only failed to deal effectively with the problems of the *apartheid* system, but that system had been reinforced and extended to Namibia and Southern Rhodesia. *Apartheid* was the creation of man and could therefore be controlled and eliminated by its creator; yet the Organization was powerless to deal with the situation.

33. Since its foundation as a nation, his own country had come far along the path of racial equality. His Government publicly rejected the abhorrent practice of *apartheid*. Condemnation would be ineffective, however, unless accompanied by a manifestation of political will. In that connexion, his Government had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.182/Rev.1 concerning the arms embargo (resolution 2624 (XXV)). As a member of the Committee for the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the United Nations, it had supported the section of the final document which concerned *apartheid* and racial discrimination in the version proposed by the African group of countries. Since 1966 it had participated in the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts established under resolution 22 (XXIII) of the Commission on Human Rights. His Government's Minister for Foreign Affairs, as an observer at the Lusaka Conference of non-aligned countries, had condemned racial discrimination and had emphasized his country's support for decolonization.

34. His delegation would remain alert concerning the development of any future initiatives and would support those draft resolutions which might contribute most to the elimination of *apartheid*.

35. Mr. AMONOO (Ghana) said that, each time South Africa's policies of *apartheid* were discussed, nearly all delegations experienced mixed feelings of frustration, impotence, and even anger. While innocent persons were being segregated, arrested and detained without trial, some Member States were not only unwilling to lift a finger to correct the situation, but were even bolstering the monstrous and evil *apartheid* régime. His delegation was deeply disappointed that after many years and despite countless documents and resolutions the problem was becoming more and more intractable. In fact, in the parlance of the United Nations, the agenda item was now a perennial and insoluble problem.

36. He assured the Committee members that OAU would never rest until the inhuman and pernicious policies of *apartheid* had been eradicated. His own country was strongly and irrevocably opposed to *apartheid*. As a member of the Special Committee it was a regular contributor to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa. It supported the conclusions and recommendations made by the Special Committee in its report, and strongly commended them for action by the General Assembly and the specialized agencies.

37. Proposals for mandatory economic sanctions, suspension and the boycott of South Africa from the world community were worthy of support, provided they could be carried out. If history was any guide, however, those proposals would not be implemented because of the lack of political rule and because of the veto in the Security Council. What, then, should the General Assembly do?

38. The situation in South Africa was steadily worsening. The wife of Nelson Mandela and eighteen others freed by a court had recently been placed under restriction again. According to *The Times* of London, of 6 August 1970, during the period from mid-1968 to mid-1969, an average daily total of almost 88,000 prisoners could be found in South Africa's jails. Nearly 500,000 people—1 in 40 of the population—had been sentenced to imprisonment in that period. African prisoners had provided more than 95 per cent of them—a figure swollen by a vast number of convictions of Africans for technical offences concerning their passports. According to that newspaper, 187 babies had been born to imprisoned mothers, while 4,700 unweaned babies had been taken into prison with their mothers; 25,933 strokes had been administered to those sentenced to corporal punishment; there had been 340 deaths in prisons and 84 hangings. *The Times* ended by saying that South Africa was at the top of the world execution table: during the period under review, 166 persons had been condemned to death, 84 executed, 12 reprieved, 4 released on bail, 1 sent for retrial and 65 remained in custody. Those figures illustrated the story of man's inhumanity to man. Yet the so-called representative of South Africa had the audacity to proclaim to the General Assembly that the black and Coloured peoples in that country were very happy with their situation in the so-called self-governing states, based on separate development. All persons of goodwill would like to combat that crime against humanity with all available means, including armed struggle.

39. The Prime Minister of Ghana had stated on 21 October 1970, during the commemorative session of the General Assembly (1876th plenary meeting), that hitherto United Nations efforts had been half-hearted and ineffective. Sacrifices had been demanded which nations, both great and small, had not been prepared to make. It was because Member States had not cared enough that it had been possible for decisions of the Organization to be flouted. Yet the United Nations must have faith in itself and continue to maintain pressures both by word and by deed.

40. Was it not true that the major trading partners of South Africa carried on almost twice as much trade with the rest of Africa as with South Africa, including Namibia

and the so-called Portuguese Territories? Those trading partners could not be so short-sighted as not to see that they would alienate the majority of the African people, and that their true interests and even destiny lay in genuine friendship with Africa.

