

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records

**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 538th  
MEETING**

Friday, 9 December 1966,  
at 3.25 p.m.



**NEW YORK**

**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> | 229  |

**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/L.135, A/SPC/L.136)

1. Mr. ANUP SINGH (India) said that although representatives of the great majority of States had for the past twenty years expressed condemnation of the policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa, no solution was in sight. The problem had become more serious than ever and the situation had grown worse as a result of the assistance which South Africa was providing to the racist and colonialist régimes in Southern Rhodesia and the Portuguese territories. Owing to the support given it by the Western world, the Republic of South Africa was becoming a powerful citadel of racism and a new spearhead of the reactionary forces of colonialism and imperialism in southern Africa. India had taken political and economic measures to combat South Africa's racist policies long before the General Assembly and the Security Council had recommended action to end apartheid. It had implemented all recommendations of the General Assembly and the Security Council and had severed all diplomatic and commercial relations with the Republic of South Africa. It had consistently opposed the granting of loans to the South African Government and South African companies by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Despite all the efforts of the United Nations and other organizations, nothing had yet been accomplished.

2. The reports of the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa, including the report of October 1966 (A/6486), clearly showed that the oppression and exploitation of the indigenous population had been greatly intensified. Mr. Ngcobo, Treasurer-General of the Pan-Africanist Congress (South Africa) in his

statement to the Committee (533rd meeting), had described the conditions now prevailing in South Africa. It should be noted that the South African authorities were taking new measures designed to eliminate all opposition. The economic position of the indigenous population was worse than ever, and the land areas reserved for Whites had been further increased, with the result that South Africa's indigenous inhabitants, who represented 87 per cent of the population, had only 13 per cent of the land. Repressive measures had increased since the decision of the International Court of Justice concerning South West Africa.<sup>1/</sup> In addition, the policy of apartheid was being extended to the neighbouring territories of South West Africa and Southern Rhodesia, and the latter's illegal régime was being actively supported by the South African Government.

3. His delegation believed that it was the moral and material support, both direct and indirect, being given to the South African régime by certain major Western Powers that had caused the situation to become so dangerous. Without that support, the 3 million racists of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia could not possibly defy the world's 3,000 million people. In numerous resolutions, especially resolutions 1761 (XVII) of 6 November 1962 and 2054 (XX) of 15 December 1965, the General Assembly had called upon all Member States to take certain political and economic measures against the Republic of South Africa in order to compel it to end its policies of apartheid. His delegation had unequivocally supported those resolutions and wished to reiterate the urgent need for their implementation. It also felt that the Security Council should take enforcement action under Chapter VII of the Charter. Since it was generally recognized that the universal and effective application of certain economic measures would compel the South African régime to comply with the United Nations resolutions, his delegation attached great importance to the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions calling for economic sanctions and an embargo on the sale of military equipment to South Africa. It deplored the attitude of South Africa's main trading partners, which, by refusing to serve on the Special Committee, were giving direct encouragement to the South African Government to persist in its racial policies. South Africa's powerful allies were prepared to sacrifice human rights and disregard all humanitarian considerations rather than give up the profits they derived from their trade with South Africa. They should not trade human rights for commercial profit. His delegation appealed to those Western Powers which were permanent

<sup>1/</sup> South West Africa, Second Phase, Judgment, I. C. J. Reports 1966, p. 6.

members of the Security Council to agree to serve on the Special Committee.

4. His delegation had great sympathy for the innocent victims of the inhuman policy of apartheid. It appreciated the contributions made by Member States to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, to which India would contribute 25,000 rupees. It fully endorsed the conclusions of the seminar on apartheid held at Brasilia in August and September 1966 and endorsed the idea of launching an international campaign against apartheid. It would support any United Nations measures designed to put an end to the evil practices of apartheid in the Republic of South Africa.

5. Mr. MANDEFRO (Ethiopia), introducing draft resolution A/SPC/L.136, which related to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, said on behalf of the sponsors that the resolution was in effect a continuation of General Assembly resolution 2054 B (XX). By adopting the latter resolution by an overwhelming majority, States Members had shown that they wished to provide practical assistance to persons who were persecuted because of their opposition to apartheid. As the Chairman of the Trust Fund's Committee of Trustees had recently stated in the Special Political Committee (530th meeting), it was essential to increase the resources available to the Fund, whose purpose was not to solve the social and political problems of apartheid but to meet humanitarian needs. Contributions to the Trust Fund did not relieve Member States of the obligation to fight for the elimination of apartheid. It should be emphasized that international aid to the victims of apartheid gave moral support to everyone working for racial equality and social justice. He noted that the Trust Fund's current reserves amounted to only \$46,000, which was very little in comparison with what was needed.

6. The members of the Committee were aware of the Vorster régime's unyielding determination to stifle the legitimate desire for freedom of the indigenous inhabitants of South Africa. Aid to the victims of apartheid was essential, and it was those humanitarian considerations that had prompted his own and other delegations to submit their draft resolution to the Committee. The Special Committee's report made it clear how greatly the victims of apartheid needed help. The draft resolution was a straight forward text, and its sponsors hoped that it would be adopted unanimously.

