

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 331st
MEETING**



Tuesday, 16 October 1962,
at 3.10 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 87:</i>	
<i>The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued):</i>	
(a) <i>Race conflict in South Africa;</i>	
(b) <i>Treatment of people of Indian and Indo-Pakistan origin in the Republic of South Africa</i>	21

Chairman: Mr. Leopoldo BENITES (Ecuador).

AGENDA ITEM 87

The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (A/5167 and Add.1-6) (continued):

- (a) Race conflict in South Africa;
- (b) Treatment of people of Indian and Indo-Pakistan origin in the Republic of South Africa (A/5166, A/5173)

1. Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela) said that as the representative of a country with a long tradition of opposition to racism he could not remain silent when the South African Government's policy of racial discrimination was being discussed. In the Americas the process of the fusion of races had begun with the arrival of the first European explorers and had continued uninterruptedly throughout the period of the struggle for independence and into modern times. The absurd prejudice based on the concept of racial purity and the idea that one ethnic group was entitled to rule over others had never existed in Latin America. Venezuela had never experienced conflict arising out of racial considerations and its Constitution guaranteed the absolute equality of all its citizens regardless of their race.

2. It seemed inconceivable that there should still be anyone seeking to justify a policy whereby a tiny white minority held absolute power over a great non-white majority. In South Africa, moreover, racial discrimination was not simply a matter of government policy but was embodied in legislation imposing intolerable restrictions on the civil rights of the non-white inhabitants. The many restrictive laws with which the Committee was only too familiar had now been supplemented by the General Law Amendment Act under which still further discriminatory measures were being applied.

3. The Assembly had been discussing the question for so many years with so little tangible effect that Members might understandably feel frustrated and pessimistic. The representatives of African countries had repeatedly stated that Africa was a hospitable continent where people of all races were welcome provided they were willing to respect the concepts of human dignity, yet the South African Government

continued to ignore their pleas. Similarly it turned a deaf ear to the warnings of the danger it was courting by arousing the antagonism of its neighbours. Nevertheless, the long years of patient discussion had had two positive results. Firstly, there could no longer be any doubt that the international community not only was competent, but also had the obligation, to concern itself with the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms and that in the case of the problem under discussion the South African Government accordingly could not invoke the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter. Secondly, it had been made unmistakably clear that world public opinion condemned South Africa's racial policy. Those two positive results, together with the steps taken by certain countries to exert moral and material pressure on the Government of South Africa, justified the conclusion that some progress towards a solution of the problem had been made, for no country could remain forever indifferent to world public opinion.

4. Mr. VASQUEZ (Chile) said that the problem of apartheid was one which was of concern to all the members of the international community and which could in no way be considered purely a domestic affair of the Government of South Africa. Reviewing briefly the history of the question in the General Assembly, he noted that the policy had been unanimously condemned by the Members of the Organization. Outside the United Nations, it had been condemned at the Asian-African Conference at Bandung, in April 1955 at the Conference of Independent African States, held in Monrovia in August 1959, and at many other international gatherings. The South African Government's determination to pursue its apartheid policy had cost it its membership in the International Labour Organisation^{1/} and in the Commonwealth. Conversely, Chief Albert Luthuli's struggle against that inhuman system had won him the Nobel Peace Prize in 1960. Those facts demonstrated irrefutably that the policy of apartheid was repudiated by the international community, and that men of all races and ideologies were in agreement that the existence of such a system, representing as it did the absolute negation of the fundamental rights of the individual, could no longer be tolerated.

5. In Chile the equality of all citizens was guaranteed by the Constitution and the laws of the Republic. In Chilean eyes racism was a denial of historical realities, for it was incompatible with recognition of the contribution made by people of many races to that Western civilization of which South Africa claimed to be the defender. The South African Government not only had failed to comply with the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly condemning its policy of apartheid but had gone so far as to try to make it appear that it was the United Nations which was at

^{1/} International Labour Organisation, *Records of Proceedings, Forty-fifth Session*, resolution I.

fault. In doing so it was forgetting that it was the existence of the United Nations which had been the principal factor in saving mankind from a new world war. As for South Africa's charges that the United Nations was ineffective, they were clearly refuted by the Organization's great accomplishments in the cultural and scientific fields, and the impetus which it had given to economic development in all parts of the world. His delegation earnestly appealed to the Government of South Africa both to alter its policy towards the non-white population in accordance with its obligations under the United Nations Charter, and to comply with the many resolutions which had been adopted in that connexion. It did so as the representative of a peace-loving people who feared that the maintenance of the present situation in South Africa would endanger international peace and becloud the future of the newly independent nations of Africa.