41. His delegation was encouraged somewhat by reports that France, after receiving the mission of President Kaunda dispatched by OAU and the non-aligned countries, had taken the first step of limiting the supply of arms to South Africa. He appealed to France to take further steps to impose a total ban on arms shipments, since his country did not recognize any distinction between arms for external defence and arms for internal suppression.

42. By contrast, his country was greatly perturbed that there had been no sign from the United Kingdom Government that it would reverse its reported intention to resume the sale of arms to South Africa. There was still time for the United Kingdom to heed the appeals made by the Kaunda mission, and by a number of Commonwealth Heads of Government, including the Prime Minister of Ghana—appeals which had the support of a very large number of people in the United Kingdom, including officials in the United Kingdom Foreign Office and Ministry of Defence. Already it was known that, from the military point of view, South Africa did not really need arms from outside. All Member States should, through diplomatic channels, continue to bring moral pressure to bear on the United Kingdom; his country was confident that if all nations, especially the friends of the United Kingdom, were to do so, the United Kingdom Government might change its mind. Similarly, irrespective of any resolutions that might be adopted, his delegation considered that massive and persistent diplomatic pressure should be brought to bear on all the major trading partners of South Africa to stop trading with that country and thereby make it almost impossible for the *apartheid* régime to survive. The Africans in South Africa were prepared to suffer, and even to die, to bring that injustice to an end.

43. He paid tribute to the heroic freedom fighters, whose efforts were supported by OAU and the United Nations and which had been blessed by the Pope, and reaffirmed his Government's determination to give moral and material support to the liberation movement in southern Africa.

44. Finally, he wished to comment on protests made by the Federal Republic of Germany and by the Argentine delegation—in connexion with the statement by the representative of Ghana at the 1546th meeting of the Security Council, held on 20 July 1970—that his country had misrepresented the facts regarding the sale of arms to, and military co-operation with, South Africa. It was puzzling that those Governments had taken so long to protest. The information had been obtained from the United Nations, OAU and other sources, and it was interesting to note that both the Special Committee and OAU still maintained their position on that matter. Those countries should show by actual deeds that they were really against *apartheid* in South Africa.

45. Mr. MARSCHIK (Austria) said that it was a source of disappointment, regret and very real concern that, despite scores of General Assembly and Security Council resolu-

tions over more than two decades condemning *apartheid* and exhorting the South African Government to abandon racial discrimination, that Government had thus far shown no inclination to change its policies. In the face of increasing frustration, it might be wondered whether there was really any value in the annual repetition of statements which produced no tangible results. Nevertheless, his Government hoped that the value lay in continually confronting South Africa with an unequivocal expression of the world community's firm determination never to acquiesce in a doctrine based on inequality and disrespect for the most fundamental human rights and the value of the human personality. His Government had always rejected all policies based on doctrines of discrimination on grounds of race, colour, sex or religion, and wished to reaffirm that position. Furthermore it believed that the United Nations could add weight to the many appeals addressed to the South African Government by effective and practical peaceful means. In that connexion, his Government saw value in a number of constructive steps already taken and implemented. It had faithfully observed the arms embargo imposed in 1963 by the Security Council (resolution 182 (1963)) and had supported draft resolution A/SPC/L.182/Rev.1 (resolution 2624 (XXV)), whereby the General Assembly called on all States to implement fully Council resolution 282 (1970) concerning the embargo.

46. *Apartheid* was a fundamental political, social and philosophical concept, the modification and elimination of which would require basic changes in the moral, philosophical and political attitude of the opponents of *apartheid*, as well as acute awareness on the part of the international community of all aspects of the problem. His Government attached importance to the widest possible dissemination by the United Nations of information on *apartheid*.

47. It also supported the programme of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, established in 1965 by virtue of General Assembly resolution 2054 B (XX). As members already knew, his Government had contributed to the Fund during the past years and intended to make a further contribution in 1971. The establishment of the Fund had been a constructive and humanitarian step.

48. There was no doubt that in South Africa equality and justice would eventually prevail. It was only on the basis of those principles that the people of South Africa, working together as equal citizens, would be able to work out for themselves the institutions and the system of Government under which they, by general consent, would live and work together to build a harmonious society. In that connexion, the United Nations would have the responsibility of constantly confronting South Africa with the universal rejection of *apartheid* by the world community, of convincing that Government of the moral wrongfulness of such a doctrine and of assisting by peaceful means in persuading it to change its policy. To that end, his delegation pledged its firm and continuous support.

