



CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 34:</i>	
<i>The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa: report of the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued)</i>	245

Chairman: Mr. Max JAKOBSON (Finland).

AGENDA ITEM 34

The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa: report of the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued) (A/6356, A/6412, A/6486, A/6494, A/SPC/L115, A/SPC/L.135 and Add.1, A/SPC/L.136)

1. Mr. DE CARVALHO SILOS (Brazil) said that the experience of his country, where all races were equal and mingled freely and harmoniously, showed that racial harmony must derive from a whole philosophy of life and not merely from a political act or an administrative decision. In most cases, racial discrimination sprang from political, economic, social or even religious causes and was transformed into a particular cultural pattern. Often, even after the disappearance of the original causes, the cultural pattern survived and could be destroyed only by a lengthy process of education. Realizing that racial discrimination was a social cancer, many countries were making gallant efforts to abolish it.

2. Unfortunately South Africa was doing just the opposite; apartheid was the official doctrine and the whole apparatus of government was used to promote and practise racial discrimination. His delegation did not agree that the United Nations had achieved nothing in its efforts to put an end to the policy of apartheid. A number of measures adopted by the Organization were cogent testimony to its condemnation of that policy and—perhaps even more important—the opinion and conscience of the world had been mobilized. The recent seminar on apartheid held at Brasilia in August and September 1966 was a magnificent example of that mobilization. Brazil was confident that efforts to eliminate apartheid from the minds and hearts of men would be successful.

Mr. Goñi Demarchi (Argentina), Rapporteur, took the Chair.

3. Mr. DIOUF (Senegal) recalled that in proclaiming its independence, Senegal had also proclaimed its devotion to fundamental rights, as defined in the Declaration

of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen of 1789 and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 10 December 1948. It had also proclaimed inviolable respect for political freedoms, trade union freedoms, the rights and freedoms of the human person, the family and the local community, philosophical and religious freedoms, the right to private and collective property, and economic and social rights. Those rights, which were the very basis of modern society, were granted to their citizens by all States Members of the United Nations, with the exception of the Republic of South Africa. Thus the United Nations, which had originally been intended to be a harmonious symbiosis of universal values, was becoming an aggregate of different interests.

4. Twenty years of debate had revealed clearly the nature of the racist creed of the South African Government, and the time had come to cease sterile discussion and evolve a new and more realistic approach to the problem. The evil of apartheid was spreading and threatened to engulf all coloured peoples and all whom the members of the "master race" did not consider as their equals. Hitler's dream would come true, in a world with too short a memory. Collective action should therefore be taken by all the Members of the Organization, for its very existence would be threatened if the situation in southern Africa was allowed to continue. If the United Nations failed to act, it would be disappointing 3,000 million people and would leave to posterity only the ruins of a world which had, nevertheless, been striving to achieve a universal civilization.

5. Nostalgic for a bygone era, the white leaders of South Africa were stifling the national conscience which had awakened in all the countries that had suffered under the colonial yoke and trying to recreate the colonial system in a disguised form. The South African Prime Minister had stated that, although there were some coloured representatives in the South African Parliament, in fact only Whites should be seated there. Such a statement on the part of the leader of a Member State was a serious affront to the United Nations.

6. The numerous resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council had not succeeded in making the Pretoria régime change its policy. Efforts had so far been limited to a battle of words, and the true offensive had not yet been launched. It was sometimes argued that Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter, concerning intervention in matters within the domestic jurisdiction of any State, prevented the United Nations from considering the policies of the South African Government. The argument was unfounded, however, and the Organization had been considering the question for the past twenty years. It