6. Mrs. LIONAES (Norway) said that her country regarded the steadily increasing number of newly independent States as a confirmation of the historic process leading to greater freedom for all peoples. The ending of colonial rule was in its opinion the most significant progressive development of the twentieth century and a major contribution to the establishment of lasting peace. Against that background the situation in South Africa was anachronistic and could not continue indefinitely. The South African Government, however, not only refused to abandon its current policies but was even intensifying them, as could be seen from the adoption of the General Law Amendment Act commonly called the Sabotage Act. History taught that all régimes based on violence and discrimination were doomed, yet the South African Government refused to heed that lesson.

7. In conformity with the Norwegian people's belief in, and advocacy of, the policy of settling conflicts by peaceful means, the Norwegian Nobel Peace Prize Committee had awarded the Prize for 1960 to Chief Albert Luthuli because he had refused to resort to violence in his struggle to assert the rights of the non-white inhabitants of South Africa. The action of the South African authorities in denying Mr. Luthuli freedom of speech had caused deep concern in her country.

8. Previous speakers had noted that South Africa's budgetary expenditures for military purposes had been more than doubled during the past two years. In the light of the intensification of apartheid measures it would appear that the main purpose of that military build-up was to make possible the permanent suppression of the non-white element of the population. Her delegation felt that the United Nations should take a new and realistic step towards the peaceful solution of the racial problem in South Africa by seeking to bring that military build-up to an end. It therefore appealed to the countries concerned to discontinue all shipments of arms and other military supplies to South Africa. The accumulation of military power in an area of such acute political and social tensions as existed in South Africa was clearly a threat to international peace. The termination of military shipments to the area would be an effective means of reducing those tensions and thus lessening the danger of an outbreak which could threaten the peace of Africa and of the world as a whole.

9. Mr. CHEEMA (Pakistan) said that his delegation had agreed to the amalgamation into one item of the two questions of race conflict in South Africa and the

treatment there of persons of Indian and Indo-Pakistan origin in order to save time and avoid repetition. Both problems had arisen out of the same policy, but the case of the people of Indo-Pakistan origin was different from that of the rest of the non-white population of South Africa because it involved not only an infringement of human rights but also a violation of contractual rights and treaty obligations. Although those people had migrated to South Africa a century before at the request of the colonial Government, and although statutory provisions safeguarding their rights and privileges had been solemnly affirmed and reaffirmed, the South African Government had for more than twenty years been resorting to discriminatory legislation against them. Those discriminatory measures had culminated in the appointment, on 1 August 1961, of a Minister for Indian Affairs, barring access by people of Indo-Pakistan origin, who had contributed so much to the wealth and prosperity of South Africa, to all the other Ministries. However, the situation of those people was not essentially different from that of the rest of the non-white population of South Africa. The recently adopted Sabotage Act, applied to the non-white population as a whole, accentuated the discrimination only between whites and non-whites.

10. Pakistan's condemnation of apartheid had a wider and a stronger basis than the South African Government's maltreatment of people of Indo-Pakistan origin. Pakistan was an Islamic State and the Islamic ideology stood for equality, freedom and social justice. It completely rejected the concept of racial superiority. Racial discrimination was, therefore, alien and repugnant to Islam and its followers.

11. Previous speakers had already described in detail the deplorable situation obtaining in South Africa as a result of the Government's policy of apartheid. He would merely note that under the latest legislation the definition of "sabotage" was so comprehensive as to cover almost every conceivable act. Denial of civil rights, complete segregation, and elimination of the rule of law amounted virtually to "civil death" for non-whites in the police state of South Africa.

12. The Pakistan delegation was convinced, after years of studying the background of the problem and the relevant proceedings of the United Nations, that no valid reason could be advanced in defence of apartheid. The General Assembly had declared it to be inconsistent with the Charter and the Security Council^{2/} had resolved that the situation in South Africa had led to international friction and might, if allowed to continue, endanger international peace and security. At the sixteenth session (1008th plenary meeting), the President of the General Assembly had been constrained to condemn racism in his inaugural address. Also, for the first time in its history, the Special Political Committee had adopted a resolution drawing the attention of the Security Council to Article 6 of the Charter.^{3/} The General Assembly had once again deplored the passage by the South African Government of discriminatory laws and of their ruthless enforcement. That Government had ignored the General Assembly's resolutions and had refused to

^{2/} Official Records of the Security Council, Fifteenth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1960, document S/4300.

