

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records



THIRD COMMITTEE, 1380th
MEETING

Monday, 3 October 1966,
at 10.40 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 95:

Question of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including policies of racial discrimination and segregation and of apartheid, in all countries, with particular reference to colonial and other dependent countries and territories (continued) 21

Chairman: Mrs. Halima EMBAREK WARZAZI
(Morocco).

AGENDA ITEM 95

Question of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including policies of racial discrimination and segregation and of apartheid, in all countries, with particular reference to colonial and other dependent countries and territories (continued) (A/6303, chap. XI, sect. II; A/6442)

1. Mr. RESICH (Poland) said that the position of the United Nations on the question under discussion was clear from the United Nations Charter, the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, General Assembly resolutions 2022 (XX) and 2074 (XX) and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination article 3 of which specifically condemned racial discrimination and apartheid. The inclusion in that Convention of a complete system of supervision and international conciliation was evidence that the United Nations was now entering a new phase: that of the implementation of the resolutions and declarations previously adopted. That development would open up to States of goodwill the possibility of an equitable solution of international litigation in the field of racial discrimination. For that possibility to materialize, however, it was essential that all States, especially those where manifestations of racial discrimination still occurred, should sign the Convention.

2. He wondered whether the measures recommended in the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1164 (XLI) (A/6442, annex I) were adequate to achieve the purpose sought. In his view, the General Assembly should endorse in the resolution the third and fifth conclusion of the United Nations human rights seminar on apartheid, held at Brasilia from 23 August to 4 September 1966 (see A/6412, para. 138). The draft resolution should also make a specific reference to paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 2054 A (XX) of

15 December 1965. Since the adoption of that resolution, the situation in South Africa had reached the point of explosion. Despite the provisions of Article 41 of the Charter and despite the recommendations which the Security Council in its resolution 134 (1960) of 1 April 1960 had addressed to the South African Government under Article 36, that Government had not changed its policies. The Security Council, in its resolution 181 (1963) of 7 August 1963, had expressed its conviction that the situation in South Africa was seriously disturbing international peace and security.

3. In the circumstances, his delegation believed that the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council should be supplemented along the lines he had indicated. This delegation would submit amendments to that effect.

4. Mr. ATASSI (Syria) considered that the survival and recrudescence of manifestations of racial discrimination and attacks on the fundamental freedoms were likely to jeopardize the future of the newly independent countries. If colonialism, with its concomitant economic and racial exploitation, could consolidate itself with impunity in Africa at the expense of the African peoples, it could strengthen its positions throughout the world and thus endanger the achievements of the African and Asian States. His country therefore strongly supported the millions of Africans who were struggling against exploitation and racial discrimination in South Africa, Angola, Mozambique, Southern Rhodesia and South West Africa. Africa appeared to be witnessing an attempt at recolonization starting from South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. Accordingly, all new and developing countries must directly concern themselves with the struggle being waged by the African people against racial discrimination and apartheid.

5. The racist régime of South Africa maintained itself only with the moral and financial support of the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United States of America and other Powers which had an economic interest in that régime's survival. Despite Security Council resolution 182 (1963) of 4 December 1963 and General Assembly resolution 2054 A (XX), those countries had increased their investments in and their arms deliveries to South Africa.

6. Encouraged by the survival of the South African régime, the United Kingdom had delivered Southern Rhodesia over to a racist minority which practised the same type of economic exploitation and racial oppression. For nearly a year the world had been waiting for the United Kingdom to put an end to that rebellious régime by blockade or economic sanctions.

However, the events of 1966 had shown that only armed intervention could bring the tragedy of Southern Rhodesia to an end. The United Kingdom was legally and morally obliged to intervene to restore the rights of the majority of the population. The African members of the Commonwealth had been right in considering that only through force could a lawful régime be restored and the majority of the population enabled to exercise their right to self-determination. The case of Southern Rhodesia appeared to be simply a repetition of the tragedy of South Africa and the same Powers which were directly or indirectly supporting South Africa would soon openly assist Southern Rhodesia.