was also said that the General Assembly decisions that the situation in South Africa constituted a serious threat to peace had no binding force under the Charter and that it was the responsibility of the Security Council to decide whether a threat to peace existed and what measures should be taken by the Organization and its Members. While that argument established a dangerous dichotomy between the two United Nations organs, it did indicate that the problem of apartheid should be considered in the context of a threat to international peace and security and should be referred to the Security Council. In its resolution adopted as long ago as 1 April 1960 (134 (1960)), the Council had recognized that the situation in South Africa had led to international friction and if continued might endanger international peace and security. Later, in its resolution of 7 August 1963 (181 (1963)), it had expressed its conviction that the situation in South Africa was "seriously disturbing international peace and security". The time seemed to be drawing near when the Security Council would envisage action under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. In view of the aggravation of the situation and its repercussions on international relations, it seemed difficult for the Council not to decide that a threat to international peace and security existed. It was to be hoped that the big Powers would seize that occasion to strengthen their co-operation with the countries of the "third world" and to prove that it really was in the United Nations that the world of tomorrow would be built. The victory over apartheid should be one of the great designs of the second half of the twentieth century.

7. Mr. TELIALOV (Bulgaria) noted that there was increasingly energetic and widespread condemnation of apartheid—that detestable creature of imperialism and colonialism—as a crime against humanity and a direct threat to the independent African States as well as to international peace and security. Yet, despite that condemnation and the efforts of the United Nations, the racist régime in South Africa not only continued to pursue its policy of apartheid but had actually intensified its inhuman measures of oppression and was strengthening its economic and military position. South Africa's defiance of the United Nations and world public opinion was a source of increasing concern to the Organization and to all peace-loving peoples. Concern about the whole situation in the area had recently been expressed in a resolution adopted at the third session of the Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held at Addis Ababa in November 1966. Faced with the arrogance and brutality of the Pretoria racists, the United Nations and peace-loving peoples should redouble their efforts to eradicate apartheid.

8. The Government of the Republic of South Africa would continue to ignore the decisions of the United Nations and the just demands of the international community so long as it could rely on the political and economic support of the United States, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany and their allies. South Africa's trading partners were evading the Security Council ban on supplies of arms to the Republic by investing capital in the production of armaments within the country. South Africa already possessed the most modern weapons and, with the

co-operation of its NATO protectors, was continually increasing and perfecting its war equipment. South Africa had increased its trade with all its major partners, including the United States, the United Kingdom, Japan, Italy and the Federal Republic of Germany. The attitude of the latter country was in sharp contrast to that of the German Democratic Republic, which had no relations with South Africa, vigorously condemned apartheid and supported all the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on that subject.

9. In violation of General Assembly resolution 2054 A (XX), some specialized agencies were helping to strengthen the South African economy. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development had made eleven loans to South Africa. The General Assembly should urge the Bank to heed its appeals to the specialized agencies not to render any assistance to South Africa and Portugal.

10. Apartheid had now crossed the frontiers of South Africa. Without the encouragement and assistance of the South African Government, it would have been more difficult for Ian Smith's illegal régime to come into existence and prosper in Rhodesia. South Africa was the leading member of the unholy alliance which united South Africa, Portugal and Southern Rhodesia and which derived its force from the assistance of the Western Powers and foreign monopolies.

11. Some Western Powers tried to prevent the Security Council from ordering mandatory sanctions against South Africa and had refused to become members of the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa. The Bulgarian delegation considered that action should be taken under Chapter VII of the Charter, with the full co-operation of all the permanent members of the Security Council and the major trading partners of South Africa. The Security Council should without delay adopt a binding decision on the unconditional application of sanctions against South Africa. His delegation supported draft resolution A/SPC/L.135 and Add.1. It also thought that the activities of the Special Committee should continue.

Mr. Jakobson (Finland) resumed the Chair.