7. Mr. NABER (Jordan) congratulated the Special Committee on its report. He said that Jordan was in the forefront of the countries calling for the liquidation of racial discrimination, and it made no distinction between the problem of apartheid in South Africa and the situations existing in Angola, Southern Rhodesia and Palestine. In all those cases a minority group had come to a country and settled there and had subsequently expelled many of the inhabitants or had oppressed them by depriving them of their basic rights. The conditions under which the indigenous population of South Africa was living were well known, and it was unfortunate to note that the United Nations, which had been dealing with the problem for twenty years, had failed to make any progress. The reason why no agreement had been reached with regard to concerted action was that the Western Powers had

not been able to solve the dilemma of choosing between their financial interests and respect for their obligations. Thus, despite all the appeals which had been made to it, the South African Government persisted, with increasing harshness and determination, in carrying out its policies of oppression and exploitation. South Africa was also adamantly extending its policies to the neighbouring countries, including the Mandated Territory of South West Africa. That kind of conduct posed a threat to South Africa's neighbours and strengthened the position of the rebel régime in Southern Rhodesia. The situation that was developing in South Africa was fraught with the danger of setting all of Africa on fire and of leading to bloodshed there and it was likewise a threat to international peace and security. Realizing that danger, the Security Council had since 1960 adopted numerous resolutions providing, in particular, for the imposition of an arms embargo on South Africa. Also, the General Assembly had recommended the application of economic and diplomatic measures against that country. Those resolutions and recommendations had unfortunately remained a dead letter because certain big Powers had refused to comply with them. Although those Powers had condemned the South African régime by voting for the resolutions in question, they continued to be that country's trading partners. The \$20 million loan that the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development had granted to South Africa, in violation of the General Assembly recommendations, was a further insult to the victims of apartheid. His delegation wished to associate itself with the conclusions arrived at by the Special Committee (see A/6486, chap. IV) and with the recommendations of the seminar on apartheid (see A/6412, sect. III), particularly the recommendations for an international campaign against apartheid under the auspices of the United Nations. A campaign of that kind could enlighten world public opinion on the dangers and disasters of apartheid, and the time for such a campaign was overdue. His delegation fully supported draft resolution A/SPC/L.135.

8. Mr. VIERA LINARES (Cuba) said that it was apparent from the reports submitted by the Special Committee and from the testimony of Mr. Ngcobo, Treasurer-General of the Pan-Africanist Congress (South Africa), that the United Nations had not yet been able to achieve any results with regard to apartheid. The exploitation and oppression of the non-Whites was continuing, and increasingly severe measures were being taken to keep them under a racist régime of economic exploitation. All the evidence indicated that the racist régime of Pretoria had devised new forms of oppression and torture. None of the resolutions previously adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council had been able to prevent the Government of South Africa from systematically pursuing its illegal policies.

9. It was obvious that the Government was being protected by the Western Powers, chief among which were the United States and its trading partners. The United States was not only giving the Pretoria régime economic support, but was also contributing to the expansion of its military forces, which were already much larger than those of its immediate neighbours. Such a policy was not altogether surprising on the

part of a country that was waging a criminal war in Viet-Nam and which, at all times and in all places, opposed the forces of progress with the aid of racism, colonialism and neo-colonialism. There was likewise no doubt on the score of what country dominated certain international agencies that were providing economic aid to the Government of South Africa.

10. At the time of the revolution in 1959, the Cuban people, who were a multiracial people, had abolished all forms of discrimination. It was to be noted that the Government of the United States, which, on account of its trade and its investments, favoured the policies of apartheid, was now submitting Cuba to an illegal economic blockade.

11. Although some delegations had expressed the fear that acts of violence might erupt in South Africa, the fact was that violence already existed there. According to the Special Committee's report, "Indefinite imprisonment without trial, solitary confinement and ill-treatment in prison, arbitrary banishment and house-arrest, trials and harsh sentences under racist laws and mass removals of communities have become normal features in the administration of South Africa." (See A/6486, para. 107.) There could be no peace in a country where 11 million human beings continued to be subjected to arbitrary rule, nor for so long as the Pretoria régime continued to support the fight against the liberation movements in Angola and Mozambique or to support the illegal government of Southern Rhodesia.

12. The Cuba Government believed that revolutionary violence must be the response to counter-revolutionary violence, and it was prepared to give every kind of moral and material support to the people of South Africa in their fight against colonialism. Liberation and armed revolutionary struggle were the only possibilities open to the people of South Africa if they were to put an end to the policies of apartheid and to destroy the racist régime and expel its supporters.

