

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 609th
MEETING

Thursday, 7 November 1968,
at 11 a.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 31:

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) 1

Chairman: Mr. Abdulrahim Abby FARAH (Somalia).

AGENDA ITEM 31

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/7254, A/7259, A/7270)

1. Mr. MUNYANSHONGORE (Rwanda) said that, in the past year, the members of the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa had visited most of the main capitals of Europe in their search for a peaceful solution to the serious problem of apartheid. During that time, the situation in South Africa had worsened and the Government of that country had been enacting new repressive laws as well as ruthlessly applying the existing discriminatory legislation. The Group Areas Act was designed to put a stop, by 1978, to the flow of migration of African labour from the reservations to the "white areas" by restricting their entry and expelling to the reservations all unemployed Africans. All persons of mixed blood were also to be transferred from the eastern to the western part of Cape Province. The reservations in which they were herded did not have even the minimum economic resources that they would need. Through those inhuman laws, the South African racists were seeking nothing less than the death of the non-white populations in order to perpetuate white supremacy in southern Africa.

2. Those savage measures directed against the most elementary human rights had been condemned by eminent personalities both inside and outside South Africa. At its twenty-second session, the General Assembly had adopted several resolutions against the policy of apartheid in South Africa and in the neighbouring countries. At the fifth session of the Assembly of the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held at Algiers in September 1968, the participants had condemned apartheid in South Africa and its spread through southern Africa. Many cultural,

humanitarian and sporting organizations had also ceaselessly protested against the policy.

3. The spread of the poison of apartheid to the neighbouring countries constituted an ever-growing threat which would soon have dire consequences for the United Nations. How long would the Organization allow a Member State openly to flout its resolutions? All Member States, and above all the great Powers which were permanent members of the Security Council and had economic and trade relations with South Africa, should examine their consciences, weigh their responsibilities in the matter and work out the most effective means of putting an end to that odious policy. Since resolutions had been unsuccessful, a new strategy might be considered. His delegation was prepared to make its modest contribution to any initiative taken by the Special Political Committee to rid southern Africa of the inhuman régime of apartheid.

4. Mr. ANGULO-GOMEZ (Colombia) said that the very complete report of the Special Committee (A/7254) had described the full extent of the problem of apartheid, suggested possible solutions and emphasized the seriousness of the situation. The existing tension had been heightened by the spread of apartheid beyond South Africa's frontiers, the inevitable and just struggle in which the national liberation forces were engaged, the military build-up of the Government of South Africa and, above all, by the insistence of some Powers on maintaining trade relations with that country, thus ignoring the sanctions laid down in the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.

5. However, all aspects of the struggle against racial discrimination were not negative. World opinion had been roused against that hateful policy, certain States and organizations had made generous voluntary contributions to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa to help the victims of that policy, and aid and military assistance to South Africa had considerably decreased.

6. The inevitable conclusion to be drawn from the report of the Special Committee was that a problem unique in modern times weighed heavily upon the peace of the African continent, in paradoxical contrast with the victories won by man in all branches of knowledge.

7. His delegation had supported every resolution condemning the policy of apartheid, in accordance with his country's traditions, its constitutional and legal provisions, its Christian outlook on life and the unreserved support it had always given to principles which protected and raised human dignity. Colombia had waged its long and hard struggle for independence without appreciable outside support.

There were therefore reasons to be confident that the heroic struggle of oppressed majorities would prevail against a system condemned to disappear under the weight of its own crimes.

8. The Special Committee had recommended that the General Assembly and the Security Council should restate their resolutions on the question of apartheid that measures should be devised to guarantee their full application, that ways should be suggested of obtaining fuller information on compliance by Member States with the resolutions, on the effects of the measures taken and on means to ensure more effective international action.

9. His delegation was prepared to vote in favour of any draft resolution condemning the policy of apartheid, but considered a restatement of resolutions by the General Assembly and the Security Council to be a useless repetition of the same sanctions which, despite their compulsory nature, had clearly not been applied by certain States. It would be more effective, as suggested by the Special Committee, to formulate measures which would guarantee the full application of existing resolutions and to request the Security Council to resume consideration of the question.