Mr. Hierro Gambardella (Uruguay), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

49. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary) said that the resolutions passed year after year by United Nations bodies, which gave

expression to the profound indignation aroused by the wanton policy of the racist régime of South Africa, were intended to make the fundamental principles of modern international law and of the United Nations Charter prevail against the blind racial prejudices, the unscrupulous exploitation of the non-white population and the oppressive and arbitrary policies of South Africa. Although the South African Government, in signing the Charter, had thereby assumed the obligations arising from it, during the 25-year history of the United Nations it had violated provisions laid down in the second preambular paragraph of the Charter, in Article 1, paragraphs 2 and 3, in Article 55c, and in Article 56, as well as various provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenants on Human Rights and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. Despite all those measures, the situation was deteriorating from year to year.

50. Recalling that the United Nations had been born in the struggle against fascism and nazism and was designed to prevent those inhuman political systems from reviving in the future, he would read out the following statement, quoted by the *News from South Africa*, in its No. 17, of 29 April 1970, which had been made by the South African Prime Minister Vorster and which appeared to be an open challenge to the world:

“We stand for Christian Nationalism, which is an ally of Nazism. You can call this anti-democratic principle dictatorship if you wish. In Italy it is called Fascism, in West Germany National Socialism, and in South Africa Christian Nationalism.”

51. While claiming to “save” the indigenous and Coloured population by spreading “civilization and enlightenment”, the Pretoria régime transformed South Africa into a police State, enacted repressive legislative measures one after another and resorted to illegal arrest and the massacre of progressive elements fighting to improve their lives. In addition to the notorious repressive measures so often referred to by members of the Committee, South Africa issued further measures every year and amended the existing legislation to suit the interests of the policies of *apartheid*. For example, during the fourth session of the Third Parliament of the Republic of South Africa, held from 31 January to 20 June 1969, some 129 bills had been submitted, of which 106 had been signed into law, further curtailing the rights of the Coloured and indigenous population. One such legislative measure was the General Law Amendment Act (No. 101, 1969), concerning the Bureau of State Security, which authorized the Prime Minister or his nominee or any cabinet minister to prohibit the giving of any evidence or the production of any documents to any court or any statutory body if the document or evidence was, in their opinion, prejudicial to the interests of the State or public security. The Act was clearly intended to sanction illegal arrests and trials; since material evidence could be regarded as top secret, anyone could be wantonly arrested, convicted and even executed in the absence of any proof.

52. The way in which the principles of equal rights and equal economic opportunity were violated in South Africa was evident in figures prepared by the South African

Institute of Race Relations, which showed that average monthly earnings in the mining industry were 297 rands for white workers and 18 rands for indigenous workers, while white workers in the building industry earned 282 rands, as opposed to 45 rands for indigenous workers, during the period 1968-1969. Owing to such officially recognized discrepancies between the monthly wages of white and non-white workers, the latter had difficulty in securing the barest necessities for their families.

53. Such continuous violations of human rights at the level of official state policy were a disgrace to all mankind and should be considered a crime against humanity. The Government of South Africa should break with its arrogant attitude and, in compliance with Article 56 of the United Nations Charter, should eliminate racial discrimination and respect fundamental human rights. Of course, the violation of human rights was not an end in itself, nor was it a philosophical or legal issue in the view of the Pretoria régime. Rather, it served to strengthen the methods of colonialism and neo-colonialism and to increase the profits of the ruling white population and of the capitalist Powers which supported it.

54. It was common knowledge that South Africa was unique in the world system of capitalism and imperialism for its almost unlimited natural resources, particularly mineral resources, and cheap labour exercised a magnetic attraction on imperialist Powers. The fabulous profits derived from over \$7,000 million in foreign capital invested in South Africa explained why such countries as the United Kingdom, the United States of America, the Federal Republic of Germany and Japan clung so tenaciously and so desperately to that country. That was why, despite the trade embargo confirmed by General Assembly resolution 2547 B (XXIV), the United Kingdom's trade with the Pretoria régime had shown a new upward trend since 1969, particularly where imports of non-ferrous metals were concerned. That was also why the United States encouraged its private firms to invest capital in South Africa. Business enterprises in certain Western countries, disregarding the interests of international peace and security, were now going so far as to furnish the Pretoria régime with nuclear installations. That South Africa was converting its nuclear power plants from peaceful uses to war production was confirmed in an article published in the September 1970 issue of the *Anti-Apartheid News*, in which it was stated that:

“The South African Government is to invest nearly £30 million in a new plant. Plant of the size contemplated should enable South Africa to produce a very large quantity of high-power uranium bombs. The quantity should be more than sufficient to destroy completely every city and every major town in Africa south of the Sahara several times over, and the production of enriched uranium by South Africa thus endangers the existence of every African State.”