13. Mr. KOFI (Ghana) recalled that the General Assembly, at its twentieth session, had decided to enlarge the Special Committee by the addition of six members to be appointed by the President of the General Assembly, but that of the nineteen countries invited, only the Soviet Union and Denmark had accepted to serve on the Committee. The difficulties faced by the Organization arose from the contradictory positions taken by the States which would have been in a position to use their influence to resolve the problem of apartheid peacefully. In that regard, the attitude of the United States was quite revealing. Senator Barrett O'Hara, the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs of the United States House of Representatives, had declared in March 1966 that the United States Government, despite its positive position on the immorality of apartheid, took the position that apartheid did not constitute a threat to peace, the kind of threat that would properly bring the matter before the Security Council of the United Nations. At the same time, Mr. G. Mennen Williams, the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, had said that the broad aims of United States policy towards South Africa were essentially political; that the United States supported freedom, equality and

justice for the people of South Africa, just as it did everywhere, because that was in accord with its heritage; and that in the opinion of the United States there must be renewed efforts to initiate in South Africa a peaceful, evolutionary process towards those goals. However, in the reply which, three months later, it had addressed to the President of the General Assembly, the United States Government had said that it was not prepared to take part in the work of the Special Committee.

14. With regard to the United Kingdom, the earnings from its trade with South Africa had risen from £36 million in 1962 to £61.7 million in 1964 and were still increasing, and South African investment in the United Kingdom was in excess of £100 million. At the same time, United Kingdom spokesmen continued to condemn apartheid in very strong language. Lord Caradon, for example, had said in the General Assembly (1448th plenary meeting) that he hoped the South African Government would acquiesce in the recommendations of the General Assembly and carry them out, but that if it did not, the factors which he had emphasized in the Committee regarding coercive action under Chapter VII of the Charter continued to apply. The attitude of France, which had indicated that the question of apartheid was not really important and that the United Nations had no business to interfere, was little more encouraging. France continued to ignore all resolutions on the ground that most of them had been adopted illegally. The cynicism of the great Powers seemed to be spreading to some countries of Latin America. There were reports that Venezuela was shipping more oil to South Africa and that the South African Government had obtained concessions in Venezuela. The Argentine Government, for its part, had said that it abhorred apartheid but that that abhorrence was no reason for disturbing Argentina's long-standing trade with South Africa. Argentina expected to increase its volume of trade with South Africa and to sell it oil, in particular; small wonder then, that Argentina had refused to join the Special Committee.

15. His delegation solemnly appealed to all Governments to change their attitude and to reconsider their positions on that grave matter. It supported the Special Committee's recommendations for it believed that the problem of apartheid would only be resolved peacefully if the United Nations imposed economic sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. Some representatives had warned about the dangers of economic sanctions, but no alternative had been proposed. The situation in southern Africa was explosive and if the problem of apartheid was not resolved peacefully as soon as possible, it would resolve itself in violence and considerations of trade would then have little importance. His delegation hoped that draft resolution A/SPC/L.135 would be adopted unanimously, so as to convince the South African racists that all members of the Committee believed in the principle of the equality of the races.

16. Mr. HILLEL (Israel), after reviewing the historical background of the resolutions on apartheid, said that the problem before the United Nations was no longer how to convince but what to do in the face of a situation that had steadily deteriorated. Un-

questionably, apartheid was not an African problem only, and doctrines of that kind were a danger to mankind as a whole; yet while apartheid was unacceptable to all, it was certainly intolerable to the Africans. On that question, the position of Israel, which had supported all the resolutions adopted against apartheid, was the instinctive reaction of its people which for 2,000 years had suffered persecution on racial grounds and which could not forget its recent dreadful experience. For every Jew and for every Israeli, discrimination could only be regarded as the most shameful and dangerous expression of inhumanity. In that, the people of Israel shared the feelings of the African people. Those same sentiments had recently been expressed by the Prime Minister of Israel when visiting Liberia. However, Israel had also spoken out in the name of sanity itself, in opposition to the insanity represented by the inhumanity of apartheid and it was that feeling which Martin Buber and other Israeli writers had invoked in an appeal to the South African Government.

17. That appeal, like many others and like the United Nations resolutions themselves, had been disregarded. It was therefore the Organization's duty to draw a balance of the situation since the previous session. One encouraging event that had taken place since then was the attainment of independence by Botswana and Lesotho. But that was the only encouraging note. As far as the rest of southern Africa was concerned, there was no indication of improvement; on the contrary, the situation was deteriorating. In the Republic of South Africa itself the situation was really frightening. When it was borne in mind also that the decision of the International Court of Justice with regard to South West Africa was discouraging, that the development of the problem of Southern Rhodesia was fraught with dangerous consequences and that the struggle continued in Angola and Mozambique, there were no grounds whatever for optimism.

18. It was obvious that the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia would not have dared to contradict the voices of wisdom if it had not had the backing of the Republic of South Africa. The whole region was now a source of grave international dangers. Furthermore, in order to enforce its apartheid policy, the Republic of South Africa was obliged to use even more brutal measures against the population. The threat to international peace and security was thus becoming more imminent. Yet it was very doubtful whether another resolution alone could bring about any change. Nevertheless, the Committee had no right to abandon its task. It was its duty to raise its voice against racism and apartheid and to do whatever was in its power to eliminate that shameful practice. His delegation would support any resolution which had that purpose. Moreover, Israel would contribute to any programme of aid to the refugees from South Africa, as it had contributed in 1965 to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa.