12. Mr. KILLION (United States of America) said that the facts of the situation inside South Africa were known to all. They were recorded in United Nations debates, in reports of the Special Committee, in the world press; they had been examined at the Brasilia seminar on apartheid and in recent hearings conducted by the United States Congress. The increasingly stringent measures of discrimination and suppression adopted by South Africa were a violation of the obligations it had assumed under the United Nations Charter. The United States had hoped that the events of Sharpeville in 1960 would have alerted the South African Government and people—as they had alerted the world—to the disastrous course South Africa was following. In August 1963, the United States representative had expressed the hope in the 1052nd meeting of the Security Council that the embargo on supplies of arms and military equipment to South Africa would make the Pretoria Government reassess its attitude, in view of the growing international concern at its failure to heed the numerous appeals of Member

States. The United States had hoped that the cessation of supplies of arms and military equipment might contribute to a peaceful solution and avoid any measures which might contribute directly to friction in southern Africa. Instead, it had witnessed the further extension of the legislation and practices largely responsible for the tension in the area and the continuation of the supply of arms to South Africa—not by the United States but by other countries.

13. There was thus every reason for the United Nations to make the question of apartheid one of its major and continuing concerns. At stake was the welfare, dignity and political freedom of all Africans, white and black, inside and outside South Africa. So long as South Africa continued on its perilous course, there would be no peace and freedom in the world and not enough time to devote to the problems of development. Almost all the Governments represented in the Committee were unalterably opposed to the policy of apartheid. The question was what effective action they could take, either unilaterally or through the United Nations, to persuade South Africa to abandon its policy and ensure for all South Africans equal rights to full participation in all aspects of the life of their country.

14. The United States Government had emphatically stated its opposition to and abhorrence of the actions and policies of the South African Government with respect to apartheid. The Government and citizens of the United States were devoting considerable time and attention to the problem. In its contacts with the South African Government and people, it had repeatedly expressed the view that the Government of the Republic of South Africa should in its own interest abandon apartheid. In addition, it had enforced a rigorous embargo on the sale to South Africa of arms, ammunition, military equipment and equipment for their maintenance and manufacture. That had been implicitly acknowledged in the statement made at the beginning of the debate on that agenda item by the Chairman of the Special Committee (530th meeting). The extent of the enforcement of that embargo was indicated in the report of the Special Committee (see A/6486, annex II, paras. 250 and 254). The United States delegation had expressed concern that, despite the Security Council resolutions of August and December 1963, South Africa continued to receive substantial quantities of modern and sophisticated weapons.

15. Many Member States held the view, expressed in draft resolution A/SPC/L.135 and Add.1, that a strong programme of economic sanctions was the only peaceful way of avoiding disaster. Others, including the United States, had expressed strong reservations about the wisdom and legality of the application of economic sanctions against South Africa in the existing circumstances. The possibilities for a peaceful solution of the problem had not yet been exhausted, and efforts should not be channelled into an unhelpful repetition of simplistic solutions. The United States continued to reject the conclusion that there was no alternative to the present collision course towards disaster in South Africa. Its affirmative vote on the embargo of oil supplies to Southern Rhodesia, and its support of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) on the question of South West Africa and acceptance of membership on the Ad Hoc Committee for South West Africa were

illustrations of its willingness to join in effective and appropriate action within the terms of the Charter to ensure observance of the obligations assumed by all Member States. His delegation expected to make the same careful decisions in the current Security Council debate on the question of Southern Rhodesia. It could do no less on the question of apartheid.

16. Mr. DIACONESCU (Romania) said that the policy of apartheid was a challenge to the human conscience and a cynical violation of the principles of international law and of the United Nations Charter, endangering peace and security not only in Africa but all over the world. It amounted to an attempt to perpetuate slavery by racial practices of segregation, and was an outrage against human dignity and a violation of fundamental human rights and freedoms. It represented a threat to the equality of rights of all men and all peoples. The existence of apartheid was also a serious obstacle to the attainment of the goals of the United Nations.

17. The reports submitted by the Special Committee, the statements made by various delegations and the testimony provided by the representatives of the oppressed population of South Africa over the years had built up a comprehensive picture of the true situation in that country and provided convincing proof of the atrocities committed by the South African racists, with the help of their police apparatus and barbarous legislation. The racist Government of South Africa had simply ignored the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council and had actually intensified its discrimination and oppression against the coloured population.