55. The Dutch colonizers of South Africa had become aware of the strategic importance of the Cape of Good Hope as early as 1651, using it as a port of call for vessels shipping merchandise and slaves in the service of the Dutch East India Company and other companies. The modern colonialists now planned to use the Cape and other naval

stations as principal bases of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the South-East Asia Treaty Organization, with the full consent of the Pretoria régime, for the execution of their plans against international peace and security. In the United Kingdom, a Member of Parliament and defence spokesman for the Conservative Party had stated in 1969 that his country would join with South Africa in playing its full part in the strategic defence of the Cape route and of the South Atlantic and Indian Oceans, not only in its own interests but in those of NATO and the whole free world. Meanwhile, South Africa was receiving submarines and Mirage aircraft from France and troop carriers of the type Hercules C-130 and missiles from the United States. Certain Western Powers were clearly acting in concert to thwart the enforcement of the arms embargo provided for in Security Council resolution 282 (1970) and General Assembly resolution 2624 (XXV).

56. The activities and policy measures of the Vorster régime, especially the events of the ten years following the Sharpeville massacre, bore witness to political efforts to maintain the régime by force and to promote the economic and strategic interests of the former colonial Powers, the leading neo-colonialist Western Powers of today. South Africa, by reason of its social system and its dependence upon the Western Powers, was well-placed to be used against the progressive African countries and the growing independence movements. That fundamental political objective had given rise to efforts to extend the policies of *apartheid* beyond the frontiers of the Republic of South Africa, as could be seen in Southern Rhodesia, Angola, Namibia and Mozambique.

57. As a member of the Special Committee, his country not only sympathized with, but also felt responsible for the black and other non-white peoples of the African continent. His delegation resolutely condemned racial discrimination and was always ready to take an active part in any United Nations activity aimed at the suppression of the policies of *apartheid*. It agreed with the report of the Special Committee and with its recommendations for the adoption of urgent and effective measures.

58. His delegation was convinced that the Pretoria régime in itself would be unable to enforce its policies of *apartheid*. In that connexion, he recalled statements made before the Special Committee in March 1970 by Mr. Dennis Brutus, cited in issue No. 7/70 of *Notes and documents*,³ to the effect that the strength of the *apartheid* régime was derived from sources outside South Africa and that the régime could be brought down by internal pressure if it were not for the United Kingdom, the United States of America, Japan, France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

59. Considering that the policy of *apartheid* resulted in the cruel oppression of the population of South Africa, and that its extension to other parts of southern Africa and its conflict with the national liberation movements, as well as the large-scale armament programme of the racist Government of the white minority of South Africa, gravely endangered international peace and security, his Govern-

ment agreed with the proposals for the application of the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter; it considered it the duty of the United Nations to keep alive the conscience of mankind, not by means of administrative and bureaucratic measures, but through concerted action by Member States and deemed it necessary that the Powers supporting the South African Government should be reminded again and emphatically of their duty to comply with the anti-*apartheid* resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Moreover, his Government felt that it was appropriate, by virtue of Article 5 of the Charter, to begin serious and positive consideration of the proposals for the probationary suspension of the membership rights of the Republic of South Africa and proposed that, while consideration should be given to humanitarian measures, the main efforts should be concentrated on the promotion of the independence movement of the South African peoples and of their struggle against the white racist terror.

60. Mr. EILAN (Israel), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that the representative of Tunisia, like previous speakers from Arab countries, had grossly misused a procedural opportunity for propaganda purposes. Such callous misuse of the debate, as many distinguished speakers had noted during the general debate in the General Assembly, was largely responsible for the shortcomings of the United Nations. The Tunisian representative had reverted to statements by other Arab speakers in the forlorn hope of convincing some additional representatives of the truth of his misrepresentations of past and present history. The assumption of such gullibility on the part of members was an insult to the Committee's intelligence. Like other Israeli representatives on so many occasions, he was obliged to set the record straight. *Apartheid* was a policy of racial discrimination and oppression. However, no ethnic differences existed between Jews and Arabs. In Israel one often saw fair-skinned Palestinian Arabs side by side with dark-skinned Jewish refugees from Arab repression. The only truly dark-skinned Arabs in Israel were descended from African slaves brought to the Middle East by generations of Arab slave-traders. The Arab-Israeli conflict was not racial but political in nature and had no bearing on the problems under consideration.