19. Mr. SHEVCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that since the policy of apartheid flouted the fundamental principles of the Charter, it was the duty of the United Nations to continue studying the problem until it had been completely eliminated. Defying the Organization's decisions and the protests of world public opinion, the Government of

the Republic of South Africa was further reinforcing the inhuman policy of apartheid and inventing even more brutal forms of repression against all who opposed it. During the past year thousands of persons had been imprisoned, humiliated, maltreated and tortured and a large number had been executed. The arbitrary judgement against Abram Fischer had aroused universal indignation. Mr. Vorster, the new Prime Minister of South Africa, was guided by Nazi principles in the repressive measures he was taking against the opposition. The police had full powers and could imprison indefinitely any person suspected of "terrorist" or "communist" activities. Under the notorious 180-day law, potential witnesses for the prosecution could be imprisoned for six months. Moreover, the South African Government's activities were not confined to the territory of South Africa, as evidenced by the Prime Minister's cynical statement that South Africa did not recognize the United Nations resolution withdrawing its mandate over South West Africa (2145 (XXI)) and intended to continue its rule over that territory.

20. The Special Committee's report showed clearly the responsibility of South Africa's major trading partners for the failure of United Nations efforts to force the South African Government to renounce its policy of apartheid by imposing economic sanctions. In fact, those Powers were strengthening the racist régime in Pretoria by providing it with the means of building up a vast apparatus for repression, and of arming and preparing for aggression against the African countries. In an April 1966 number of The New York Times it had been reported that there were 247 American companies in South Africa, some of them making a profit of 20 per cent on their investments. Three hundred and fifty British firms had subsidiaries in that country. According to the Ambassador of the Republic of South Africa at Washington, United States exports to his country had reached a record figure of \$438 million in 1965. There was no need to look further to find the reason for the United States Government's indifference to the elimination of apartheid. As the Guinean representative had indicated, South Africa's trading partners were speculators profiting from apartheid and battenning on the blood and sweat of the non-Whites of South Africa.

21. One of the most important of those partners was West Germany, which was providing military, economic and technical assistance to the racist régime. The monopolies of the Federal Republic of Germany controlled the uranium industry in South Africa and, working with South African specialists, were studying ways and means of producing up-to-date rockets and chemical and atomic weapons. Such an attitude contrasted with that of the German Democratic Republic, which condemned apartheid and unreservedly supported the measures recommended by the United Nations concerning South Africa. Thus, the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the German Democratic Republic had informed the Chairman of the Special Committee that his country had discontinued all trade and navigation with the Republic of South Africa since June 1963 (see A/AC.115/L.119).

22. The Ukrainian delegation was greatly disturbed to find that, in spite of resolution 2054 A (XX), in

which the General Assembly requested the specialized agencies to refrain from assisting South Africa, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development had granted South Africa numerous loans, amounting in all to \$241.8 million. It associated itself with the delegations which considered that the United Nations should ask the Bank to reconsider its decision. The Ukrainian delegation also supported the Afro-Asian proposal that the Special Committee should continue its work.

23. In order to induce the South African régime to renounce its racist policies, the United Nations must decide unanimously to apply economic and political sanctions against it. The Ukrainian delegation therefore joined with all countries demanding effective action aimed at a speedy elimination of apartheid and considered that the General Assembly should recommend the Security Council to take the measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter.

24. Mr. KLUSAK (Czechoslovakia) said he would like to state his country's position on the question of apartheid, for two reasons. First the Czech people had been one of the first victims of Hitlerite aggression, and knew from experience what racism meant. It therefore supported any energetic measures that might be taken to ensure the elimination of racism wherever it existed. Secondly, it realized that the apartheid régime threatened international peace and security and that the States Members of the United Nations, by virtue of the obligations they had contracted under the terms of the Charter, were obliged to make every effort to remove that threat.

25. The evidence and statements which the Committee had heard enabled a picture to be formed of the present régime in South Africa. It was a country equipped with modern industry, yet where barbaric and outdated principles inspired by the worst forms of imperialism and colonialism held sway. Under the banner of anti-communism, the Pretoria régime was trying to mobilize the reactionary forces in the country and to stifle all progress, while posing as a parliamentary democracy—albeit reserved for a privileged white minority.

26. In its resolutions, and particularly in resolution 2054 (XX), the General Assembly had stressed the deterioration of the situation in South Africa and had recommended a series of measures aimed at eliminating the policies of apartheid. Unfortunately, not only had those resolutions not been implemented, but apartheid had been strengthened still further. The appeals addressed to South Africa's major trading partners, in particular the United Kingdom, the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany, had remained unheeded. On the contrary, there had been a tendency to increase trade between several Western countries and South Africa. The attitude of the German Democratic Republic was in striking contrast to that of those countries and particularly to that of the Federal Republic of Germany. Whereas the latter had large interests in South Africa and was intensifying its activities there, the other German State had broken off all trade relations and all communications with South Africa since June 1963 and was strictly observing all the United Nations resolutions.

27. It should be noted that the provision in General Assembly resolution 2054 A (XX) for increasing the number of members of the Special Committee had remained inoperative because of the refusal of several Western countries. Finally, contrary to that same resolution, in which the specialized agencies were requested to refrain from giving economic and technical aid to South Africa, the International Bank had granted eleven loans to the Republic of South Africa, amounting to \$241.8 million.