^{3/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 76, document A/4968, para. 13, draft resolution I.

respond to the unconditional and conciliatory offers of negotiation of the Governments of Pakistan and India, contained in their respective letters of 29 and 30 May 1962 (A/5173 and A/5166).

13. The Pakistan delegation had therefore been particularly interested to hear the arguments advanced by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa at the 1128th plenary meeting of the General Assembly. Since the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan had analysed those arguments fully (1141st plenary meeting) and brought out all their fallacies in his statement in the general debate, the delegation would not go into details. The South African Minister for Foreign Affairs had spoken of the deterioration of the international situation and the Pakistan delegation agreed that moral values had failed, and that only the fear of annihilation had served as a deterrent to war. Surely, however, the policy of apartheid was partly responsible for that situation. The Minister had also talked of the United Nations loss of prestige. The policy of apartheid and South Africa's continuous and deliberate flouting of United Nations resolutions was one of the greatest blows to that prestige. The Minister had asserted that important provisions of the United Nations Charter were being callously disregarded. There was no more glaring example of persistent disregard for the principles of the Charter and the verdict of the world Organization than the policy of apartheid. He had also referred to the application of a "double standard" in the United Nations. There could be no worse demonstration of the literal application of double standards than the policy of apartheid.

14. The Minister had also pointedly drawn the General Assembly's attention to India's aggressive designs and intransigence over Kashmir. Yet, a refusal by India to honour its pledges and commitments to implement the United Nations resolutions on the holding of a plebiscite in Kashmir was no excuse for South Africa's behaviour. Two wrongs did not make a right. Nevertheless, precedents of violations and defaults on the part of some States did lend support and encouragement to others, and went far to undermine the authority and influence of the United Nations. They had indeed already done so to a considerable degree.

15. The United Nations sometimes allowed situations not directly involving the great Powers, and not apparently posing an imminent danger, to drift and deteriorate until they could become explosive, when it might be too late to control them. That appeared to be the case in South Africa where ominous warnings were not being properly heeded. The policy of apartheid was opposed in letter and spirit to the laws of both God and man. The Government of South Africa had not only continued to pursue that policy in utter disregard of world opinion, the repeated requests of the Governments of India and Pakistan, and the protests of the United Nations, but had accentuated it. Moreover, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa had defied the world even more blatantly. The Government of South Africa, while claiming to be the heir of Christian civilization, refused to recognize the inexorable divine laws at work. It rejected the lessons of history and closed its eyes to the march of time. It had not taken warning from the recent emergence of so many African States, including the heroic nation of Algeria. It had even ignored the policy so far-sightedly followed by the United States Government in a similar matter. The Government of South Africa was determined to pursue its policy to the bitter end.

That attitude, besides setting a dangerous precedent, had directly contributed to the confusion in the Congo and was partly responsible for the difficulties of the United Nations in that country.

16. South Africa had also created a serious situation in South West Africa and in the whole of Central Africa through its unholy alliances. All those circumstances had led to a situation which was a threat to world peace and security. The question was, what remedial measures should be adopted in the face of the complete failure and ineffectiveness of earlier resolutions? References had been made to sanctions and expulsion, both of which were difficult and extreme steps with far-reaching consequences. The Special Political Committee's recommendation at the last session, regarding an early discussion by the Security Council of the continued membership of the Republic of South Africa in the United Nations, had not been endorsed by the General Assembly.^{4/} It was to be hoped that an appropriate resolution would soon be brought before the Committee for thorough discussion. At the present stage, however, his delegation felt that mere verbal condemnations, already tried unsuccessfully, would not be enough. Wavering and indecisive action and lukewarm half-measures would also not help. Whatever decision was taken, it should be firmly and faithfully adhered to. Several General Assembly resolutions on other matters were still awaiting implementation, those on the repatriation of the Palestine Arabs and on the plebiscite in Kashmir to name only two. Such a state of affairs undermined the authority and prestige of the United Nations.

17. Mr. KIZIA (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the presence of so many newly independent States at the seventeenth session of the General Assembly was one more proof that the era of colonialism and oppression was finally coming to an end. However, his delegation's happiness at welcoming those new States was clouded by the fact that the Committee was once again examining the deplorable situation in the Republic of South Africa. Speaking on that subject at the sixteenth session (270th meeting), the Ukrainian delegation had noted that in resorting to force to retain its system of racial oppression and exploitation the South African Government was clearly advancing towards a fascist dictatorship. Its racist policy had since been intensified still further, and there were new instances of discriminatory legislation, culminating in the adoption of the so-called General Law Amendment Act. That Act was nothing more than a legislative means of repressing all protest against the Government, offering as it did unlimited powers to the racist minority. It was so vaguely formulated that those applying it were free to interpret it in any way they wished and the burden of proof of innocence had been shifted to the accused.