61. He invited representatives to come to Israel to inspect the situation for themselves, as 30,000 tourists from the Arab world had done the previous summer. If the Tunisian representative was genuinely concerned over the fate of the Palestinian Arabs, he should direct his words of censure to his sister country, Jordan, where many more Palestinians had been killed by Arab bullets than had died in the six-day war.

62. Mr. NAVEIRO de la SERNA (Argentina), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, recalled the allegations made by the representative of Ghana to the effect that a South Atlantic Treaty had recently been concluded and pointed out that the existence of any such pact had already been denied by his Government on a number of occasions. In the view of his delegation, such allegations contributed nothing to the debate and tended to question the propriety of the attitude his country had always taken on the subject of *apartheid*. He pointed out that that attitude had been sufficiently clarified in a letter of June 1969 addressed to the Chairman of the Special Committee by his country's

³ Published by the Unit on *Apartheid*.

Permanent Mission to the United Nations (A/AC.115/L.2584).

63. Mr. AMMAR (Tunisia), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that Israeli representatives often referred to statements by Arab speakers in the United Nations as propaganda. Allegations of that nature were false and impressed few delegations. Many delegations, and not merely those of Arab States, often referred to the question of Palestine to clarify their ideas. One of the main tasks of the United Nations was to deal with political problems, including difficulties arising from violations of the Charter, and violations by Israel in particular; thus, it was wrong to state that the shortcomings of the United Nations arose out of references to political problems. Indeed, no one was duped by the arguments advanced by the representative of Israel. The question of the Middle East was currently being debated in the General Assembly, and it was only natural to refer, in the Special Political Committee, to political problems which offered parallels with the problem of *apartheid*. The Palestinian people, as the victims of an unjust policy, had resisted and organized themselves into a force to be reckoned with; indeed, injustice was the underlying cause of the conflict in the Middle East.

64. The Israeli representative had said that *apartheid* was defined by colour. His delegation, on the other hand, contended that injustice could also be attributed to colonialist oppression, as in South Africa, where the colonists resorted to unjust and brutal legislation to retain their special privileges. The comparison was an apt one when it was remembered that the Palestinian people had been driven from their land by colonists who did everything in their power to ensure that they would not return from their isolated camps. Evidently, what was needed was a broader definition of *apartheid* than the near-sighted one advanced by the representative of Israel. The problem of the Middle East was a political one, and it was perfectly appropriate to refer to it in the Committee. As for the question of discrimination in Jordan, it was entirely outside the framework of the Committee's debate.

65. Mr. KHALAF (Iraq), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that the representative of Israel was attempting to give African delegations the impression that Arab delegations were using the question of *apartheid* to promote their own views on the problem of the Palestinian refugees and the rights of the Palestinian people. For his part, he had stated that the Arab delegations considered that there was only one question at issue, namely the struggle of the peoples of the world against *apartheid*, discrimination and oppression. Only when all oppressed peoples became united in their struggle would they be able to obtain their just rights throughout the world. The representative of Uganda had made that point very clear in his statement at the preceding meeting. The peoples of Africa and the Arab world were indeed united in their struggle for human rights.

66. In view of Israel's most recent vote on the question of *apartheid* in the General Assembly, it was strange that the Israeli representative was attempting to make the question a humanitarian rather than a political one. It was also strange

that he should extend an invitation to members of the Committee when it was well known that his Government had refused to admit a committee composed of representatives of Ceylon, Yugoslavia and Somalia sent to Israel by the General Assembly. The large numbers of tourists of whom the Israeli representative had spoken had most likely been Americans. According to an article which had appeared in *The New York Times* of 11 October 1970, the International Committee of Red Cross Societies had stated that months had passed before Israel had allowed its representatives into the occupied territories to observe the repression of the Palestinian people. The International Committee had gone on to say that, according to its observers, Israel was violating the Geneva Conventions.

67. If the Israeli representative wished to bring up the question of the slave trade, he should be reminded that Israel's ally, the United States of America, had been the recipient of African slaves and now continued to ignore the suffering and poverty of their 50 million descendants while sending huge quantities of military supplies to Israel. The Israeli representative had raised the question of Jordan only because of his pleasure at the shedding of Arab blood; the Committee was not the proper forum for the discussion of such matters.