10. Mr. KUDIWU (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said that, since the General Assembly had first discussed the question of apartheid in 1946, efforts had been made by all Member States to make the South African leaders understand the need to adopt a flexible policy consonant with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The measures taken by peace and freedom-loving countries to condemn that policy had in no way altered the attitude of the Pretoria Government. During 1968, it had added two more laws—the General Law Amendment Act and the Criminal Procedure Amendment Act—to the long list of repressive laws referred to in so many General Assembly resolutions.

11. It was well known that the extension of the policy of apartheid to the whole of southern Africa was due to the moral and material assistance constantly given by the Pretoria authorities to the illegal minority racist régime of Southern Rhodesia and to the colonial policy of Portugal. If the United Nations did not take concrete measures to ensure that the principles of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights were scrupulously respected, it would fail in its objective to maintain international peace and security.

12. His delegation therefore considered that, to put an end to the anachronistic situation prevailing in South Africa, Namibia, Southern Rhodesia and the Portuguese colonies, the following measures were necessary: first, the racial policy of apartheid especially its application to territories outside South African jurisdiction must be unreservedly condemned; secondly, moral and material support must be given to liberation movements; thirdly, respect by the Pretoria authorities, not only of the fundamental principles of the Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, but also of the relevant resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly, especially resolution 2307 (XXII), must be

ensured; fourthly, the Group Areas Act must be repealed so that all the inhabitants of South Africa could live freely in areas they had occupied from time immemorial; fifthly, a policy based on the principles of modern democracy must be applied.

13. To achieve those aims the great Powers which were continuing to encourage the régimes in Pretoria, Salisbury and Lisbon, finally abandon their attitude. They must become aware of their responsibility for the constant worsening of the situation in all southern Africa and understand that history would never forgive their miscalculations in that respect. They must follow the example of the small Powers and make the United Nations an effective organization. He therefore reiterated the appeal which he had made in 1967 (562nd meeting) that operative paragraph 3 of resolution 2054A (XX) concerning the enlargement of the Special Committee should be applied in conformity with the recommendations made by the Special Committee in its report of 1966.^{1/} The great Powers could thus contribute effectively to the elimination of the odious policy of apartheid in South Africa, in particular, and in southern Africa in general and ensure the success of the legitimate struggle of the liberation movements.

14. His delegation endorsed the recommendation made in the Special Committee's report that the Security Council should adopt effective measures to ensure the full implementation of the arms embargo and call upon all States to stop the flow of all capital investment and migrants, particularly skilled and technical personnel, to South Africa (A/7254, para. 114 (b)). Before sanctions were applied unreservedly, his delegation wished to appeal once more to all States and organizations to increase their political, moral and material support to all opponents of the policy of apartheid which threatened international peace and security and to contribute to the mobilization of world public opinion against the crimes committed under that policy so that truth might finally triumph.

15. Mr. EREN (Turkey) quoted a recent article in The Economist showing the effects of apartheid on the daily life of the Africans. They were not allowed to spend more than 72 hours in a "white" area unless they were employed under contract, and the number of daily prosecutions for offences against that restriction was almost 2,000. Social stability was impossible, since even if both members of a married couple were from the same district, the marriage was secured only for as long as they were both employed.

16. The Turkish people found it impossible to believe that such an archaic concept of human relationships could persist in an age in which the dignity of the individual was internationally recognized. Even in an age when might had generally been accepted as right, every nation in the Turkish polity had spoken its own language, enjoyed freedom of worship and lived under its own laws; and the same spirit of understanding had guided Turkey in its international relations, leading it to take a strong position against all forms of racial, religious and other discrimination.

^{1/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Annexes, agenda item 34, document A/6356, para. 18.