18. On 30 July, the Government Gazette, the semi-official journal of the South African Government, had published a list of 102 persons prohibited from participating in public meetings. Under the Sabotage Act the South African Press was prohibited from reproducing any written or oral statements by anyone on the list or circulating printed matter containing such statements abroad. The name of the Nobel Prize winner Chief Luthuli was on that list and no one in South Africa would have the right henceforth to quote his words.

^{4/} Ibid.

19. At the present moment, the South African Government was fanning war hysteria at home in order to stifle opposition and suppress demands for higher wages. All such activities were classed as unlawful behaviour and treason. On the pretext of the danger of outside intervention, South Africa was being turned into a totalitarian police state. It went without saying that South Africa was in no danger of attack, and that the Government's military preparations were in fact being made to suppress the struggle of the indigenous inhabitants for democracy and equality of rights. Anti-communism was being used by the forces of fascism as a cover for all their crimes and attacks upon democratic freedoms. The Head of the South African State was known to have supported Hitler, and it was significant that the President of the Bonn Republic should have said in the course of a visit to South Africa that the racial problem there was in good hands.

20. Terrorism at home in the Republic of South Africa was combined with aggressive acts and intentions abroad. In the Congo, South African mercenaries had fought to achieve the secession of Katanga. South Africa's current military budget was almost three times what it had been in 1960 and its armed forces had been almost tripled. Military installations were being constructed and the armed forces were being equipped with new bombers and fighters, automatic weapons and rockets. The Director of an atomic energy agency in South Africa had said that the Republic had the technical and scientific means to manufacture atomic bombs. Such weapons were clearly not needed by South Africa to settle its internal conflicts.

21. The South African leaders were pursuing dangerous international objectives. According to Press reports, a military alliance existed between the racist Government of South Africa, the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, and the Portuguese Administration in Africa. Its purpose was to suppress all liberation movements in Central and South Africa. The Republic of South Africa was a powder keg which could explode at any moment and bring war to the whole African continent.

22. The Ukrainian delegation shared the fears of many African and Asian countries regarding the introduction of fascism into South Africa. During the Second World War, the Ukrainian people had experienced the practical application of fascist ideology. The fascist aggressors had planned the physical destruction of the Ukrainian and other Slav peoples; those that were left alive were to be made the slaves of the German barons. Those barbarous plans were inevitably called to mind when the racist policy of the leaders of South Africa was considered. The South African Government's so-called Bantustan plan was one whereby the indigenous population would be herded onto infertile reserves where their situation as second-class citizens would become even worse. Out of 16 million people in the Republic of South Africa there were only 8,000 doctors, hardly any of whom were Africans. There were only five doctors for every 10,000 people and expenditure on science by that very wealthy country was only 0.3 per cent of the national income. The bulk of its funds were devoted to increasing its armaments. However, as the representatives of Ghana (327th meeting) and Tanganyika (328th meeting) had pointed out, South Africa would have been unable to increase its military might without the assistance of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries. The representative of the Soviet Union (329th

meeting), among others, had already enumerated the armaments that the Republic of South Africa was receiving from NATO sources. The United States representative (329th meeting) had tried to answer the Soviet charge by saying that United States loans to and investments in South Africa were intended to improve social and economic conditions for all the people of that country. In fact, the funds obtained from the Western Powers were used by the racist Government to oppress the indigenous population and to further their aggressive intentions. Moreover, at the sixteenth session of the General Assembly, the United States and other members of NATO had argued against the Soviet Union proposal to declare an embargo on shipments of arms to the Republic of South Africa. If the actions of the Western Powers were the same as their words they would not block the application of effective action against the Republic of South Africa as provided for in the Charter.