28. The racist South African Government was actively supported by reactionary elements in the principal Western countries, whose representatives criticized the apartheid régime in order to appease the indignation of the African countries, though in fact they had no intention of taking effective measures for its suppression. The countries concerned were strengthening that régime through their investments in South Africa. The problem was thus political in nature; the Powers with economic ties with South Africa must cease lending support to the South African racists, and must act in accordance with their obligations as Members of the United Nations and members of the Security Council. It was time to take effective measures to put an end to apartheid, and the Security Council must therefore be asked to adopt all-embracing and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter.

29. The Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was applicable to South Africa, and the Organization's first duty was to give effect to the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and to take measures corresponding to the recommendations appearing in paragraphs 200-207 of the report of the Special Committee (see A/6486, chap. V).

30. Czechoslovakia was prepared to do everything it could to carry out the measures provided for. As far back as 1963, it had closed its Consulate General in Johannesburg. In implementation of the resolutions of the Organization, it had broken off all trade with South Africa; at the same time, it had offered ten scholarships to South African students to enable them to attend courses at Czech universities. It had contributed a sum of \$2,000 to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa.

31. In resolution 2105 (XX), the General Assembly had recognized that "the continuation of colonial rule and the practice of apartheid as well as all forms of racial discrimination threaten international peace and security and constitute a crime against humanity". That declaration was pregnant with meaning and called for urgent action on the part of the Organization. It was consequently essential that all States should support measures capable of putting a speedy end to the racist régime of apartheid, which violated human rights, the United Nations Charter and the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

32. Mr. FATTAL (Syria) said it was abundantly clear from the report of the Special Committee (A/6486) and from the no less important report of the seminar on apartheid (A/6412) that the situation in South Africa was fraught with real danger and seriously threatened international peace and security.

The report of the Special Committee proved beyond any doubt that racial conflict was inevitable if the South African Government persisted in seeking to impose its racial domination. The report also emphasized the collusion existing between South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Portugal. His Government whole-heartedly supported the Special Committee's conclusion that the bulkwork of racism must be destroyed and a non-racial society established based on respect for the human person.

33. His Government's position had always been perfectly clear. Syria had been one of the first countries to break off all international relations with South Africa. It did not regard apartheid as an independent social phenomenon but as a particular manifestation of colonialism and imperialism, indeed, as one of the most advanced stages of colonialism. It knew from its own experience of colonialism, imperialism and their most hateful manifestation, Zionism, that foreign interests would not hesitate to use any methods, however immoral, to strengthen their hold on lands and peoples that did not belong to them.

34. Mr. HILLEL (Israel), speaking on a point of order, asked whether the Committee proposed to reopen the debate on the Palestine question, on which all delegations had had the opportunity to express their views. If some representatives were determined to broaden the area of the debate, the Israel delegation would raise other important problems which also related to colonialism, racism and discrimination.

35. The CHAIRMAN recalled that it had been agreed on the previous day not to reopen the discussion on a question which had already been debated. He requested the Syrian representative to continue his statement, bearing that decision in mind.

36. Mr. FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the Israel delegation had gone out of its way to disturb the work of the Committee. It seemed to him perfectly justifiable to draw a parallel between Zionism and apartheid.

37. Mr. DOSUMU-JOHNSON (Liberia) said that the Committee was dealing with a clear and well-defined question. It was essential not to stray from the point if the Committee was to meet the deadlines set for the study of the other items on its agenda.

38. Mr. FATTAL (Syria), continuing his statement, said it was no accident that the various forms of colonialism were supported by imperialist forces in a number of Western countries. The report of the Special Committee (A/6486) and that of the seminar on apartheid (A/6412) denounced the ties existing between the self-styled defenders of democracy and those guilty of crimes against humanity. The Special Committee noted in its report that the major trading partners of South Africa had increased their profitable collaboration with the South African Government and must therefore be held responsible for the deterioration of the situation in southern Africa as a whole. The report of the seminar on apartheid was even more revealing; it confirmed once more the connivance of the imperialist and neo-imperialist Powers with South Africa's white minority régime.

It sufficed to read the reservations made by those Powers on the recommendations adopted by the great majority of participants to understand their reluctance to take any practical action. Their categorical refusal to collaborate with the Special Committee was additional proof of their guilty conscience.

39. In the face of that permanent threat to international peace and security, it would be logical for the Security Council to adopt the measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter; but some permanent members, which were at the same time South Africa's major trading partners, strongly opposed such action and invoked Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter, dealing with the principle of non-interference. His delegation rejected those legalistic arguments, for it believed that neither the spirit nor the letter of the Charter would prevent the Security Council from declaring that a threat to the peace existed. Its view was emphatically confirmed by the testimony of Mr. Ngcobo, the representative of the Pan-Africanist Congress, and by the statements of most delegations. If the subjugation of an entire people, repression, and violation of human rights did not create the risk of a racial conflict whose consequences could be foreseen even today, one wondered what other situation could be considered a threat to international peace and security.