17. Apartheid was spreading beyond its present confines into new areas, and was gradually leading to a situation of crisis in the whole of southern Africa. Member States were becoming increasingly disappointed at the relative ineffectiveness of the United Nations in combating apartheid, and his delegation therefore welcomed the general feeling in the Committee that greater and more persistent efforts should be made. However, failure, though disappointing, had not been total. The international community remained determined to continue its efforts, and opposition to apartheid had reached a stage where practical action was almost inevitable. The anti-apartheid movement was continuing with increasing momentum, both inside and outside the United Nations family; the Commission on Human Rights had condemned apartheid both as a crime against humanity and as a threat to international peace and security, the Economic and Social Council had reiterated that condemnation and called for the suspension of relations with South Africa, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development had passed resolution 26 (II) at its second session suspending South Africa from membership, the International Conference on Human Rights had underlined efforts to ostracize apartheid and the International Olympic Committee had excluded South Africa from the Olympic Games of 1968. The universality of such condemnation and its undeterred persistence offered hope not only for the victims of apartheid but for those throughout the world whose existence depended on the inalienable dignity and worth of the individual.

18. The Special Committee had used every opportunity with realistic effectiveness and unswerving dedication to its objectives. Its report (A/7254) must be commended for the organization of its material, for the exposition and analysis of the issues and for its constructive conclusions and recommendations. The Special Committee had formulated recommendations covering every possibility, political, economic and moral, of enforcing the standards of domestic and international conduct laid down by the United Nations Charter, and he hoped that the Special Political Committee would continue its discussions in the same unity of purpose.

19. The Committee should indicate its persistent determination by reaffirming previous resolutions of the General Assembly, and by urging all States and organizations to provide greater moral, political and material assistance to the African peoples suffering under apartheid. Serious consideration must also be given to the protection of political prisoners with a view to preventing summary executions, maltreatment or reprisals; the activities of the International Defence and Aid Fund were to be particularly commended in that respect. The international campaign against apartheid must be pursued, and the Special Committee, while recommending that Member States and international organizations should co-operate in that effort, had also requested the United Nations to intensify its efforts to inform the people of the world of the evils of apartheid. The dispatch of military equipment to South Africa should be curtailed, and the Special Political Committee should support the continuation of the valuable work of the Special Committee and make every effort to ensure closer co-operation between the specialized agencies, regional organizations,

non-governmental institutions and the United Nations itself. However, even if all those measures were implemented, the goal would still not have been reached; further efforts should therefore be made with a view to bringing an end to the policies of apartheid.

20. Mr. KASRAWI (Jordan) expressed approval of the report of the Special Committee (A/7254) which contained many important conclusions and recommendations, and of the report of the Special Rapporteur appointed by the Commission on Human Rights^{2/} which provided most useful information on the inhuman legislation and practices of the white minority régime in South Africa.

21. The Government of South Africa was intensifying its policies of racial discrimination and repression, and those policies were being extended to Southern Rhodesia. South Africa continued to defy United Nations resolutions on Namibia, and was aiding the illegal racist minority régime in Salisbury. The people subject to such régimes had no choice but to struggle for liberation, and it was reported in the Special Committee's report that the liberation movement considered armed struggle to be the only feasible and effective means of securing the human rights and fundamental freedoms of the people of South Africa (*ibid.*, para. 98). The United Nations had already recognized the legitimacy of that struggle, and had called for moral, political and material support for it. It had a responsibility to protect the freedom fighters, and a start should be made by deciding that the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War applied to them.

22. The Special Committee had stressed the danger of violent conflict, which in the view of his delegation was a result of the intransigence of the Government of South Africa in blocking any hope of a peaceful evolution towards a society based on freedom and justice. The situation was made more serious by the growing military strength of South Africa, and the chances of averting danger depended essentially on the willingness of the great Powers and the major trading partners of South Africa to persuade the Government of that country to abandon its present course. Concerted and effective pressure could be brought to bear on the Government of South Africa by genuine implementation of the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, which provided an appropriate framework for international action if fully implemented by all States. However, trade between South Africa and a number of States continued to grow; not only had the major trading partners not changed their attitudes, but other States were following their example. According to the Information Service of the International Defence and Aid Fund, South Africa's trade with Israel was expected to grow, and a direct airline route had recently been opened between Lydda and Johannesburg. It was because of such attitudes that the United Nations had failed to make any progress towards a solution of the problem of apartheid.