18. South Africa's contempt for the resolutions of the United Nations was not unrelated to the unilateral interests of certain Western Powers in that country. Under various pretexts and in various ways, those Powers were violating the United Nations resolutions calling for economic sanctions against South Africa and were maintaining normal trade relations with the Pretoria régime. More than four fifths of South Africa's foreign trade was with those Powers. Such economic co-operation was intensifying the inhuman exploitation of the cheap manpower supplied by the indigenous population of South Africa and the interest of those Powers in maintaining apartheid encouraged the régime in its pursuit of that policy, to the benefit of the South African leaders and the foreign monopolies. A particularly serious aspect was the military assistance extended to South Africa and the investments of capital in that country. If the States concerned really wanted to end the racist situation in South Africa, as they claimed in their official statements, they should bring their policies into line with those statements and with the resolutions adopted by the United Nations.

19. The Special Committee had produced a most valuable report, which had re-emphasized the need for the United Nations to adopt effective measures. It was regrettable that the membership of the Special Committee had not been enlarged in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2054 A (XX).

20. The South African Government was continuing to violate the political freedoms and elementary rights of the coloured population and to effect forced transfers

of that population into native reserves. There were still restrictions on freedom of movement and discrimination with regard to employment, wages and representation in the Parliament and in local organs. At the same time, South Africa was strengthening its ties with Southern Rhodesia, Angola and Mozambique; the secret agreements concluded with the consent of certain Western Powers, which were interested in preserving a racist and colonialist fortress in South Africa, evoked legitimate concern.

21. The Romanian delegation was deeply concerned about the danger which apartheid represented to international peace and security. If the United Nations remained powerless to solve that problem, its authority and prestige would be undermined and the cause of international peace and security would be jeopardized. The Organization should therefore enforce the economic sanctions and the other measures it had recommended. The Romanian delegation endorsed the conclusions and recommendations of the Special Committee and would continue to support any action designed to achieve a rapid solution of the problem of apartheid.

22. Mr. MATTHEWS (Botswana) said that apartheid was naturally a matter of great concern to Botswana, which as a neighbour of South Africa was obliged to maintain close relations with that country. Many Batswana lived and worked in South Africa and his country had offered asylum to numerous South African refugees, whose absorption created economic and other problems. Nevertheless, his Government's attitude towards apartheid had always been stated clearly: President Sir Seretse Khama had repeatedly emphasized that while Botswana was prepared to maintain friendly relations with all its neighbours, including South Africa, it intended to build a non-racial society within its own frontiers. His Government would not tolerate within its own territory a policy under which the political, social and economic rights of individuals or groups were determined by colour or ethnic origin, for such a policy was unsound both in theory and in practice and could never produce the peace and harmony essential to progress. Botswana therefore condemned the policy of apartheid pursued by the South African Government.

23. It would, however, be idle to underestimate the depth of conviction with which that policy was espoused by responsible circles in South Africa, or the determination of white South Africans to maintain the status quo, in defiance of world public opinion. Repeated threats and appeals by the United Nations had gone unheeded and apartheid was, indeed, going from strength to strength, for those who benefited from it, both inside and outside South Africa, saw no reason to change their ways. More effective steps must be taken if progress was to be made, and it was to be hoped that the international conference proposed in draft resolution A/SPC/L.135 and Add.1 would suggest realistic solutions.

24. For over thirty years he himself had been engaged in the struggle of the South African people and had borne his share of their suffering and humiliation. Nevertheless he did not intend to dwell on the demerits of apartheid, which had already been graphically described by previous speakers; he wished rather to emphasize a humanitarian aspect of the problem,

namely the need to assist apartheid's victims, both inside and outside South Africa. He thanked those Member States which had already contributed to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and the educational and training programme for South Africans established by the United Nations, and expressed the hope that they would continue to contribute and that other States would join them. Such contributions brought hope to those who were struggling for a better future for themselves and for their people, and his delegation therefore fully supported draft resolution A/SPC/L.136.