7. South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, Angola and Mozambique were so many bastions for the perpetuation of white supremacy in Africa and it was vitally necessary for the countries and peoples threatened with exploitation and imperialist pressures to combat those inhuman and reactionary régimes.

8. In Aden, the United Kingdom, disregarding the General Assembly resolutions on the subject, continued its oppression and ignored the wishes of the population for self-determination and independence. There again, colonialism hoped to maintain itself through selected individuals in order to create another bastion from which to threaten the countries of the region.

9. His delegation, representing a country which had itself suffered from colonialism and which now faced imperialist pressures, considered it its duty to take part in all efforts to publicize and condemn all manifestations of racial discrimination and exploitation throughout the world. In that context, his delegation expressed its indignation at the manifestations of racial discrimination occurring in the United States of America, where coloured persons were prevented from the full enjoyment of the same rights as their white counterparts.

10. His delegation also condemned the racist and discriminatory practices applied by the Israel authorities who, after having driven more than a million Arabs from their territory, were now conducting a reign of terror against the Arab minority remaining in the country. The Arabs in Israel were obliged to live in "security areas", where their rights to travel, to freedom of assembly and to work were being infringed.

11. It was the Committee's duty to condemn such practices wherever they occurred and to ensure the implementation of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council. The Committee must also endeavour to oblige those Powers which were drawing huge profits from the suffering of millions of human beings to carry out those resolutions. All Members of the Organization must squarely meet their responsibilities. The Charter had given the Security Council all the necessary powers: action must be taken before it was too late. An overwhelming majority of exploited and persecuted people could not indefinitely endure the rule of a racist and reactionary minority. The situation was becoming increasingly explosive. Every effort must

be made to avert the danger of a racial war which could hardly fail to have serious repercussions throughout the entire world.

12. Mrs. POCEK-MATIC (Yugoslavia) said that there had been intensive debate on the subject under discussion ever since the first session of the General Assembly but there was now even less sign of any practical results being achieved. Despite the innumerable decisions and recommendations of United Nations organs, the situation of the non-white population in Southern Rhodesia, Angola, Mozambique, so-called Portuguese Guinea, South Africa and the Mandated Territory of South West Africa was deteriorating; more drastic legislation, under which the non-white population was being reduced to a state similar to slavery, was being enacted. That situation made the recent judgement of the International Court of Justice incomprehensible.

13. Logically the problem posed by South Africa should be treated not only as a racist, but also as a colonial, issue whose solution must be closely linked to the imperative need to recognize the right of people to self-determination, national freedom and independence, as demanded by the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The most recent developments in Southern Rhodesia confirmed that the outdated colonial system was being maintained through the active support of the Republic of South Africa and of certain external factors which were either overtly or covertly opposing the struggle of African and international progressive forces against colonialism. For that reason, the problem of apartheid in the Republic of South Africa must be approached from the standpoint of contemporary colonialism. The racists and colonialists could not be induced to abandon their policies through mere persuasion; the recommendations of United Nations bodies had remained without effect and would continue to remain without effect as long as their implementation was obstructed by a number of countries that were maintaining close economic ties with South Africa. By their condemnations of racist and colonial policies those countries showed that they misjudged the ability of mankind to judge for itself. In her delegation's view, the countries that had failed to take the measures prescribed by the General Assembly and the Security Council, including economic and other sanctions, should reconsider their attitudes towards those resolutions. Any lack of unity or any inconsistency in the application of the sanctions called for by the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council would merely further encourage the racists and the colonialists.