23. The only peaceful way left of eliminating apartheid was through the application of mandatory economic

^{2/} "Study of apartheid and racial discrimination in Southern Africa" (E/CN.4/949 and Corr.1, E/CN.4/949/Add.1 and Corr.1, and E/CN.4/949/Add.2-5).

sanctions as envisaged in Chapter VII of the Charter. Such application would be fully justified in view of the fact that the policies of apartheid in South Africa were a threat to international peace and security and a crime against humanity. That partial remedies were not sufficient to deal with the situation was proved by the fact that in spite of Security Council resolution 191 (1964) calling for an embargo on the sale of arms to the Government of South Africa, South Africa's military strength was growing. His delegation supported the proposal to intensify the international campaign against apartheid, which was essential and necessary in order to lay the groundwork for further effective action. The development of that campaign should stress the encouragement of anti-apartheid movements, humanitarian assistance to the victims of apartheid and counter-measures against the increasingly strong propaganda of the South African Government.

24. Mr. ANSARI (Iran) said that the debate which had been continuing for more than twenty years in the United Nations on the question of racial discrimination and the policy of apartheid of the Government of South Africa should not be considered as sterile or devoid of any practical effects. On the contrary, it testified to the determination of Member States to enforce respect for human dignity. Initially, the United Nations had been satisfied with passing resolutions condemning apartheid, in the hopes that they would be heeded by the Government of South Africa. In view of South Africa's intransigence, other more appropriate steps had had to be taken, which had also failed to produce the expected results, with the result that a further effort should now be made to find more effective remedies.

25. It was regrettable that in an era of great discoveries in science and biology, in which the absurdity of any racial prejudice had been demonstrated, segregation was still practised on the grounds of different ethnic origins. Racial discrimination was an evil with deep roots in the history, tradition and mental outlook of a people, but the complexity of the problem should not discourage the international community from attempting to find a solution to it. It was in that spirit that his delegation approached the discussion, taking into account the report of the Special Committee (A/7254). The conclusions of that report showed that no progress had been made towards abolishing apartheid.

26. His delegation deplored the intransigent attitude of the Government of South Africa and associated itself with other delegations in an energetic condemnation of its policies. The people and Government of Iran had always been opposed to all forms of racism. In May 1968, the International Conference on Human Rights held at Tehran had adopted a proclamation^{3/} in which it was stated that gross denials of human rights under apartheid was a matter of the gravest concern to the international community, continuing seriously to disturb international peace and security and making it imperative for the international community to use every possible means to eradicate it. The proclamation further stated that the struggle against apartheid

was legitimate and that the peoples of the world must be made fully aware of the evils of racial discrimination, that the implementation of the principle of non-discrimination, embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international instruments was an urgent task at the international as well as the national level, and that all ideologies based on racial superiority and intolerance must be condemned and resisted. His delegation believed that those ideas should be taken into account in the draft resolution to be adopted at the current session.

27. Iran had not failed to contribute to the limit of its ability to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa to alleviate the suffering of the victims of apartheid, and was pleased to note that the Fund had been able to discharge its task within the limits of the amounts it had received. Until a final remedy was found for the evils of apartheid, the Fund should be strengthened and its resources increased. He hoped that sincere co-operation in combating apartheid would continue and that the unanimous will of the international community, particularly during the International Year for Human Rights, would lead the Republic of South Africa to heed the voice of reason before it was too late.

28. Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy) expressed his delegation's appreciation of the accurate, painstaking report of the Special Committee, which it had studied with deep interest. Nothing could be more contrary to the essence of the Italian outlook and civilization than the policies of apartheid. His Government had repeatedly asserted its will to contribute, within its ability, to the peaceful elimination of apartheid. That had been reaffirmed in an address to the General Assembly by the Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs on 9 October 1968 (1687th plenary meeting). His country was among those contributing to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and had fully complied with the embargo on the shipment of arms to South Africa, enacting special legislation to that end.

29. His delegation had taken note with great satisfaction of the anti-apartheid information activities and warmly supported the Special Committee's proposals for the vigorous promotion of the international campaign to disseminate information on the evils of apartheid. He recalled that, at the 562nd meeting of the Committee, in 1967, his delegation had emphasized the necessity of intensifying all efforts tending to enlighten world public opinion in that connexion.