25. Another matter to which he wished to draw attention was the need to help the young people being trained under the United Nations educational and training programme. They could not return to South Africa, and it was to be hoped that upon completion of their studies the African countries would generously provide them with employment and settlement opportunities. The question could, perhaps, be handled on a co-operative basis, so that the burden would not fall solely on one or two countries; he therefore welcomed paragraph 5 (d) and (e) of draft resolution A/SPC/L.135 and Add.1.

26. One effective method of combatting apartheid would be to give moral and material support to those countries of southern Africa which were trying to construct societies in which people of different races and culture could live together in harmony with equal rights, opportunities and responsibilities, thus disproving the false theory upon which apartheid was based.

27. Mr. IYALLA (Nigeria) proposed that the statement by the Botswana representative be reproduced in full.

28. The CHAIRMAN said that the verbatim record of the meeting would be distributed to all members.

It was so decided.

29. Mr. KOVALEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the report of the Special Committee testified to the continuing urgency of the situation in South Africa. That situation was a threat to international peace and security, for the racial policies of the South African Government could best be compared with those of Hitler's Germany. Opponents of the régime were not merely gaoled, but virtually legislated out of existence. The indigenous inhabitants were denied the most elementary rights and freedoms in their own land. Savage legislation had been enacted to repress the African population, and a formidable police and security system had been built up to enforce it. Meanwhile the white racist minority continued to maintain that it was entitled by birth to rule South Africa and bring "civilization" to the Africans.

30. Although the United Nations had adopted many resolutions condemning apartheid and calling on all States not to assist the racist régime in South Africa, the Western Powers continued to give that country extensive economic and other support. The reason for that policy was the determination of the international monopolies to continue extracting the enormous profits from South Africa made possible by the use of African slave labour. The extent of those profits was amply confirmed by press reports. West German capital was playing a particularly prominent role in

building up South Africa's war industries, and the leaders of the Federal Republic of Germany did not conceal their sympathy with the present régime in South Africa. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development must also be condemned for continuing to extend loans to South Africa after the United Nations had adopted a resolution calling on the specialized agencies to deny assistance to the South Africa Government.

31. The imperialist Powers were interested in using South Africa as a base for the struggle against independent African States and against national liberation movements. The strategic importance of South Africa had been candidly recognized by members of the United States Government.

32. His delegation shared the concern at the situation in South Africa expressed by the representatives of the African countries, and agreed with the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.135 and Add.1 that that situation continued to pose a grave threat to international peace and security. His delegation deplored the refusal of the Western Powers to join the Special Committee, which was doing vital work. The draft resolution rightly condemned the position of those countries, and called on all States to cease the sale and delivery of arms to South Africa and to discourage the establishment of closer economic and financial relations. His delegation believed that the General Assembly should go further and recommend the Security Council to call for mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. It was the duty of all States to assist the African peoples in their struggle against apartheid. His delegation would support draft resolution A/SPC/L.135 and Add.1.

33. Mr. VINCI (Italy) congratulated the Special Committee on its excellent report, although he could not endorse all its conclusions. His Government had consistently condemned the policy of apartheid, which was inconsistent with the ideals and traditions of the Italian people and the principles of the United Nations Charter. Furthermore, it fully agreed that apartheid could not be conquered by words alone, although that type of argument was often used to condemn those countries which allegedly gave economic support to the South African Government. It must be remembered in that connexion that trade with South Africa was not limited to its so-called "main trading partners", which were the world's main trading nations; the situation could be more accurately assessed by expressing each country's trade with South Africa as a percentage of its total foreign trade. Furthermore, the imposition of economic sanctions against South Africa would affect developing as well as developed countries; he therefore doubted the feasibility of that policy and endorsed the views on the subject expressed by the Irish representative (535th meeting).