14. In view of the relative failure of the measures so far taken, new and more effective measures were needed. Her delegation therefore fully supported the proposal that the sanctions already agreed upon should be reinforced by a decision of the Security Council and that their implementation should be ensured under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. Such a decision would make certain narrow economic interests subordinate to the interests of the dependent peoples, the international community and world peace. The aspirations of the peoples of Africa were reflected not only in the increased

membership of the United Nations but also in the determination of the independent African countries to help other African peoples who had not as yet achieved their national freedom and independence.

15. Yugoslavia fully accepted and supported the request made in General Assembly resolution 1761 (XVII) that Member States break off diplomatic relations with the Government of the Republic of South Africa, boycott South African trade, discontinue economic ties with that régime and deny it the use of sea and air transport facilities. It fully applied those recommendations and maintained no relations of any kind with South Africa.

16. Her country condemned with indignation and abhorrence all forms of discrimination and segregation anywhere in the world, and especially in colonial countries. She wondered whether the United Nations itself and its individual Members had done all they could in that respect and specifically whether new generations were being educated in the spirit of respect for human rights and human dignity.

17. Her delegation considered the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council (A/6442, annex I) entirely acceptable, but would support any effort to improve it and to give it all the necessary force. In that connexion, she welcomed the constructive suggestions made by the representative of Madagascar. Her delegation supported the proposal that a recommendation should be made to the Security Council to take adequate measures and considered it essential that the present item should be retained on the General Assembly's agenda.

18. Mrs. SEKANINOVA-CAKARTOVA (Czechoslovakia) said that, while her delegation was happy to see the positive results of the liberation of the colonial peoples reflected in the work of the United Nations, the disturbing problems the United Nations still had to deal with proved that the struggle of dependent peoples was still continuing and that the Organization had the task to eliminate the impediments in the way of those peoples to freedom and independence. It was anachronistic that, at a time when science and technology were making such strides, the Committee had to deal with a phenomenon which should long have disappeared from the world. Her country strongly condemned the violations of human rights in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, and the Territories under Portuguese administration. Denial of the right to self-determination was the most flagrant violation of basic human rights because it was only through the free development of a country that its people could fully enjoy all their other human rights. World public opinion was shocked by the brutal colonial policies and racial discrimination practised in some parts of Africa. The situation in South Africa, South West Africa, Southern Rhodesia and the Territories under Portuguese administration was not only a violation of the Charter, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, but was also a threat to international peace and security.

19. Czechoslovakia, which had consistently opposed colonial oppression and racial discrimination, had faithfully implemented all United Nations recom-

mendations concerning apartheid, Southern Rhodesia, and the Portuguese Territories. It had withdrawn its Consul-General from Johannesburg and had discontinued all trade with South Africa. As a contribution to the struggle against apartheid, the Czechoslovak Government had granted scholarships to victims of that infamy for study in Czechoslovakia in 1965 and 1966. It had taken part as an observer in the United Nations human rights seminar on apartheid, supported the conclusions of the seminar and hoped that the appropriate United Nations organs would carry out its recommendations.

20. With regard to the unilateral declaration of so-called independence by the white minority in Southern Rhodesia her Government supported all effective steps taken by the United Nations against the illegal régime set up in that Territory. It had not recognized the régime and maintained no relations of any kind with it. It recognized the right of the indigenous people of Southern Rhodesia to freedom and independence, just as it supported the right to self-determination of the people of the Territories under Portuguese administration.

21. Her Government opposed any attempt by South Africa to annex South West Africa and to extend the policy of apartheid to it and would support all efforts designed to enable the people of South West Africa to exercise their right to self-determination and independence.