30. His delegation believed that no progress could be made unless the question of apartheid was examined in all its aspects and in the context of the present state of international relations, including economic relationships. All countries of the world had long since developed an extremely complex network of neutral ties in all sectors of economic co-operation. It was unnecessary to emphasize the contribution of that co-operation to better understanding between peoples and the avoidance of dangerous political crises. The subtly interwoven fabric of international trading patterns was such that it was impossible to impose restrictions in one sector of a country's commerce without damaging other sectors and the general

^{3/} Final Act of the International Conference on Human Rights (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.XIV.2), chap. II.

trend of that country's economy as well as hampering the trade and development of all the other countries with which it was connected. The consequences of such restrictions could not be exactly assessed in advance but no country should underestimate them, as the world was ever-increasingly inter-dependent.

31. His delegation had doubts as to the effectiveness of the impact that strong trade restrictions might have upon the South African economy and was concerned as to their possible political consequences throughout southern Africa—particularly as it doubted seriously that the severance of economic ties with South Africa could cause a collapse likely to alter that Government's present political course. Aware as it was of the extremely rigid position of the Pretoria authorities regarding apartheid, his delegation did not think that the Committee could consider its future approach to that policy without considering how South Africa would react to a deterioration of its trade with other countries. Risks could be taken only if they offered a certainty of substantial progress in other fields. His delegation feared that, in the present case, the Committee could be certain only of dangerously aggravating the problem and perhaps delaying, rather than accelerating, its solution.

32. His country had always joined fully in the general moral condemnation of apartheid. Many appeals had been addressed to the Security Council to take action under Chapter VII of the Charter and his delegation held that the Council was the only organ empowered to establish, in a legal context, the gravity of the policies adopted by South Africa and to draw the appropriate conclusions. The Council's competence and freedom of decision should therefore be strictly respected. In fact, it was the only body which could impose obligations on Member States.

33. His delegation did not consider that the General Assembly's debates and resolutions on apartheid had been totally ineffective. They had testified to the moral and social isolation of South Africa in the world—as that Government was aware. No country could long remain in that position; it must inevitably join other countries in the ever-developing work of international collaboration, even if that came about through a gradual process of modification of its own structures and policies. That process must be encouraged. As had been pointed out at the present session by the representatives of Brazil (600th meeting) and Mexico (606th meeting), South Africa was not monolithic; several groups within the white minority had already protested against the policies of apartheid. The United Nations should show its solidarity with those groups. The intensification of the information campaign suggested by the Special Committee should take account of the rising generation of South African youth who must be shown where the true interests and future of South Africa lay.

34. Mr. RUMBOS (Venezuela) felt that his delegation had no need to reiterate its condemnation and repudiation of apartheid. The Committee must face the realities of the situation. It must take the Charter as its fundamental dogma and, if that instrument was to be respected, the Committee could not continue the ritual drafting of resolutions which were ineffective or not implemented. It was a cruel fact that there

had been little, if any, progress towards an equitable, rapid solution of the problem. Indeed, there was evidence of a continuing deterioration in the situation. The only alternative was a change of approach. Either the United Nations could reaffirm everything that had proved to be ineffective or, having faith in its Charter and aware of its own strength, it could correct its methods and approach.

35. The reasons why the endeavours of the United Nations had proved ineffective were common knowledge. Certain major Powers, while morally accepting draft resolutions by voting in favour of them as a whole, did not join with the majority of delegations in the effective application of them because they systematically abstained from voting on the most important paragraphs. His delegation therefore suggested that, with the Committee Chairman's co-operation, those same Powers might reach agreement, within the limits described by their ability to do so and their own interests, on the degree of co-operation which they were able to guarantee. They could thus submit a practical formula allowing them to join effectively with the remaining delegations in obtaining the desired results.

36. His delegation urged those Powers to prepare such a formula and submit it to the Committee as a new approach to a possible collective dogma which would lead to a settlement of the problem and spare the Committee the tedium of adopting ineffective resolutions.

37. Mr. AL-DAOUD (Iraq) said that his delegation had carefully studied the report of the Special Committee (A/7254) and other relevant documents. The picture that had emerged during the debate was bleak and bore out his delegation's worst forebodings. It was all the more alarming in view of the fact that General Assembly resolution 2307 (XXII) appeared virtually ineffective and that South Africa had persisted in the implementation of its apartheid policies. Paragraphs 23 and 24 of annex II of the Special Committee's report gave details of the continued implementation of apartheid and, together with the information in the remainder of that annex, confirmed what had already been established. The South African Government was adamant in flouting United Nations resolutions, world public opinion and the African majority's rights.