40. Nevertheless a number of Western Powers, indifferent to the danger posed by the situation in South Africa, were increasing their investments in that country. The International Bank, an agency associated with the United Nations, had gone so far as to extend loans to the Pretoria régime, disregarding the Organization's most elementary principles.

41. All means of dissuasion and persuasion had brought no success thus far. On the contrary, the only effect of the moderate approach had been to encourage South Africa to extend the odious apartheid system to South West Africa. Therefore, without prejudging the outcome of the heroic struggle of the peoples of southern Africa for liberation, his delegation unreservedly endorsed all the recommendations of the Special Committee and those contained in draft resolution A/SPC/L.135. In its view, it was essential to adopt the measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter and, first of all, to apply universal mandatory economic sanctions. However, if the Security Council should prove unable to take that decision, which was the only peaceful way to eliminate apartheid, the Syrian Arab Republic would give the people of South Africa its full support in promoting the triumph of their just cause.

42. Mr. KAMARA (Mauritania) congratulated the Special Committee on the objectivity of its report and on its tireless efforts to find concrete solutions.

43. Even though all Member States had condemned discrimination in all its forms when they signed the Charter, the United Nations had tried in vain through its resolutions to bring the Pretoria authorities to their senses. Since the acquisition of power by the National Party in 1948, the situation had grown steadily worse. A long series of discriminatory and harassing laws and measures had been adopted in respect of the non-white peoples; among them were the denial of representation in Parliament, the crea-



tion of reserved areas, the classification of the population into racial groups, the pass laws and, most recently, the bill prohibiting universities from rejecting applications for admission from all individuals who practised or recommended discrimination. Those measures constituted a pattern of inhuman repression under which arbitrary detention and arrest were everyday occurrences.

44. A number of authors, including Miss Mary Benson and Mr. Frantz Lee, had given the Special Committee living testimony on that situation. In Look magazine, only a short time earlier, Senator Robert Kennedy, after a stay in South Africa, had described the land of apartheid as a land of oppression and sadness, darkness and cruelty and deplored the fact that one of its most illustrious citizens, Albert Luthuli, winner of the Nobel Prize, was condemned to live in isolation from his compatriots. The French journalist Gilbert Comte, in an article entitled "Journey to the Land of Apartheid" published in Le Monde on 3 and 4 November 1966, had painted a distressing picture of the situation and condition of the black man, who "is compelled to live within the narrow horizons of his own race, doomed to a life of abasement".

45. Yet those men, whose dignity had been profoundly affronted, had spared no effort to restore equality and justice by peaceful means. The African National Congress and the Pan-Africanist Congress had both proclaimed through their most eminent representatives the desire of Africans to build a free and democratic society in which every individual's rights would be respected. Today, as the statement of Mr. Ngcobo, the representative of the Pan-Africanist Congress (533rd meeting), had made clear, the only logical choice open to the South African people, in the face of the white minority's obstinacy, was to fight for its freedom. Yet to prevent that final resort to violence it would suffice if all of South Africa's trading partners finally acknowledged their responsibilities and other Powers recognized the precariousness of their profits. It would be enough if all States Members of the United Nations decided at last to concern themselves seriously with the state of the South African people and to put an end to its sufferings.

46. Mr. ABDELLAH (Tunisia) thanked the Special Committee for the objective report it had submitted to the General Assembly. The report painted a sombre picture of the South African situation, which was growing progressively worse, particularly because of the most recent police measures instituted by the South African authorities in the vain hope of destroying all desire for independence in the South African people. His delegation's gratitude also went to those who had participated in the seminar on apartheid, held at Brasilia in August and September 1966. The report they had prepared constituted a thorough study of the problem of apartheid.

47. From the moving statement of the South African petitioner, Mr. Ngcobo, the Committee could measure the full extent of the repression to which the South African people were being subjected and could see that the indigenous peoples were determined to rid themselves of the racist Pretoria régime. In that

struggle the South African people was entitled to the support of all peoples that had risen against national socialism during the Second World War. Indeed, it was to prevent the resurgence of such an ideology that the United Nations had declared themselves determined "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small". And Marshal Smuts himself, one of the men who drew up the Charter, had declared that behind the struggle against nazism there was a moral struggle and the determination to affirm the fundamental rights of mankind.

48. The South African leaders' attitude had since changed and Mr. Daniel Malan had, in fact, quoted nazism in applying the doctrine of apartheid. What the National Party ideologists actually sought, however, was to perpetuate its hegemony and tighten its hold on the South African people. Apartheid was nothing but the basest and most odious form of colonialism, while the establishment of "reservations", which called Hitler's concentration camps to mind, was but one more step in the progressive extermination of the indigenous population.

49. In their drive for expansion, the Pretoria authorities had extended their domination to South West Africa. The illegal occupation of that country in many ways recalled the arbitrary annexation of Austria by Hitler's Government and cast light on the dangerous intentions of the advocates of apartheid. South Africa's aid to the rebel régime at Salisbury was significant. The alliance between Pretoria, Salisbury and Lisbon was a step towards domination of the southern part of Africa and thus constituted a threat to the independence of the neighbouring territories. Botswana and Lesotho were exposed to the risk of political and economic pressures from South Africa such as would render their independence illusory. There was thus a real conspiracy afoot to isolate southern Africa from the rest of the continent and keep the non-European majority under the colonial yoke as long as possible.

