

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 477th
MEETING

Friday, 3 December 1965,
at 3.25 p.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 36:

The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued):

(a) *Reports of the Special Committee on the Policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa;*

(b) *Reports of the Secretary-General. 1*

Chairman: Mr. Carlet R. AUGUSTE (Haiti).

AGENDA ITEM 36

The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued): (A/SPC/L.118, L.119):

(a) Reports of the Special Committee on the Policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (A/5692, A/5707, A/5825 and Add.1, A/5932, A/5957);

(b) Reports of the Secretary-General (A/5850 and Add.1, A/6025 and Add.1)

1. Mr. HORAN (Ireland) said that the word apartheid—"separateness"—was used by its advocates to mean a form of separate development ensuring that one section of the population would for all time be kept in an inferior position to another section, indeed kept in a state of semi-servitude. The authors of the policy of apartheid were the Government of a Member State of the United Nations which called itself Christian and claimed to be a democratic State; in fact it was not, and its Government represented a minority selected on racist grounds. That state of affairs was morally wrong and politically retrograde. Ireland joined with all other right-minded peoples in condemning it unequivocally and without reservation.

2. The racial policies of the Government of the Republic of South Africa and the practices by which they were implemented were not only gross violations of the principles of the Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, but heinous offences against the natural law. South Africa's defiance of United Nations resolutions and its continued violations of fundamental human rights were the more regrettable since South Africa had been a founding Member of the Organization. Fundamentally, the question was one of human rights. The denial of those rights was made more flagrant by the fact that they were denied by a minority to the overwhelming majority of the population, for the one and only reason that the majority was not white. Human rights were fundamental. They had always existed, even if they had not always

been recognized. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights had not created, but merely formulated them.

3. Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter, on which the South African Government based its claim that the United Nations had no authority to discuss its policy of apartheid, used the words "essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State". The key word was "essentially". In the view of the Irish delegation, no one could hold that a question such as the violation of fundamental human rights was, in its essence, within the domestic jurisdiction of any State. His delegation took the view that Article 2, paragraph 7 did not bar the United Nations from discussing violations of human rights whenever and wherever they occurred.

4. Having in the past opposed any suggestion that South Africa should be expelled from the United Nations, on the grounds that it should be exposed to whatever influences could be brought to bear, the Irish delegation had welcomed the proposal unanimously adopted at the 470th meeting calling upon the Chairman to communicate to the delegation of the Republic of South Africa the Committee's wish that it should be represented and should participate in the discussion. South Africa should not only be a Member of the Organization but should be present when the Committee discussed apartheid.

5. In August 1963 the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches, in a statement on racial and ethnic tension, had pointed out that the continuance by South Africa of its present policy of race relations would inevitably lead to its increased isolation from the rest of the world. Evidence of that isolation, not only political but also mental, could be found in recent speeches by prominent South Africans, some of which had been quoted by the representative of Iran (471st meeting).

6. Recalling the Irish delegation's statement in 1961 at the 275th meeting of the Committee, he said it was deplorable that South Africa's wealth, skill and capital should be withheld from the majority of its own citizens and from the rest of Africa. The South Africans themselves must have some vision of the immense contribution they could make to the advancement of all their citizens and of Africa. That would be South Africa's true path to greatness, and the whole world devoutly wished that it would pursue that vocation and cast off the folly of apartheid.

7. Mr. KARASIMEONOV (Bulgaria) said that the preceding two years had witnessed increased activities by the United Nations and other organizations in support of the struggle of the South African people against the policy of apartheid. The Special Committee on the Policies of apartheid of the Government of

the Republic of South Africa and its Chairman deserved praise for their untiring efforts and the excellent documentation they had produced on the criminal policies of the Verwoerd Government. Despite their work, however, the paralysis of the nineteenth session of the General Assembly had given breathing space to the South African Government, which had multiplied its inhuman measures of repression against the coloured population.