38. There were several obvious reasons for the South African attitude. His delegation concurred with the conclusion in paragraph 104 of the Special Committee's report which pointed out that the reluctance of the main trading partners of South Africa to join in effective international action had encouraged the racist régime to persist in its obnoxious policies. Encouraged by such tacit support, South Africa had not only pursued its policies internally but had extended them, sponsoring the infamous entente with the colonial Government of Portugal and the illegal minority régime of Southern Rhodesia. It was inevitable that South Africa should extend its intervention all over southern Africa seeking to build a southern African bloc under its hegemony as the Special Committee had pointed out in paragraph 17 of annex II of its report.

39. It was extremely doubtful that such an extension could fail to involve the infringement of the territorial integrity of neighbouring African States and ultimately threaten their independence. Indeed, such was the declared policy of the South African Government whose spokesman had claimed that the Zambezi was South Africa's security border. It was hardly necessary to emphasize the sinister connotations of the term "security border". The South African Government's policy would invariably endanger the world's peace and set an example for other forces of aggression. On 6 November 1968, The New York Times had reported the Israel Prime Minister as stating in the Israel Parliament that the river Jordan would be Israel's "security frontier".

40. His delegation fully endorsed the Special Committee's conclusions and recommendations and would contribute to any concerted endeavour by the international community to combat the evils of apartheid. It would support any draft resolution to that end which demonstrated the determination of Member States to end apartheid. It would particularly welcome a draft resolution emphasizing the following: first, the necessity for the indigenous and non-white peoples of southern Africa to enjoy the exercise of their natural right to self-determination and national independence and the legitimacy of their struggle for the restoration of their human and political rights; secondly, the necessity for the Security Council to make a fresh appraisal of the situation, particularly in view of the ineffective implementation of the arms embargo; thirdly, the necessity for adopting further measures to impress upon the Government of South Africa the futility of its apartheid policies both internally and externally; fourthly, the necessity to secure the co-operation of all Member States and international organizations in the effective implementation of all the measures designed to put an end to the policies of apartheid.

41. His delegation was motivated by its desire to apply the principles of the Charter, its alarm at the evils of apartheid and its genuine concern that that policy might manifest itself in forms other than racial discrimination.

42. Mr. ERELL (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the remarks of the representative of Iraq were perhaps not surprising in view of Iraq's relations with the nazi régime during the

Second World War and the policies followed by its Government with respect to the Kurdish people. He quoted Le Monde of 12 October 1968 which reported the leader of the Kurdish people as refusing to supply Kurdish fighters to fight Israel because the Iraqi Government had been trying to annihilate the Kurdish people. As to the press report of a statement by the Prime Minister of Israel, he suggested that the Iraqi delegation should leave such matters to the Secretary-General's Special Representative who was dealing with the question of making peace between Jordan and Israel. The Iraqi delegation would do better to call for peace in the Middle East.

43. Mr. AL-DAOUD (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he wished to reject the claim which the Israel representative had just stated. The Arabs and Kurds were living in complete fraternity in Iraq and all that the Israel representative had said related to purely internal matters which concerned the Iraqi Government.

44. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) observed that the record should show that the representative of Israel had been unable to refute the arguments adduced by the representative of Iraq in drawing a parallel between the practice of apartheid and the Zionist practices in occupied Palestine. As to his reference to the Second World War, the Iraqi régime which had tried to collaborate with the Nazis had been overthrown by the Iraqi People.

45. Mr. ERELL (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that in some respects even the relatively progressive country of Lebanon could learn a lesson from the way people lived in Israel. He drew the Committee's attention to a report in The New York Times of 28 October 1968 concerning a decree passed by the Government of Iraq under which any non-Arab citizen of Iraq would no longer be eligible to work for the Government or a State-controlled enterprise after 31 December 1968. That was a good example of the attitude of the Government of Iraq to human rights.

46. The CHAIRMAN repeated his appeal to members of the Committee to confine their remarks to the item under discussion; although the use of analogy was quite valid, it should not be carried excessively far.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.