50. Thus, both at home and abroad, South Africa was pursuing a policy which endangered international peace and security. The part South African mercenaries had played in the Congolese tragedy was proof, if any were needed, of the Pretoria authorities' aggressive intentions. He hoped that the situation would not be allowed to culminate in a racial confrontation spreading throughout Africa. The General Assembly had so far confined itself to moral condemnation of apartheid. If the United Nations itself was to survive, it must go beyond the stage of moral condemnation. The General Assembly's recommendations remained ineffective because some countries refused to carry them out. South Africa's allies had, moreover, been unable to propose an alternative solution. On the contrary, their passive attitude gave South Africa additional reasons for disregarding the deliberations of the United Nations.

51. It was sad to note that the Western Powers, and in particular three of the permanent members of the Security Council, refused to have recourse to the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter and to agree to a principle of mandatory sanctions, which were

amply justified by the prevailing situation in South Africa and which were the only means of ensuring a peaceful settlement. The failure of all attempts undertaken so far should make the Security Council face its responsibilities and avert the conflict which would soon break out if the necessary measures were not taken. Mr. Ngcobo had answered the fallacious argument that economic sanctions would injure the African inhabitants by saying that in fact they had almost nothing to lose. The truth was that South Africa's trading partners were trying to evade their obligations. His delegation deeply regretted the refusal of the Western great Powers to serve on the Special Committee. While avoiding discussion, those Powers intended to pursue their collaboration with the racists and strengthen the latter's economic and military potential. The immediate profits the great Powers derived from their co-operation with South Africa had prevailed over the ideals to which they claimed to be firmly attached. Under those conditions, Mr. Vorster might well think he was assured of impunity.

52. The Security Council was meeting that week at the request of the United Kingdom to consider the situation in Southern Rhodesia and the imposition of economic sanctions on the Salisbury rebel régime. It should also consider the question of South Africa, because the issue was actually the same in both cases. Any decision which did not also involve South Africa would be doomed to failure and help further to strengthen the alliance between the two countries. The South African rebellion was directed against fundamental human rights and the General Assembly had pronounced it a crime against humanity. It would be an aberration, to say the least, to regard that rebellion as less noxious than that of Mr. Ian Smith.

53. The impotence of the League of Nations in the face of fascist expansionism had brought the world to the brink of destruction. Hitler's spiritual successors were now following the same path. The United Nations must thwart the forces of evil by swift and effective action, if it were not to lose the confidence of mankind.

*Mr. Jimenez (Philippines), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

54. Mr. SAVAGE (Sierra Leone) agreed that the situation in South Africa was continuing to deteriorate, as the report of the Special Committee showed. It was clearer than ever that the policies of apartheid were based on the implacable desire of a minority of 3 million people of European origin to reign permanently over 14 million Africans and Asians. The non-European inhabitants were forced to settle in territory which represented only 13 per cent of the whole area of the country and to continue to provide the white population with cheap labour, which would be all the more tractable in that the creation of "reservations" would make the repression of revolt easier.

55. The policy of separate development could not be justified in any way. Its discriminatory character deprived the non-white inhabitants of their few remaining rights. Family life was deliberately broken

up and the individual was divested of all dignity. Inasmuch as the policy of separate development implied that certain population groups were by nature incapable of advancing at the same pace as the dominant group, and as that policy was imposed by the latter because it wished to perpetuate its economic hold on the country, apartheid was a form of colonialism. Furthermore, as General Assembly resolution 2105 (XX) had stated, apartheid was a "crime against humanity". No freedom was guaranteed in South Africa any more. Wage inequality was an established principle. Africans were forbidden to strike, and freedom of movement was rigorously restricted. There was total segregation in all spheres. The native inhabitants had no property rights or right to education. Worst of all, the Africans were denied, on their own soil, enjoyment of the rights of citizenship.

56. For some time, however, apartheid had been becoming expansionist. The policy had found fertile soil in Southern Rhodesia and was also being extended to the Mandated Territory of South West Africa. Meanwhile South Africa's economy was continuing to thrive and that enabled the Pretoria Government to flout world public opinion. South Africa could thus persist in its policy of apartheid mainly thanks to the support of its major trading partners. The Security Council's call for the cessation of the sale and shipment of military equipment to South Africa had proved ineffective because several States, including at least one permanent member of the Council, France, had flagrantly violated the resolution adopted by the Council. The General Assembly resolutions appealing to Member States to discontinue commercial and diplomatic relations with South Africa were even more openly disregarded; certain countries were still allowing their nationals to trade with South Africa and invest capital there. Those countries also included permanent members of the Security Council. Moreover, it was the same States which were refusing to take part in the work of the Special Committee. Out of the nineteen Member States invited to take part in the Committee's work only one, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, had accepted unconditionally. The refusal of the United States, France and the United Kingdom constituted a most disturbing precedent, especially as the same Member States had not proposed any other effective measures and were continuing to expand their trade with South Africa. It appeared that South Africa's trading partners had decided that their economic interests must take precedence over all other considerations. Thanks to the support it was thus receiving, South Africa had been able to build up its military and police forces in an impressive way, since it had received strategic materials and arms from abroad.