8. In recent years, the Verwoerd Government had managed to find a way of living with the world's protests and quietly pursuing its policies. South Africa openly defied the United Nations, as the absence of its representative from the Committee confirmed. The reason for the indifference and arrogance of the South African Government was simple and obvious—South Africa could continue to apply its policies of apartheid with impunity because certain great Powers continued to maintain political and economic relations with it. The reports of the Special Committee and in particular its study of recent investments by foreign-owned corporations (A/5932, annex II) showed that collaboration between the Western Powers and South Africa was flourishing.

9. Even the Security Council resolutions calling upon all States to cease the supply of arms to South Africa had been evaded. Several ingenious methods had been used. Those countries which had been obliged by public opinion to relinquish trading in arms had begun to invest in South Africa's armaments industry. The international monopolies of the United States and Western Europe had made massive investments in South African weapons factories. When the question of an oil embargo had arisen, companies from the United States, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany and France had offered to finance the building of refineries in South Africa and to participate in distribution. The same process had taken place when a rubber embargo had been discussed. Canada had invested huge sums in the production of synthetic rubber. Certain representatives had made solemn declarations to the effect that they no longer exported armaments to South Africa. But what was the worth of those statements when arms were being produced on the spot and when South Africa already possessed a stockpile of the most modern types of weapons? It was not surprising that the Verwoerd Government had boasted that in the event of war, South Africa could not be defeated by conventional means.

10. South Africa's trade with the Western Powers was expanding. The volume of trade with all its major partners had increased between 1959 and 1964, the most spectacular case being Japan, whose trade had tripled over five years, followed by Italy and the Federal Republic of Germany. It was no accident that the attitude of the latter was diametrically opposed to that of the German Democratic Republic, which had broken off all relations with South Africa and vigorously condemned its racial policies.

11. Events in Southern Rhodesia had shown the danger of apartheid to world peace. Without the encouragement and assistance of the Verwoerd Government, Ian Smith would never have dared to

declare unilateral independence. Apartheid had long since crossed the frontiers of South Africa into South West Africa, and was now the official policy of Southern Rhodesia. The "unholy alliance" between South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Portugal was a threat to all the peoples of Africa. The main strength of that alliance, whose purpose was to perpetuate a slave régime in the whole of southern Africa, was the Verwoerd régime, which had justly been compared to Nazi Germany. The policies of the Western Powers towards the Verwoerd Government might well have the same disastrous consequences for mankind as their Munich policy towards Hitler.

12. The Chairman of the Special Committee had addressed a solemn warning to the Western Powers, particularly those which were permanent members of the Security Council. A war was brewing in South Africa which would shake the entire world, not even sparing the United Nations itself. But it would seem that the Western Powers and South Africa's other partners had turned a deaf ear to that warning. Recent events in Southern Rhodesia had taught them nothing. Apart from shedding a few crocodile tears for the coloured population, they had offered nothing new, merely reiterating the reasons for continuing their trade with South Africa.

13. The Bulgarian delegation believed that the time for studies and pious hopes was over. The Committee of Experts which the Western Powers had insisted on creating had produced no results. Only urgent and resolute action could remedy the situation. For that reason the Bulgarian delegation wholeheartedly supported the proposals of the Special Committee and in particular its main recommendation that action 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 Africa, was indispensable to reverse the tragic course of events and move towards a solution.

14. Mr. NEKROUF (Morocco) said that the problem of apartheid now required action, not condemnation. The non-white population of South Africa and international opinion must be told whether the United Nations would and could undertake that action. It was not by chance that the Committee was faced with the difficulty of achieving unanimity on such important questions as peace-keeping, the Palestine question and apartheid.

15. Mr. BARROMI (Israel), speaking on a point of order, said that the debate should be confined to the question of apartheid and that any attempt to reopen the discussion of the Palestine question was out of order.