34. The South African situation arose primarily from the deep-seated psychological and political misconceptions and apprehensions which dominated the minds of white South Africans. United Nations action should therefore be directed mainly towards removing those fears and creating a climate in which South Africans of all races could live together in mutual trust and build a new society based on equality of rights and obligations. Similar ideas had been ex-

pressed by Mr. Ngcobo, the representative of the Pan-Africanist Congress (South Africa), at the 533rd meeting. It was to be feared, however, that some of the measures advocated by previous speakers might destroy any hope of creating a non-racial society in South Africa; he agreed with the Irish representative on that point also.

35. Although his Government doubted the feasibility of certain suggested solutions to the apartheid problem, it sincerely wished to see that problem solved, and had complied fully with the relevant United Nations decisions, in particular by banning the export to South Africa of arms, ammunition, military matériel, spare parts and equipment for their maintenance or manufacture. Furthermore, it intended to contribute \$2,500 to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and \$12,500 to the United Nations education and training programme for South Africans. Those contributions were, of course, modest when compared with the magnitude of the need, but they expressed his Government's confidence in the ability of the United Nations to alleviate the suffering of apartheid's victims.

36. He referred those who had explicitly or implicitly criticized his Government for allegedly refusing to serve on the expanded Special Committee to his delegation's letter of 13 June 1966 to the Secretary-General (see A/6356, annex), which showed that Italy was ready to serve provided certain conditions were met. Member States could hardly be blamed for being reluctant to co-operate unconditionally in the implementation of decisions of which they had been given no advance notice. His delegation was proud that it had been asked to serve on the Ad Hoc Committee for South West Africa, and hoped that that body's work would make for a concrete and comprehensive approach to the wider problem of the South African Government's policies. His delegation firmly believed that history and progress had always been shaped by ideas rather than events, and that justice and freedom would eventually prevail in southern Africa.

37. Mr. IYALLA (Nigeria) said that the report of the Special Committee (A/6486) gave little grounds for hope that the South African Government would become amenable to the demands of reason. On the contrary, it showed that the policy of apartheid had been pursued with increasing brutality during the past year: discriminatory legislation had been further expanded, the heroic opponents of apartheid had been even more severely repressed, and political trials had been intensified through a judicial system which disregarded the essence of justice. The build-up of the military and police forces had continued, as had the development of the arms industry and the massive importation of military equipment. The feverish arms race was directed not against any immediately identifiable external foe, but against the millions of non-white South Africans whom the South African Government wished to maintain in a state of subjugation.

38. The facts reported by the Special Committee were incontestable, but when confronted with its frightening record the South African Government invariably claimed that the truth had been distorted by its enemies for propaganda purposes. It was therefore significant that the findings of the impartial

Brasilia seminar on apartheid corroborated the conclusions of United Nations bodies. It had been the seminar's unanimous view that the United Nations should, as a matter of urgency, devise ways and means of eliminating apartheid.

39. The experience of the past twenty years had proved that the South African Government was impervious to argument, and the freedom movements in that country had concluded that justice and liberty could not be attained by constitutional means. Their struggle had taken a more active turn, owing to the general atmosphere of violence created by the oppressive policies pursued by the ruling class in South Africa. There was a threat of a racial war which would engulf the whole of southern Africa, with its all too foreseeable consequences for international relations. If that danger materialized, history must record that the peoples of Africa had consistently advocated the development in that continent of societies in which all races would live and work together in equality, justice and harmony; that the conscience of mankind had been revolted by the oppression and exploitation of millions of peace-loving Africans by the white minority in southern Africa; and that some enlightened and powerful peoples and Governments outside Africa had failed to heed the persistent appeals of the African peoples, thus failing in their duty to mankind. The indifference of some affluent Governments to the plight of the South African people was vividly illustrated by their failure to contribute to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, which was designed to help alleviate the suffering of apartheid's victims, including innocent women and children.