23. Western support was not limited to providing the Republic of South Africa with arms. The Republic's departure from the Commonwealth had not changed the relations between South Africa and the United Kingdom. South Africa still enjoyed imperial preference and its trade relations with the United Kingdom were unchanged. People in the United States, too, were more interested in obtaining profits from capital invested in industry based on apartheid than in being loyal to their own Declaration of Independence which recognized all men as equal. The United States Secretary of State had said in a newspaper interview, after paying lip-service to the condemnation of apartheid, that the United States was working side by side with the Republic of South Africa on other matters and wished to co-operate with it. That was not surprising since the internal and external policies of the Republic of South Africa remained the same: to fight communism and maintain the purity of the white race. The policy of the United States was almost identical. Together with the arms race, it was whipping up war hysteria against Cuba, which was alleged to be threatening the United States. Its policy had been further illustrated by recent events in Mississippi.

24. The struggle against apartheid was expanding in South Africa and could not be stifled by any repression. The African Nation Congress had appealed to all the Governments in Africa and in Asia to adopt sanctions against the South African Government. If the United Nations wished to be loyal to the Charter, it could not overlook facts which were incompatible with membership in the Organization.

25. If the leader of the Republic of South Africa had left the Commonwealth because non-white States were entering it, it was extraordinary that representatives of his Government should remain in the United Nations where persons of all races were represented. He ought to endorse the proposal of many Members of the United Nations that the Republic of South Africa should be expelled. The Organization ought not to retain persons who persisted in violating the Purposes and Principles of the Charter and those of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

26. The Ukrainian delegation supported the demand for the immediate application of the most stringent political, economic and other sanctions against the Government of the Republic of South Africa. That Government's violation of the Principles of the Charter

made it essential to apply the provisions of Article 6 and to call for the immediate expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations.

27. In supporting that proposal the Ukrainian delegation fully understood that the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations would not solve the problem. Each of those countries whose delegations had condemned the policy of apartheid should prove by their actions that they were prepared to wipe out racism. The South African leaders were amassing weapons and might soon seek to propagate their racist theories by force of arms unless immediate action was taken to avert the threat to peace. The Ukrainian delegation would support the proposal of a number of African and Asian delegations and of the Soviet Union that the General Assembly should recommend to the Security Council the adoption of a decision on the immediate application of sanctions to the Republic of South Africa, as provided for in the Charter.

28. Mr. BLAKE (United States of America), exercising his right of reply, said that the Committee had been subjected to a flood of cold war arguments by the Ukrainian representative. He suggested that the Ukrainian delegation should pay more attention to the business at hand. The members of the Committee were there to dedicate their efforts to winning the fight against racism and not to waging the cold war.

29. Mr. GASPARINI (Italy) expressed regret that the United Nations was still confronted with a situation in South Africa which affected the very principles on which the Organization had been built. There were, admittedly, serious difficulties in organizing a multi-racial society, which called for a restrained and realistic approach to the problem. But it was disturbing to note that the political leaders of South Africa had not yet heeded the repeated appeals of world opinion to respect fundamental human rights and freedoms. In Italy, the anachronism of such policies as apartheid was keenly felt. They were alien to the mentality of the Italian people, who resented racial discrimination as a blatant denial of the principles of freedom and equality on which their nation was founded.

30. It was no mere chance that the treatment of peoples of Indian and Indo-Pakistan origin in South Africa was being considered by the Committee under the same heading as apartheid, since both problems stemmed directly from discrimination. As discrimination of any kind could only lead to serious social and political difficulties, his delegation sincerely hoped that reiterated and determined exhortations by the United Nations would induce the leaders of South Africa to reappraise the effect of their policies. However, as the ultimate aim of the United Nations was the welfare of the inhabitants of South Africa who were denied their fundamental rights and freedoms, no action should be taken that might precipitate a crisis by aggravating their sufferings.

31. In formulating its recommendations, the Committee should bear in mind that it was of the utmost importance for the United Nations to consider all possible means of influencing the South African Government to alter its present racial policies. Those policies were not merely morally repugnant; they could well end in catastrophe. It was therefore to be hoped that the Assembly would reach a decision that was both unanimous—so as to command the necessary respect—and realistic, in that it took account of the

complexity of the situation in South Africa. The Italian delegation had no specific proposals to make, but it felt that the South African Government should be made aware of the fact that the United Nations intended to keep the situation in South Africa under closer scrutiny. At the same time, it believed that action inspired by heated feelings, however justified, was bound to prove ineffective. Thus, any measure that might be suggested would be judged by the Italian delegation in the light of its effectiveness in attaining the ultimate goal, on which all Members were agreed, namely to put an end to apartheid and to ensure the happiness of the populations concerned.