16. The CHAIRMAN requested the representative of Morocco to restrict his remarks to the item under discussion.

17. Mr. NEKROUF (Morocco) pointed out that he had referred only to the difficulty of reaching unanimity on the question of Palestine and had not condemned any party to that dispute.

18. The many references to the Charter, and the many interpretations of it, made during the debate on peace-keeping were equally relevant to the discussion of

apartheid. The time had come when all Member States would be increasingly obliged to define their conception of the purposes of the Organization and the means by which it could achieve its aims. In that confrontation of views it would have to be decided whether the United Nations was anything more than a grouping of interests, in which only the great Powers held sway. If so, what were the powers of the small States? Were they merely puppets whose approval and support had to be solicited for the actions of the major Powers? Ultimately, it would have to be decided whether or not the Organization was to become an effective instrument for peace and progress.

19. With all its fundamental contradictions, such as the principle of voting equality on the one hand and the right of veto for permanent members of the Security Council on the other, the Charter remained a legal and moral ideal for the countries of the third world. The developing countries were determined to interpret the Charter in the only just and legal way, i.e., according to the principle that selfish interests must be set aside in favour of respect for others, prosperity for all and universal progress.

20. The peoples of Rhodesia, Angola and Mozambique, together with the African and Asian States and their friends in Latin America and Europe, would be deluding themselves if they were to imagine that resolutions and recommendations could bring down the criminal régimes of Pretoria and Salisbury. To obtain results, the developing countries must never miss any opportunity to contest an interpretation or application of the Charter that served the interests of the great Powers.

21. Concerted action by the small countries and a refusal to bow before the wishes of the great Powers was the only way towards the solution of the problem of apartheid. The issue was a test for the great Powers. Would they act solely in their own material and political interests, or would they take a more healthy view of their duties and responsibilities? It was also a test for the under-developed countries, to prove that they were capable of defending their own legitimate aspirations.

22. In the view of the Moroccan delegation, dark days lay ahead for Africa. The reports of the Special Committee and recent developments in Rhodesia must be viewed realistically. With the help of its Western allies, the racist Government of Pretoria had converted South Africa into an immense arsenal capable of supplying the rulers of Salisbury, Angola and Mozambique. Its flourishing economy could be used to counteract the effects of any sanctions that the United Nations might recommend. As a result of the actions of a small group of States in violation of the Charter, the United Nations was powerless. The Secretary-General had made no attempt to hide the total failure of Security Council resolutions 190 (1964) and 191 (1964), which had been rejected by the South African Government. In connexion with resolution 190 (1964), the Secretary-General had noted that the Pretoria régime still persisted in its attitude and had intensified its repressive measures. The High Commissioner for Refugees remained in contact with the Governments concerned but had been unable to

take any action on behalf of the non-white population. The International Red Cross Committee was powerless; all its efforts had been rejected by Pretoria as acts of interference. In response to the appeal by the Special Committee, only eight Member States out of 117 had offered financial contributions. With regard to resolution 191 (1964), the South African Government had rejected the proposal that all the people of South Africa should be brought into consultation to decide the future of their country. As for the Expert Committee, to which Morocco belonged, it had made no progress because of the time-wasting tactics of a small minority of its members.

23. He wished to pay a tribute to the Special Committee, its Chairman and its Rapporteur for the excellent reports they had produced. The reports showed clearly that a threat to international peace and security existed in South Africa. The Special Committee had recommended that action under Chapter VII of the Charter was indispensable, and Morocco fully shared that view. The application of economic sanctions would be a long and difficult process, but with the help of the African and Asian States and their friends, it would eventually be successful. Meanwhile, in order to relieve the sufferings of 13 million victims of apartheid, a number of measures should be taken: (a) relief and assistance should be given to all victims of apartheid; (b) an investigation of the treatment of prisoners should be carried out by an international commission of jurists and prison officials; (c) an effort must be made to disseminate information on the dangers of apartheid and on the efforts of the United Nations—in that respect he welcomed the offer by the Government of Brazil to organize an international seminar on apartheid in 1966; and (d) the Special Committee should be enlarged and provided with adequate financial resources to enable it to continue its work.