40. The United Nations must pursue its efforts to eliminate apartheid and to assist and educate the victims of that policy. To that end, Member States should contribute even more generously to the United Nations Trust Fund and to the United Nations educational and training programme. Furthermore, the Organization should keep world public opinion fully informed of the tragic situation in South Africa, and appeal directly to every man and woman in the world to take a firm stand against apartheid and join the offensive for its destruction.

41. Mr. MISHA (Albania) said that the report of the Special Committee and the statements made in the Committee showed that the situation in South Africa was continuing to deteriorate, and confirmed the view that it represented a grave danger to international peace and security. The Government of South Africa, flouting the resolutions of the United Nations, persisted in its brutal repression and exploitation of the indigenous population and was fast turning the country into a vast concentration camp. While the white colonialists occupied most of the land, the African majority eked out a wretched existence characterized by forced labour and poverty. The very fabric of African society was disintegrating under the pressure of more and more oppressive legislation. Thousands of African patriots languished in gaol, while their families were persecuted by the white authorities. The Pretoria régime had ignored the universal condemnation of the world community, and more specific measures such as the arms embargo had remained without effect.

42. The persistence of so dangerous a situation and the impotence of the United Nations to secure South African compliance with its resolutions could be explained only by the attitude of South Africa's major trading partners, the imperialist Powers, which eloquently denounced apartheid while sabotaging the efforts of the United Nations to put an end to it, as was amply testified in the Special Committee's report. It was common knowledge that the United States, the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany not only maintained close diplomatic and economic relations with the Government of South Africa, but derived fabulous profits from their investments in that country. It was clear that profits were more important to them than the principles of the Charter.

43. It was the duty of the United Nations to meditate on the fate of the 13 million black Africans who were denied the most elementary human rights in their own country. The mere condemnation of apartheid was not enough, and it was time to take practical steps under Chapter VII of the Charter. Albania had consistently condemned apartheid and complied with all United Nations resolutions on the subject; it maintained no relations of any kind with the criminal Government of the Republic of South Africa and would support any step designed to put an end to the system of apartheid.

44. Mr. FARAH (Somalia) said that despite the almost universal condemnation of apartheid, the response by many Member States to the call for action against it was very poor. Apart from contributions to humanitarian programmes, none of the provisions of resolution 2054 (XX) had been complied with. The Security Council, three of whose permanent members were major trading partners of South Africa, had again ignored the General Assembly's call for action under Chapter VII of the Charter. The major trading partners of South Africa and other nations prominent in international trade had all, with the exception of the Soviet Union, declined the invitation to join the Special Committee. Far from ceasing their economic collaboration with the South African Government, South Africa's trading partners had increased their investment in that country. The arms embargo called for by the Security Council had not been complied with; and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development had approved a \$20 million loan to a South African corporation.

45. The increase in investments in South Africa was paralleled by an intensification of apartheid. One of the last strongholds of freedom in South Africa had now been breached with the passage of legislation ensuring segregation at university level. The campaign against opponents of apartheid at all levels of South African society had been intensified. The leaders of that opposition looked to the Special Committee as a focus of international action which would eventually force South Africa to abandon its racial policies. Apartheid did not threaten the inhabitants of South Africa alone; it threatened the entire region of southern Africa.

46. The draft resolution on apartheid before the Committee (A/SPC/L.135 and Add.1) reflected the Special Committee's consideration of every aspect of apartheid. The short-term provisions of the resolution, which appealed for contributions to humanitarian pro-

grammes designed to assist the victims of apartheid, represented the very least that could be done. Keeping the question of apartheid before the conscience of the world was another important goal, and the proposed international campaign against apartheid deserved the support of all Member States. The organization of an international seminar on the subject would promote co-ordinated United Nations action.