22. Racist régimes could not exist without the assistance provided by certain Western capitalist countries. Many countries members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization granted the racist countries economic, political, and military assistance. Foreign investment in South Africa totalled more than \$4,000 million; the main investors were the United Kingdom and the United States, which alone had accounted for more than 70 per cent of all foreign capital invested in South Africa in 1962. That trend was continuing at an undiminished pace because of the high profits expected, which amounted to 27 per cent of the initial capital investment, and because of the investors' confidence in the stability of the South African Government. Southern Rhodesia, too, was able to continue its provocative and arrogant behaviour because it was backed by the same international monopolies either directly or indirectly through South Africa and Portugal. In that connexion, the Federal Republic of Germany played a special role; it had increased its economic relations and expanded military co-operation with those régimes, based on the affinity between their racial policies and German militarism. The support of the imperialists was the main reason why the racists remained in power. The situation therefore called for the application of effective economic and political measures, including sanctions, and the implementation—particularly by those who were assisting those régimes—of the decisions taken by United Nations organs.

23. Her delegation welcomed the fact that the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council called for the use of all available means for effectively combating apartheid and racial discrimination, including the application of economic and diplomatic measures against South Africa. The draft

could be improved, however, by being made more explicit and concrete. Specifically, it should include some of the conclusions reached by the United Nations human rights seminar on apartheid and should recommend that the question should be considered by the Security Council.

24. In conclusion, her delegation would support any measure which would accelerate the elimination of remnants of colonialism and apartheid and enable the oppressed peoples to enjoy their inalienable right to determine their own fate.

25. Begum HASHIMUDDIN (Pakistan) noted that the impressive record of the United Nations in the formulation of declarations and conventions defining and affirming human rights and fundamental freedoms had been accompanied by a depressing number of violations of such instruments, committed mostly by a handful of colonial or racist régimes but in one or two cases, unfortunately, by countries which had themselves been victims of imperial domination in the recent past. It was imperative in the future, while continuing the necessary task of formulating conventions and declarations, to devote more effort to ensuring recognition of human rights and fundamental freedoms by all Governments of the world. The draft resolution submitted by the Economic and Social Council was an excellent beginning to the attempt to eliminate such violations, wherever they occurred, by international effort and under the auspices of the United Nations.

26. Since no evil could be effectively eradicated unless its nature and scope were fully understood, it was necessary first to define the evil which it was sought to combat. The most complete and blatant form of violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms was apartheid and the other kinds of racial segregation and subjugation practised in southern Africa. Apartheid was the establishment of a new caste system, which guaranteed that most of the land and all the riches of a country or territory would belong in perpetuity to a racist minority, contrary to the universally accepted right of every people to self-determination. It was tantamount to the reimposition of slavery in a sophisticated form, subjecting the majority of the population to conditions of unbearable misery and dooming them to exist on the verge of starvation. The average life-span of a non-white in South Africa was only one third or one half of that of a white; while the rate of infant mortality among the white population in 1965 had been 29.2 per thousand, the rate among the coloured population had been 121.7 per thousand and a conservative estimate for the Africans, for whom there were no official figures, was between 200 and 300 per thousand. The pass laws guaranteed very cheap African labour for the mines and farms and caused workers to be separated from their wives and children. In pursuit of the inhuman system of apartheid, South Africa and South West Africa had been turned into police States where nazi ideology was preached and practised with increasing fanaticism.

27. An objective study of the system of apartheid made it clear that there was little prospect of a change of heart on the part of the ruling racist minority and that, as evidenced by the Sharpeville

massacre of 1960, there was little possibility of the non-whites' obtaining their own deliverance, which could therefore be brought about only by the world community. The United Nations was not a super-State, however, and enforcement action against the colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa, though desirable and necessary, could hardly be hoped for, since even the arms embargo imposed against South Africa by the Security Council had been rendered ineffective. Nevertheless, ways and means must be devised to prevent the bloodshed which would occur sooner or later in South Africa if the present state of affairs continued.