24. The Moroccan delegation continued to have faith in the efforts of the United Nations and hoped that the great Powers would co-operate. He hoped they would heed the appeal of Chief Albert Luthuli and cease supplying arms to South Africa. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that draft resolution A/SPC/L.118, of which Morocco was a sponsor, would be unanimously adopted by the Committee.

25. Mr. BENITES (Ecuador) said that like nazism, with which South African leaders such as Malan, Strijdom and Verwoerd had sympathized, South African nationalism was based on racism. South African racism, however, antedated the rise of nazism, having been present since the country's birth: the South Africa Act of 1909 had stipulated that non-white persons could not be elected to Parliament, although a non-white man earning more than £50 a year could vote after being registered on a separate electoral roll. South African racism had reached its climax with the Group Areas Act of 1950, which divided the population according to racial criteria. At the present time, 3 million white South Africans controlled 13 million non-whites, including "Bantus", "Asians" and "coloureds".

26. The whites were thus heavily outnumbered by the non-whites, and South African racism was motivated largely by fear. That fear explained South

Africa's rapidly increasing defence budget, its determination to produce its own armaments, including aircraft, lest imports be interrupted by an embargo, and the intensified military training provided for the white population. South Africa produced large quantities of uranium; it possessed at least one nuclear reactor, and had established a nuclear research centre in the Kalahari desert; and it was in a position to produce nuclear weapons. It was to be noted that South Africa had abstained during the vote in the First Committee (1392nd meeting) on the denuclearization of Africa.

27. South African racism was also influenced significantly by economic considerations, for it served as a pretext for the seizure of land by the white minority and the maintenance of a cheap non-white labour force with no trade union rights. Legislation such as the Trading and Occupation of Land Restriction Act (1943), the Natives' Consolidation Act (1945), the so-called "Ghetto" Act (1946) and the Group Areas Act (1950) was designed to ensure that the most desirable land remained under white control. The salaries of African workers were ridiculously low compared with those of white workers: in 1959 the average annual income of the white population was £425, while that of the Africans was £39. The whites, who made up 19.3 per cent of the population, controlled 67 per cent of the national income. The standard of living of the African population was extremely low, and the mortality rate for African children was twenty-five times greater than that for white children. Through the years the African population had shown its dissatisfaction with these intolerable conditions through repeated strikes and demonstrations, despite brutal repressive measures.

28. The South African authorities endeavoured to justify their policy by arguing that apartheid was designed to provide equal opportunities for whites and non-whites within a system of separate development. Separate development was, however, completely impracticable in an industrialized economy like that of South Africa, which was based on mining and needed African labour. In establishing Bantustans South Africa was, in fact, creating colonies within its own territory. Furthermore, the two groups did not enjoy equal opportunities: in education, for example, Bantu children were indoctrinated with ignoble ideas in order that they might accept the concept of racial inequality.

29. The situation in South Africa had thus continued to deteriorate over the years, despite the disapproval of the international community as expressed in United Nations resolutions, which had been ignored by the South African racists. The emergence of the newly independent African States, which now constituted the largest group in the United Nations, had introduced a new element into the apartheid problem. Those States believed that democracy was the prerogative of all men, irrespective of race, and their natural opposition to the oppressive South African régime represented a potential threat to international peace and security. The Group of Experts appointed pursuant to Security Council resolution 182 (1963) had recommended the application of sanctions against South Africa, and it was to be hoped that those

suggestions would be implemented before it was too late.