47. But the key to the problem of apartheid was in the hands of South Africa's main trading partners. Those States were being called on once more to end their economic collaboration with the South African Government and to be prepared to carry out economic sanctions against it. There was no other peaceful means of showing that Government that it stood alone and of forcing it to abandon its racial policies. The only alternative to the plan of action formulated by the Special Committee was to admit that the United Nations was helpless.

48. Mr. NDIMBIE (Cameroon) said that while there was unanimous agreement that the inhuman treatment of the non-European population of South Africa was intolerable, there were differences of opinion as to how the Pretoria régime should be brought to reason. During the many years that the United Nations had been concerned with the question, the situation in South Africa had gravely deteriorated and had become a greater and greater threat to international peace and security. During those years the South African Government had acquired an impressive array of military equipment to help it enforce its repressive laws and crush all opposition. The foreign trade of South Africa had rapidly increased, and growing economic collaboration on the part of its major trading partners had encouraged a large war industry and promoted self-sufficiency in certain strategic fields. The massive profits derived by the Western countries from trade with South Africa had blinded them to justice and humanity.

49. The United States, a country known for its democratic traditions, was better placed than most to understand that nothing could prevent the oppressed non-Whites of South Africa from regaining their rights. The United Kingdom, too, was greatly respected for its democratic principles; how much the more regrettable therefore was its handling of the Rhodesian problem, its attitude towards South West Africa, and its maintenance of relations with South Africa. France had played a major role in the accession to independence of most African States; it was the more regrettable that it should interpret its policy of non-interference in the internal affairs of States in such a way as to permit continued relations with South Africa. The Federal Republic of Germany, too, might have been expected to champion freedom and racial equality; it seemed instead to be bent on encouraging genocide in South Africa, lured by the huge profits to be derived from investment in that country. Japan, an Asian country, had been accepted as an honorary member of

the white minority in the world because of its commercial links with South Africa; but there might well be a day of reckoning.

50. The South African Government was thus being encouraged by the attitude of its trading partners, and also by the decision on South West Africa of the International Court of Justice^{1/} to intensify its discriminatory policies. It was no secret that South Africa, and Portugal too, were using loans granted by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in violation of United Nations resolutions to buy weapons for the purposes of oppression. Certain developed countries were also determined to prevent the economic expansion of the developing countries, as had been shown by the failure of negotiations to reach agreement on the price of cocoa. It was the complicity of the Western Powers that continued to prevent the Security Council from taking steps against the South African régime under Chapter VII of the Charter. It would be recalled that in granting loans to South Africa and Portugal, the International Bank had decided to ignore two United Nations resolutions because they had been passed by the General Assembly and not the Security Council.

51. There was thus no need for further study of the situation in southern Africa; what was needed now was action. His Government, which had complied with all the resolutions and maintained no relations of any kind with South Africa, appealed to that country's major trading partners to stop co-operating with a régime whose policies were incompatible with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Security Council must act unanimously to put an end to the unfortunate situation throughout southern Africa.

52. Mr. DIOP (Guinea) said that there could be but one explanation of the paradox that apartheid, although universally condemned, continued to flourish: the complicity of certain great Powers. His delegation urged the United States, the United Kingdom and France—the three countries principally concerned—to reconsider their policies towards South Africa, for those policies were quite inconsistent with their enlightened attitude in other fields. The patience of Africa, so long and so sorely tried, was at last running out; if South Africa's major trading partners did not mend their ways, it would soon be too late to prevent a blood-bath in southern Africa. He paid a tribute to the socialist countries, the Scandinavian countries, and the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America for their display of effective solidarity with the oppressed Africans of southern Africa, and appealed to the Western Powers to follow their example. They had an opportunity to help build a better world, and history would judge whether they had had the courage and humanity to seize it.

The meeting rose at 1.50 p.m.

^{1/} South West Africa, Second Phase, Judgment, I.C.J. Reports, 1966, p. 6.