57. Another fact which could not fail to aggravate the situation was that in the case of South West Africa the International Court of Justice had chosen to avoid the vital issues. Its decision had raised serious doubts as to the effectiveness of international justice. While the system of apartheid had been universally condemned, the world seemed unwilling to eradicate the evil.



58. The only possibility of remedying the situation at the present time, short of violence, was an immediate total trade blockade and an interdiction of communications. The efficacy of such measures obviously depended on the goodwill of South Africa's major trading partners. Unfortunately that goodwill appeared to be absent. Some Powers did not yet think that their interests were seriously threatened, and perhaps their attitude would not change until violence had broken out and world peace had been compromised. The international community, however, believed that the policy of apartheid constituted an actual threat to peace and security. The Security Council itself had recognized in August 1963 that the situation in South Africa was seriously disturbing international peace and security. In view of the terminology used in the resolution adopted at that time (181 (1963)), the Council's decision could reasonably be construed as having been taken under Chapter VII of the Charter. The Security Council's decisions were supplemented by the declarations of persons whose opinion was unquestionably very important. The last three Prime Ministers of the United Kingdom had stated that the situation in South Africa contained the seed of a racial conflict of such magnitude that it would seriously trouble international peace and security. At the present time the situation was so inflammable that a relatively minor incident could quickly spark widespread violence. That was a state of affairs of which the world community as a whole, and especially South Africa's main trading partners, must become aware before it was too late.

*Mr. Jakobson (Finland) resumed the Chair.*

59. The CHAIRMAN said that he hoped to be in a position to have circulated at the evening meeting the various draft resolutions and amendments that had been submitted before 12 noon, the time-limit the Committee had set.

60. Mr. GHAUS (Afghanistan) noted that the situation in South Africa had not improved at all. The ruling circles at Pretoria, in complete defiance of United Nations resolutions, were relentlessly pursuing their ruthless policy of racial discrimination, thus depriving the non-white inhabitants of South Africa of their most legitimate rights. The policy of apartheid flouted the norms of civilized conduct and had aroused the indignation of all men of goodwill. In a world which was moving towards integration and better understanding among peoples it was astonishing to see a government, which claimed to be responsible and civilized, relentlessly advocating the strict separation of races within its own frontiers. Admittedly racial discrimination was not confined to South Africa, but the countries where such practices still existed were seeking to eradicate them. The South African Government was the only one which had proclaimed apartheid the official policy of the State. The entire legal apparatus of South Africa was based on that philosophy of hatred and was aimed at perpetuating the domination of the white minority. Apartheid was the pretext and the instrument for continuing the supremacy of the white settlers and the monopoly of the large financial companies which grew rich on the forced labour of the legitimate owners of the

land. The so-called separate development of the Bantu population was merely a deceitful device to restrain the emancipation of the peoples of South Africa and it had, moreover, proved a complete failure.

61. Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter, which the South African Government was constantly invoking to accuse the United Nations of interference in its domestic affairs, had never been intended to cover the policy of discrimination which that Government practised. It was clear that Pretoria's methods were contrary to the rights and fundamental freedoms proclaimed in Articles 1 and 55 of the Charter.

62. It was evident that, on the one hand, the unholy collusion between Portugal, Southern Rhodesia and South Africa and, on the other, the attitude of the main trading partners of South Africa had greatly encouraged the Government of South Africa to cling to its racial policy. History had, however, clearly shown that neither suppression nor punishment could silence the subjugated peoples. His delegation was convinced that the South African Government's policy would have disastrous consequences for the white minority. The policy was corroding not only relations among the peoples of South Africa but also the prospect for peace in the African continent, and it seemed likely that it would lead to a fearful racial conflict.

63. His delegation therefore believed that the General Assembly should endorse by an overwhelming majority the recommendations of the Special Committee's report (see A/6486, chap. V). It should also draw the Security Council's attention to the advisability of action under Chapter VII of the Charter, including the application of mandatory economic sanctions, since that was the only means of achieving a peaceful solution of the problem.

64. It was with those considerations in mind that his delegation had co-sponsored draft resolution A/SPC/L.135.

65. Mr. GOÑI DEMARCHI (Argentina), replying to a question raised by the representative of Ghana, wished to declare most categorically that the facts cited by the latter were greatly exaggerated. It was true that his country had been trading for a long time with South Africa, but the flow of trade had steadily decreased. The volume of trade had fallen from \$7 million five years previously to less than \$2.5 million in 1966.

66. There had never been and never would be any trade in petroleum between the two countries.

67. It was a principle of his country to apply all the United Nations recommendations scrupulously and to observe its commitments to the letter. Consequently he insisted that the name of his country should not be mentioned except for valid reasons duly supported by facts.

68. Following a suggestion by Mr. HILMY (United Arab Republic), the CHAIRMAN asked delegations to exercise their right of reply at the end of the general debate.

*The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.*