30. As other representatives had already pointed out, many States had ignored resolution 1761 (XVII), which called for economic sanctions against South Africa: of the sixty-seven States which had voted in favour of that resolution, eleven still traded with South Africa, including four Western European countries. The great industrialized Powers continued to invest large amounts of capital in South Africa. As long as they received such economic support the South African racists would refuse to change their policies, and it was therefore essential to apply sanctions immediately in order to abolish a system which not only violated fundamental human rights but threatened to provoke a reaction that could endanger international peace and security. Men of goodwill of all races throughout the world were hoping for effective action that would eliminate South African racism, a political aberration born of cupidity and fear.

31. Mr. ANYAOKU (Nigeria), speaking on behalf of the twenty-three sponsors, introduced draft resolution A/SPC/L.119. He informed the Committee that Yugoslavia had joined the list of sponsors, and he expressed the hope that other delegations would follow suit. The draft resolution supplemented draft resolution A/SPC/L.118. It was designed not to cure the cancer of apartheid, but to palliate some of its disastrous effects by establishing a United Nations trust fund, administered by a five-member committee of trustees and made up of voluntary contributions from States, organizations and individuals, to be used to assist the victims of apartheid by providing them with legal assistance, relief and educational facilities.

32. Mr. PIERRE-LOUIS (Haiti) said that as a Negro country, Haiti took a particular interest in the problem of apartheid, which had been a subject of serious concern to the United Nations since 1946. He congratulated the Special Committee, and in particular the Rapporteur, on its well documented report (A/5957), which showed that the situation in South Africa continued to deteriorate. The doctrine of apartheid, based on concepts of racial inequality and prejudice, was universally condemned, yet the white racist minority cynically pursued its inhuman policy of discrimination and repression, thus flouting United Nations resolutions, ignoring its obligations under the Charter and violating the principles set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

33. As the Chairman of the Special Committee had pointed out in his statement at the 469th meeting, South Africa was a police State of the worst type, because it was also a racist State. Since September 1963 the South African Government had intensified the application of its apartheid policy and had institutionalized the brutal repressive measures employed against those who opposed that policy. It had adopted laws such as the Bantu Laws Amendment Act and the Criminal Procedure Amendment Act, and had enacted arbitrary legislation restricting the Africans' freedom of movement. A series of trials had been instituted under the General Law Amendment Act of 1962, which authorized the death penalty for

those found guilty of sabotage. The Pretoria Government had silenced the leaders of all organizations opposing its policies, thus preventing inter-racial contact and paralysing any organized anti-apartheid action. Under that discriminatory and criminal legislation Africans were arrested, imprisoned and interned on flimsy pretexts and thousands of innocent persons were condemned to long prison sentences after unfair trials. The attention of all Member States should be drawn to that tragic and unjust situation, and an appeal made to the conscience of all peoples, in order to obtain even wider moral support for United Nations efforts to eliminate apartheid, which represented not only an insult to human dignity but also a threat to peace.

34. The report of the Special Committee showed that there was an imminent danger of violent conflict between the non-white population and the white racist minority, which continued to strengthen its army and police force, thus threatening the independence of other African States. The conflict between oppressed and oppressors could easily spread to other parts of Africa and might degenerate into a world war. The situation in South Africa thus represented a threat to international peace and security under the terms of Article 39 of the Charter.

35. In view of the gravity of the situation, his delegation urged the Committee to support the recommendations set forth in the Special Committee's report and to approve the draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.118 and A/SPC/L.119). It hoped that the United Nations would forthwith adopt decisive measures that would oblige South Africa to abandon its racist policies. His delegation recommended a general boycott of South Africa; but new procedures would have to be devised in order to ensure the universal application of economic sanctions, since such sanctions were useless unless they were fully implemented by all Member States. Haiti was prepared to support any action that would eliminate apartheid and ensure the fulfilment of the just aspirations of the non-white population of South Africa.

36. His delegation paid a tribute to those Member States which had responded to the appeal contained in General Assembly resolution 1978 B (XVIII) by making contributions to aid the families of those persecuted by the South African Government. It also congratulated Denmark on the action it had decided to take with regard to South Africa.