28. The conclusions and recommendations set out in the report of the United Nations human rights seminar on apartheid (A/6412, para. 138) should be taken into account by the Committee in finalizing the resolution before it, and she wished to recommend four additional measures which were likely to obtain maximum support. First, the resolution must clearly affirm that the United Nations had a fundamental interest in combating the policies of apartheid and that it should find, as a matter of urgency, ways and means of eliminating them. Secondly, in order to give maximum publicity to the evil of apartheid throughout the world, the resolution might include a provision requesting the Secretary-General to study and report on the feasibility of establishing a small information centre to deal exclusively with apartheid. Thirdly, Member States could be requested to take any necessary measures, in accordance with their domestic laws, against the operation of the propaganda organizations of the South African Government and private groups outside South Africa. Fourthly, all Member States could be requested to refrain from cultural and sports relationships with Governments which practised and enforced racial discrimination and violated human rights.

29. Although apartheid was the most important form of racial discrimination, it was not the only one which had to be eradicated. Whereas apartheid was imposed as a matter of government policy, other discriminatory practices and violations of human rights sometimes occurred behind a façade of democracy and secularism. Religious intolerance and persecution of religious minorities still persisted in a number of countries whose Governments paid lip-service to the idea of a multiracial society. It was not enough to include fundamental rights in a country's constitution or to label its system of government as "secular democracy" if constitutional provisions were, in practice, flouted every day. Organized violence against religious and racial minorities, wrongly described as "communal rioting", the burning of their property and forceful eviction from their homelands were contrary to the very basis of democracy and secularism and, if the cause of justice was to be fully served, it was essential to take such inhuman practices into consideration, along with apartheid and other violations of human rights, and to devise ways and means of eliminating them. In the view of her delegation, it would be worth while for the General Assembly to establish its presence in such situations with a view to alleviating the sufferings of the persecuted minority groups.

30. She strongly hoped that the Committee and the General Assembly would be able to adopt a unanimous resolution on the subject under discussion, since disunity on that issue would be most regrettable.

31. Mr. SAMMAH (Afghanistan) observed that, despite the lofty principles set forth in the Charter, in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the racist minority régimes in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and the Territories under Portuguese administration continued to practise racial discrimination and segregation and apartheid. Since the very foundation of the United Nations, South Africa had consistently refused to heed General Assembly resolutions or the pleas of individual Governments for an end to the policy of deliberate racial discrimination.

32. Afghanistan strongly opposed the policies of apartheid and racial discrimination in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and the Territories under Portuguese administration, and had always supported peoples struggling for their independence from colonial domination. It had complied with General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and had no relations of any kind with the Governments of South Africa and Portugal or the racist régime of Southern Rhodesia. It hoped that Member States which had not yet done so would join others in implementing the relevant resolutions.

33. The problem of South West Africa presented an urgent challenge to the principle of international commitment on which the integrity of the United Nations depended. The International Court of Justice, by failing to render a righteous judgement on the question, had placed upon the United Nations the very serious responsibility of achieving a solution through political action. The only course remaining for the world community was to terminate the Mandate and to take over the responsibility of administering the Territory until such time as the people of South West Africa were able to assume their independence. Such action was justified by Charter provisions and by various pronouncements of the Court.

34. The unilateral declaration of "independence" by the racist régime of Southern Rhodesia was a further challenge by the colonialists to the peoples of Africa and the whole world, and his delegation believed that the administering Power should take effective measures, in addition to economic sanctions, to put an end to the rebellion and to the illegal régime. The situation in the Territories under Portuguese administration remained unchanged. His delegation therefore agreed with the representative of Saudi Arabia that the time had come to seek and find more effective measures than in the past, and it would support any draft resolution designed to hasten the complete elimination of violations of human rights, including discrimination and segregation.

35. Mr. SIRI (El Salvador) said that the Constitution of his country guaranteed complete equality for all citizens and expressly prohibited any discriminatory restriction of the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The people of El Salvador were so deeply imbued with respect for human rights

that they viewed with abhorrence any régime which practised racial discrimination, especially when it was institutionalized in so odious a form as apartheid. Racial discrimination which became a government system was an offence to all mankind, calling for just condemnation and action to put an end to it on behalf of humanity. His delegation was prepared to support any resolution on that subject which was acceptable to the Committee as a whole, and it would consider any amendments to the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council in a constant desire to strengthen whatever measures could be taken.