68. Mr. TEYMOUR (United Arab Republic) said that he would not repeat what the representative of Iraq had said about the United Nations committee which had been barred from going to Israel to inquire about the treatment imposed on the Arab people living there under Israeli occupation, but would confine himself to pointing out that the Committee was constantly hearing the representative of Israel speaking about Arab propaganda in the Committee. As he had pointed out previously, the similarity between what was happening in South Africa and what was happening in Israel to the Arabs was very close indeed. When the representative of Israel had taken the floor, he had expected him to say kind words about *apartheid*, but it seemed that *apartheid* was so dear to the Israelis that they did not dare to speak about it or condemn it, because they themselves were practising it.

69. Moreover, according to the report of the Special Committee Israel still had representation in South Africa, which proved the link between the two régimes, both of them racist.

70. He would like to point out to his African colleagues that the liberation movements had in fact condemned Israel for its aggression against the United Arab Republic, some of the territory of which was still occupied by Israel.

71. He wished to quote the following passage from the South African newspaper *Die Transvaler* for the benefit of the Israelis who denied that there was any similarity between what was happening in South Africa and what was happening in Israel:

"Is there any real difference between the way the people of Israel are trying to maintain themselves amid non-Jewish people and the way the Afrikaner is trying to remain what he is? The people of Israel base themselves upon the Old Testament to explain why they do not wish to mix with other people: the Afrikaner does this too."

⁴ Mimeographed.

Mr. Verwoerd himself had said:

“People are beginning to ask why, if Israel and its rabbis feel impelled to attack the policy of separate development in South Africa, the policy of separate development in Israel is not wrong in their eyes as well . . . It may not be said that they wish to differentiate in separate States because of religious and not racial differences, because if differentiation is wrong on one score it is also wrong on another.”

That was what he wished to cite regarding the similarity between the two racist régimes.

72. A French Zionist writer, Mr. Paul Giniewski, in his book *The Two Faces of Apartheid*, had drawn numerous parallels between zionism and *apartheid*, which he describes as “Bantu zionism”.

73. Since previous statements by his delegation had been subjected to misinterpretation in the records, he requested that the statement he had just made should be incorporated *in extenso* in the summary record.

It was so decided.

74. Mr. EILAN (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the sincerity of statements by Arab representatives on the question of *apartheid* could best be judged by considering the situation in Iraq, a country which took pride in conducting public hangings.

75. Mr. KHALAF (Iraq), speaking on a point of order, said that, while the questions of *apartheid* and of the Palestinian refugees both appeared on the Committee’s agenda, there was no question before the Committee which related to Iraq. If the representative of Israel wished to speak on topics which were not under consideration by the Committee, the Chairman should rule him out of order.

76. The acting CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee’s titular Chairman had previously requested representatives to comply with the rules of procedure, while stating that he would endeavour not to restrict their freedom of expres-

sion. He appealed to representatives to limit themselves to the strict terms of the debate.

77. Mr. EILAN (Israel) said that his delegation would conduct itself as the representative of Tunisia had done when he had been requested to remain within the terms of the question under consideration. The rules of procedure must apply equally to all delegations.

78. Mr. BENHADID (Algeria), speaking on a point of order, said that, as the representative of Iraq had stated, the treatment of Arabs living under Israeli occupation was under consideration in the United Nations. However, there was no reason why representatives should be permitted to refer to the internal affairs of States. He requested the Chairman to ensure that the representative of Israel remained within the terms of the rules of procedure.

79. Mr. EILAN (Israel) said that his delegation preferred not to interrupt Arab representatives as they did him. He merely wished to state that only in such venues as the Committee was the numerical preponderance of the Arabs of any consequence.

80. Mr. PAL (Pakistan) said that remarks by the Israeli representative referring to a lack of even-handedness on the part of the Chair should be deleted from the record. The situation in the Middle East involved questions of human rights and was of great importance to all delegations. The problems of southern Africa, South-East Asia and the Middle East were all products of colonialism and imperialism, which should be exposed to all delegations and energetically condemned. The parallels which existed between those problems must also be made clear and therefore the statements made by the representatives of Iraq, Tunisia and the United Arab Republic were relevant to the current debate.

81. Mr. EILAN (Israel) said that at no time had he intended to imply any lack of impartiality on the part of the Chair.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.