37. Mr. DUHACEK (Yugoslavia) congratulated the Special Committee on the constructive suggestions submitted in its report, the adoption of which would make it possible to halt the further deterioration of the situation in South Africa and progress towards a solution of the problem. At all gatherings in which apartheid had been discussed, whether they were meetings of United Nations bodies or other international conferences, the Yugoslav representative had condemned those racist policies in the strongest terms, pointing out that they constituted a threat to peace in Africa and in the world as a whole and that it was therefore only within the framework of the international community that a solution could be found. His Government had applied the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1761 (XVII) to the

full and maintained no relations of any kind with the Government of South Africa. Despite the efforts of a majority of Member States, however, the United Nations had not succeeded in putting an end to the application of the policies of apartheid. That situation was all the more deplorable in that the United Nations had been established largely as an expression of the desire of the world's peoples not to permit a repetition of the experiences of a war which had been provoked by forces advocating the theory of the inequality of races and even seeking the extermination of certain of them. Indeed, the similarity between apartheid and nazism was becoming more apparent with every passing day.

38. The reasons for the United Nations' failure to solve the problem were twofold. First, the South African Government, far from showing readiness to co-operate with the Organization, had stepped up its extermination policies, as reflected in the increased number of death sentences imposed and the intensifying persecution of the dark-skinned majority of the population. Those developments, coupled with the negative attitude taken by the South African delegation in boycotting the work of the Special Political Committee demonstrated clearly that the South African Government was becoming increasingly ruthless and aggressive. Any illusions that progress could be achieved by persuasion and consultation had been dispelled by the statement of the South African Minister of Justice that only white men would have the right to sit in the Parliament which must decide the fate of South Africa and its inhabitants, as also the statement by the Prime Minister that keeping South Africa white meant only one thing, namely white domination—not leadership, not guidance, but control and supremacy.

39. Secondly, it was clear that the effective implementation of the resolutions adopted by the United Nations so far was being prevented by those Powers which, instead of joining in a trade boycott, were continuing and even expanding their trade with South Africa and in some cases supplying it with arms. Among those Powers were some which had fought courageously against the Nazi-Fascist coalition in the Second World War. In the circumstances, his delegation could not but conclude that political as well as purely economic interests were involved.

40. The problem was now more dangerous than ever, for within the past five years the South African Government had increased its military budget from \$61 million to \$321 million. Such an increase was obviously not required exclusively for defence purposes. Noting that development, the peace-loving countries of Africa which, after their long struggle for independence, wished only to devote themselves to the well-being of their peoples, were inevitably reminded that imperialism and the desire for conquest were characteristic features of fascist régimes based on racism.

41. An evaluation of the danger inherent in the situation in South Africa would be incomplete if it did not take into account the newly-created situation in Southern Rhodesia. It was doubtful whether a single delegation would deny that it was precisely the attitude of those countries whose trade with South

Africa was continuing unabated which had encouraged the Smith régime to make its unilateral declaration of independence. The close relationship between South Africa and Rhodesia endangered peace and was a direct threat to the peace-loving countries which were their neighbours.

42. As the measures taken so far had proved ineffective it was imperative to take new action aimed at ensuring the greatest possible unanimity in the implementation of the decisions of the United Nations, for failure on the part of certain Members to abide by those resolutions could only further encourage the racist policies of the South African Government. His delegation accordingly endorsed the proposals set forth in the report of the Special Committee under the heading "Recommendations to the General Assembly and the Security Council" (A/5957, part III) and, in particular, the recommendation that the sanctions which had been proposed should be confirmed by a decision of the Security Council under Chapter VII of the Charter and that their full implementation by all States should be ensured. Those measures had been advocated by the Yugoslav representative who, having represented his country in the Special Political Committee during the eighteenth session, had subsequently been a member of the Security Council's Group of Experts but had resigned from that Group because he could not agree with certain other members on the timing and nature of measures to be recommended to the Security Council. Present developments and their serious implications for international peace and security made it imperative to take decisions without delay and any suggestions that such decisions should be deferred must be considered an attempt to come to the aid of the South African régime.