36. Mrs. BERRAH (Ivory Coast) expressed the hope that the Committee, in dealing with fundamental freedoms which were as vital to a human being as life itself, would achieve unanimity or, at the very least, an overwhelming majority in favour of effective action. While it was regrettable that, in an age of great technological progress, a forthright universal condemnation of apartheid was still unattainable, there was no reason for despair; her delegation believed that, with the help of education, such violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including racial discrimination, as still occurred in developing countries because the masses were unaware of the principles of the United Nations Charter would cease in the near future.

37. Apartheid was nothing more than nazism transferred to the African continent, and it was the duty of the countries of Europe, in particular, to help the peoples of Africa, who had played their part in the struggle to preserve human dignity in Europe. It was surely not too much to ask that they should comply with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council calling for the imposition of economic and diplomatic sanctions against South Africa. Africans believed that different races could live together in peace, as had been proved in Algeria, where, after seven years of conflict caused by racial prejudice, those Europeans who had remained in the country had been able to participate in its Government and its administrative and legislative bodies.

38. The white rulers of South Africa must understand, before it was too late, that they could not change the course of history, and her delegation hoped that the great Powers would use their influence to persuade South Africa and Portugal that they should reconsider their position in the light of the lofty principles of the Charter, to which they had subscribed, that the emancipation of the peoples under their domination would triumph over the policies of apartheid, that the great majority of the population could not be forcibly resettled in reservations that were already overpopulated, and that a political, economic and social system based on the brutal domination of one race by another could not survive. By taking such action, the great Powers would avoid appearing in African eyes as the tacit accomplices of the policies of apartheid.

39. When speaking of violations of human rights, one could not but condemn the establishment of the hegemony of the white minority over the black majority in Southern Rhodesia. Nor could one fail to condemn the scandalous decision of the International Court of

Justice, which, in defiance of the very foundation of moral justice, had based itself on inhuman political considerations. It was time for justice to be done and for the United Nations to decide to revoke South Africa's Mandate. That point should be borne in mind by the Third Committee, even though the question of South West Africa was under discussion in plenary meetings of the General Assembly.

40. The draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council was somewhat outdated, and her delegation would support a strengthening of operative paragraphs 3 and 5 and the addition of special paragraphs relating to Rhodesia and South West Africa. It would be willing to participate in a small drafting group to formulate the new paragraphs. Tribute was due to the Economic and Social Council, the Commission on Human Rights, the Commission on the Status of Women and the specialized agencies, particularly the ILO and UNESCO, for their effective work in the fields of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

41. Mr. FERNANDEZ DE COSSIO RODRIGUEZ (Cuba) said that Cuba was a multiracial country where discrimination on grounds of race, sex or creed had been prohibited by law in the past. It was only since the revolution, however, that discriminatory practices had been abolished for ever through the eradication of their underlying economic and social causes. The Revolutionary Government, in keeping with its achievements in its own country, was militantly opposed to imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, which were the root cause of all violations of human rights.

42. For twenty years, the United Nations had been discussing apartheid and adopting numerous resolutions in both the General Assembly and the Security Council; yet the South African Government had not only increased its economic strength but was presuming to extend its policies of apartheid to the Mandated Territory of South West Africa and to support it in the colonial Territory of South Rhodesia, in alliance with the Portuguese colonial authorities in Angola, Mozambique and so-called Portuguese Guinea. It was in that part of the world that violations of human rights had attained a level which warranted describing them as crimes against humanity. Repeated appeals to the régimes concerned had been without effect because the great imperialist and colonialist Powers, headed by the United States, turned a deaf ear to the requests of the United Nations. The detestable pattern of oppression was fundamentally supported by the whole political, military and economic apparatus of the United States. That was quite understandable, not only in view of the economic and political ties which linked the United States to South Africa and to the colonial Powers but because of the affinity between conditions in the United States and the racist régime in South Africa. It was not surprising that a State where children were segregated in the schools and where the lynching of Negroes and the murder of integrationists were tolerated should refuse to heed the appeals made in General Assembly resolutions 1761 (XVII) and 2054 (XX). The same Powers, under the leadership of the United States, were persuading the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Mone-

tary Fund to grant credits to the South African Government.