32. Mr. BA (Mauritania) remarked that once again the General Assembly was faced with the problem of apartheid, as the South African Government continued to ignore the realities of history and the recommendations and resolutions of the United Nations. The theory of apartheid was both criminal in concept and indefensible in application. It ran counter to the universally accepted principle of equality among men and was implicitly condemned in the United Nations Charter which reaffirmed faith in fundamental human rights and in the dignity and worth of the human person. The South African Government was thus showing blatant contempt for the commitments it had assumed on subscribing to the United Nations Charter.

33. Contrary to its own interests, the white minority in South Africa was driven by unjustifiable fears to reduce the remaining four fifths of the population to a state of bondage. The Africans, on the contrary, wanted no more than to be allowed to live peacefully and co-operate with the whites on a basis of complete equality, as Chief Luthuli had repeatedly emphasized. But far from showing any desire for understanding and co-operation, the South African Government was blindly persisting in its racial exploitation and made no attempt to conceal its aggressive intentions towards the African and Asian States. There was no evidence of any coming change in the political, administrative, economic or social policies of the South African Government.

34. Politically, in the areas reserved for whites, the Africans were completely deprived of their fundamental rights. The "reservations" were simply a source of cheap labour for the mines and there was no question of universal suffrage. Nor would the lot of the African population be improved in the slightest by the establishment of "Bantustan". Economically, the plight of the Africans was so severe that they were forced to seek work in regions where they were forbidden to own property or a home. Such forced migrations were detrimental to family life. In the social field, there were no new developments to suggest that a genuine effort was being made to improve the living conditions of the Africans or of persons of Indian or Indo-Pakistan origin.

35. In the view of the Mauritanian delegation, the time had come to pass from words to deeds. In keeping with the provisions of the Charter, the Assembly should lose no time in taking economic, political and diplomatic action to supplement the legal action already taken by certain States. Unless it did so promptly, the situation might soon become a serious threat to international peace and security. Since the South African Government paid no heed to the resolutions of the United Nations or to the appeals of world public opinion, the country should be expelled from the United Nations, as it had been expelled from

the ILO and the Commonwealth, if it persisted in its refusal to honour its commitments as a Member State.

36. Mr. GOMEZ ROBLEDO (Mexico) said that although all aspects of the question of apartheid had been thoroughly discussed over the years, his delegation was compelled to join once again in the universal condemnation of a policy that could only be considered inhuman. The only new development in the regrettable situation in South Africa was that the South African Government had intensified its policy of racial discrimination, far from relaxing it in any way. The Sabotage Act of 27 June 1962 seemed aimed at all who, in any way whatsoever, sought to change that policy even by peaceful means. Daily the rift between the international community and the Government of South Africa grew wider. That Government had shown its contempt of the United Nations not only by ignoring its resolutions but by disregarding its fundamental purposes and principles. Its very claim to have punctually paid its financial contributions to the Organization bore the stamp of hypocrisy. What was important was not the payment of dues but brotherly love and respect for fundamental rights and freedoms for all, as proclaimed in Article 1, paragraph 3 of the Charter. Although financial problems placed a heavy burden on the United Nations, those problems were not such a threat to its structure as flagrant disregard of its basic principles.

37. While Governments in other countries struggled valiantly to abolish racial discrimination, the Government of South Africa denied the very principle of the fundamental equality of all men. Respect for that principle was so deeply rooted in Mexico's history and thinking that the Mexican delegation must entirely

repudiate any form of discrimination on the basis of race.

38. According to Arnold Toynbee, history was a succession of challenges and responses: in order to survive, each civilization had to face certain challenges and make adequate response. Similarly, if the United Nations was to survive it must respond to the challenge now posed to its principles by refusing to countenance evil. However, if the Government of South Africa was to be forced to desist from the policy of apartheid, the method adopted by the Assembly must be both effective and legal. In pursuing its aim to save the oppressed people of South Africa from their present plight, the Committee must therefore consider what measure would be genuinely effective. With those considerations in mind, the Mexican delegation would give favourable consideration to any draft resolution on the lines of that adopted at the previous session.

39. Mr. NATWAR SINGH (India), exercising his right of reply, regretted that the representative of Pakistan should have referred to India in his statement in the manner in which he had. He assured the Committee that there was no question of India's not honouring its commitments. The representative of Pakistan's remarks were therefore extraneous and irrelevant.

40. The CHAIRMAN said he hoped that draft resolutions would soon be forthcoming on the item under discussion, so as to give the Committee a more concrete basis for its deliberations. He suggested that the list of speakers in the general debate should be closed at 6 p.m. on Thursday, 18 October.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.