43. Mr. HAMID (Sudan) said that the Committee would be wasting its time if it did nothing more than continue to talk about the problem of apartheid while the situation steadily deteriorated and the South African Government refused to heed the decisions taken by the United Nations. That contemptuous attitude had been encouraged by the position of some Members of the Organization and by developments elsewhere in southern Africa. The unilateral declaration of independence made by the racist clique in Southern Rhodesia, which had had the effect of strengthening the South African régime and its apartheid policies, was not an isolated incident but part of a well-conceived plan. Another source of encouragement to South Africa was the position taken by Portugal. However vigorously Portugal denied that it was pursuing a racist policy, its support of South Africa classified it as a racist State, and it was certainly colonialist. The collusion among those three racist Governments in southern Africa, which had been described as an unholy alliance, was now out in the open. When the Smith régime had declared independence in Southern Rhodesia the South Africans had proclaimed their solidarity with it and in reply to the Security Council's invitation they had not only refused to participate in the debate on Southern Rhodesia but had stated that they would maintain their economic relations with that country.

44. The defiant attitude taken by those three countries was no surprise to the Africans. On the other hand,

they were both surprised and saddened at the position of France. Much had been said in the Special Political Committee about France's glorious history and the impact of its revolution on the minds of men; but a country's past record, however admirable, was not an excuse for taking a negative stand now. Africans had helped fight France's wars during France's darkest hours. Was it too much to ask that France should stand with them in their time of need? It was hardly a coincidence that the three countries which had abstained in the voting in the First Committee on the subject of nuclear weapons and the denuclearization of Africa were France, Portugal and South Africa.

45. France and Portugal, however, were not the only Member States which were aiding and abetting the South African régime. The most important of South Africa's trading partners, with the exception of Japan, were Western European countries which were also members of the NATO alliance and which, in addition to trading with South Africa, were supplying it with arms and war materials. It was in carrying on that traffic in arms that the Members concerned were most flagrantly in violation of the Charter. The President of the Owens—Corning Fiberglas Corporation whose recent favourable statement about South Africa had been referred to at an earlier meeting was none other than General Norstad, the former NATO commander.

46. Those who had despaired of the United Nations' ability to find a peaceful solution, however, had been given new hope by the statement made at the preceding meeting by the representative of Denmark, on the basis of whose conclusions the Committee could begin to move forward.

47. His delegation, which was a sponsor of the draft resolution introduced by the representative of Guinea (A/SPC/L.118), would also give its full support to the draft resolution just introduced by the representative of Nigeria (A/SPC/L.119).

48. Mr. OLMOS (Argentina) said his country found it incredible that in the mid-twentieth century when mankind was making such rapid technical, cultural, social and economic progress there should still be a place on earth where millions of human beings were denied their fundamental rights because of the colour of their skins. There were few political items discussed by the United Nations on which there was such wide agreement as in the case of apartheid, yet despite that near unanimity of views the item remained on the agenda year after year, while the Government of South Africa continued to deny the African inhabitants of that country their fundamental rights and freedoms. His Government had long thought that the South African régime could be persuaded to conform to the principles of the Charter and to bring its policies into line with the basic concepts shared by almost all mankind. It had hoped that, with the passing of time and the growing rapprochement among countries made possible by material progress and the activities of international bodies, the problem would inevitably be solved. However, the lack of any indication that the South African Government was influenced by the appeals of the United Nations, the absence of its delegation from the current proceedings, and the increasingly repressive legislation

enacted in South Africa in recent years, had led Argentina to the conclusion that the time for appeals and attempts at conciliation was passed.