43. The Revolutionary Government of Cuba had supported, and would support, any measures adopted by United Nations organs which aimed to restore respect for human rights in Africa, including the expulsion of the Government of the Republic of South Africa from the Organization. However, the General Assembly should extend any condemnation of the racist régime of South Africa and the colonial Powers to the main bulwark of colonialism, racism and worldwide reaction, namely, United States imperialism.

44. The peoples of the Portuguese colonies, in taking arms against foreign oppression, had chosen the right way of achieving national liberation and full human dignity. In the view of his delegation, the greatest contribution which could be made by Governments striving sincerely for respect for human rights in colonial and dependent Territories was to give the maximum moral and material support to those peoples in their struggle.

45. Mrs. DE BROMLY (Honduras) said she was sure that all members of the Committee regarded apartheid and racial discrimination as a cancer which must be completely eradicated. She regretted, however, that some speakers had used the debate as an opportunity to level accusations against other countries. Although discrimination of every kind was prohibited in Honduras, it would be presumptuous for her country to congratulate itself while discrimination by the rich against the poor and by the educated against the ignorant, for instance, still persisted to some extent. Her delegation would support any resolution directed against apartheid, but it would do so with a feeling of pity for those who practised such policies and with whom relations must be severed as with persons suffering from a disease.

46. Mr. DOMBO (Ghana) pointed out that "the peoples of the United Nations" who had stated their aspirations for the future in the Preamble of the Charter included black peoples as well as white; consequently, if any Governments ignored the provisions of the Charter, practising segregation and discrimination as an official policy and denying human rights to colonial peoples, they must be condemned by all peace-loving nations. Since the Governments of South Africa and Portugal had been guilty of violating human rights, thus threatening world peace and security, it was incumbent on every Member State to employ all the means at its disposal to implement the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and to impose a total boycott on trade with those countries. If that were done, South Africa, Portugal and the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia would surely bow to the wishes of the United Nations, and he appealed to all States still trading with those countries to cease doing so. His delegation supported the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council, but would submit some amendments designed to strengthen it.

47. Mrs. HARRIS (United States of America) said that the goal of securing human dignity for all might still be a distant one, but if it were ever to be achieved the State must guarantee to each citizen basic human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Different States had gone about it in different ways. But there was no single cultural, economic, governmental or even religious system which in and of itself could guarantee that all those adhering to it would fully enjoy all human rights. Despite good legislation, constitutional protection, and well-designed educational programmes, there was no State at present which could claim that achievement. The United States was fully aware of the fact, having struggled since its Declaration of Independence, which proclaimed that all men were created equal, to achieve full equality for all its citizens. It had come some distance, and that in itself made the country impatient with its failures. Enormous efforts were now being made to eliminate all vestiges of injustice. Legislation prevented most discriminatory action and freedom of speech and thought were assisting in furthering human dignity and freedom from racial discrimination. One conclusion the United States had reached in that effort was that human rights consisted of a series of rights, all of which must be protected; there was no right of such vast importance that all others could be eliminated for it. The equality of slavery to government was not the equality anyone sought.

48. The denial of rights in any country or region today affected all countries and regions; violations of human rights could no longer be tolerated no matter where they occurred. It was wrong to think that a denial of a human right in a country governed by another country was any more or less important than the denial of that same right in any other country. No person in either a colonial territory or an independent State should be required to submit to personal or group indignities.