49. It was particularly distressing to Argentina that the threat of a racial conflict between different nations on the same continent should loom at a time when the African peoples were embarking on their independent existence—a joyful occurrence which should be taking place in an atmosphere of peace and progress. Like other Latin American countries, Argentina had abolished discriminatory practices when it had attained independence in the nineteenth century, and it had opened its doors to all men of goodwill. There was no minority or racial group which did not find in the Constitutions of the Latin American countries and the attitudes of their Governments a guarantee that its members could live in harmony with their fellow citizens. In that spirit, the Argentine delegation to the recent second special Inter-American Conference at Rio de Janeiro had submitted the draft declaration adopted by the Conference to the effect that any racial discrimination was contrary to the sense of justice of the peoples of America and that under the democratic concept of the State all persons should be treated as equals regardless of their race.

50. At a time like the present, when the peoples of the world were increasingly co-operating with each other through the work of international organizations and establishing bonds of interdependence within regional groupings, no State could evade its responsibility to heed the decisions of the United Nations. The provisions of the Charter concerning human rights and the fundamental freedoms set forth in Article 1, paragraph 3, Article 55c. and Article 56 conclusively established that obligation.

51. He would study the two draft resolutions before the Committee with the careful attention they warranted and would discuss them at a later stage.

52. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) said that the Government of South Africa had shown nothing but contempt for the moral values underlying the succession of resolutions adopted by the United Nations with respect to the problem of apartheid and had refused to comply with its legal obligations under the United Nations Charter. With the passage of time it was only becoming more firmly entrenched, increasing the military strength and moving towards the economic self-sufficiency which would enable it to defy world public opinion with even greater impunity. If it was to be destroyed, the adoption of resolutions by the United Nations must be accompanied by action. A favourable vote on resolutions condemning apartheid was important but it was only the implementation of those resolutions which would bring about the desired result. It was a disgrace that in a so-called civilized era like the present the South African Government should be allowed to pursue a policy of internal colonialism against the vast majority of

the country's inhabitants. South Africa was a Member of the United Nations and as such had undertaken to uphold its Charter. Yet in what way, it must be asked, did its racial policy conform to that all-important provision of the Charter concerning the promotion and encouragement of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms? In what way did it conform to article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which stated that all human beings were born free and equal in dignity and rights, or with article 2 of the Declaration, which stated that everyone was entitled to the rights and freedoms set forth therein without distinction of any kind? The only answer the South African racists could give would be that the white race was superior to all others—a theory which had been advocated by the nazis but rejected by the vast majority of peoples. With regard to the provision in article 7 of the Declaration that all were equal before the law, it must be stated that the laws in South Africa existed not for the security of the general public but for the suppression of the great majority of the inhabitants. It was the duty of Members not only to protest against the persecution of the opponents of apartheid and their families but also to provide them with all possible material assistance. His delegation accordingly supported the remarks made by the Nigerian representative concerning the establishment of a trust fund and had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution to that end.

53. Cyprus stood for the complete elimination of all forms of colonialism, neo-colonialism and imperialism and all manifestations of oppression and injustice. Consequently, it was opposed to any segregation or division on grounds of race, religion, ethnic origin, colour or sex. To Prime Minister Verwoerd's question as to who would rule South Africa, whites or blacks, Cyprus would reply that South Africa should be governed on the basis of the expression of the will of the majority, regardless of such considerations as colour. South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, Cyprus and all other countries should be governed in accordance with the principle of majority rule on the basis of the concept "one man, one vote". If members of a minority group wished to participate in the government of a country they should do so on that basis rather than by rebelling against the State and seeking to subvert it.

54. His delegation was happy to be a sponsor of draft resolution A/SPC/L.118 because it called for strong action to counteract the threat to international peace and security posed by South Africa's racist policies and because it enabled Cyprus once again to show its solidarity with the heroic champions of freedom in Africa.

55. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the letter which he had addressed to the delegation of South Africa on the Committee's behalf and the South African reply would be circulated as a Committee document.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.