49. The United Nations had taken some major steps in promoting human dignity by codifying human rights in international instruments, defining them and sometimes pointing out how violations occurred and how they could be eliminated. There was, of course, much more to be done: the international instruments on human rights must be implemented. One of the United Nations methods which had proved effective, particularly in regard to dependent territories, had been the review on a country-to-country basis of the human rights situation in the world. The more specific and detailed the review, the more effective the results. In recognition of that fact, the United States had made a determined effort to present to all appropriate United Nations bodies as accurate a picture as possible of its domestic situation in the human rights field. International concern had influenced developments in the United States. The United States was not alone in that and an effect could be exerted on others also, through criticism of human rights violations and praise for progress made. The more other countries of the world opened their affairs to the consideration of the United Nations, the more effective the Organization could be in relation to specific violations of specific rights and the faster the world would advance towards the ultimate goal because of that.

50. There were also other methods of implementing human rights, such as the implementation procedures under the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the revised system of periodic reports, and the proposed imple-

mentation clauses of the draft International Covenants on Human Rights as well as the proposal to appoint a High Commissioner for Human Rights. A persistent search should be made for new means of implementation to ensure that all human beings finally enjoyed human rights fully. In that connexion she warmly endorsed operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council, which invited the Council and the Commission on Human Rights to give urgent consideration to ways and means of improving the capacity of the United Nations to stop human rights violations.

51. One aspect of the violation of human rights with which the Committee was particularly concerned was racial discrimination. Its ultimate form—apartheid—was officially practised in one country, and it presented the United Nations with its greatest challenge in the human rights field. South Africa had made a major part of its national policy the suppression of the rights of the vast majority of its population; it rejected the scrutiny of the international community and was totally unresponsive to international criticism. The usual United Nations procedures had failed in its case. In determining the steps that could be taken to deal with the horror of apartheid certain hard questions had to be answered by the Third Committee and the Governments represented in it. Those questions pertained to the devices that were most likely to affect the South African Government and the sacrifices that should and could be made to end apartheid. It was not enough to talk about what others might do and to place responsibility on other shoulders. All steps large and small must be considered. The issue was too serious for sloganeering, and the consequences of any action would affect all countries. The Committee must think very carefully of what came after condemnation and the best ways of promoting the freedom of all the people of South Africa and South West Africa.

52. Her Government continued to struggle with those questions and sought the counsel of other nations about realistic and effective measures. The Committee should not lightly urge action that would result in the loss of life, the destruction of economies and the dislocation of world order. Neither, of course, should it fear to face the issue. First of all it should manifest in its resolution its disgust with those who refused to accept the reality of the brotherhood of man, and it should do so in clear and precise terms which all who were in essential agreement could accept. In that connexion she urged that the reference to "General Assembly resolutions recommending the application of economic and diplomatic measures against the Republic of South Africa" should be deleted from operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, since those Assembly resolutions looked to future action by the Security Council, whose decisions should not be prejudged. Although there were other elements in the draft resolution which caused her some concern, her delegation was prepared to support the draft as a whole, with that change.

53. Mr. A. A. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) said that, from the outset, the United Nations had fought for the protection of human rights. Indeed, that might be said to be the very reason for its existence. There

could be no peace in the world so long as human beings were not free. Under Article 55 of the Charter, the United Nations had the duty to promote the universal observance of human rights and, in joining the Organization, countries had agreed to co-operate in that matter. The success of the United Nations depended on the co-operation of States. If a Member erred, the consequence should not be quarrelling and conflict, but acceptance by that Member of the majority view. When a Member seemed to be disturbing the peace of the world, it was the duty of others to point out its mistake. By virtue of its accession to the Charter, that Member should follow the advice given, assuming that it did not want war. But the position today was that many Members sought only their own selfish ends in the United Nations and refused to heed the advice of others. South Africa had been practising a policy of oppression, domination and segregation wholly contrary to the Charter and the views of States and human beings and despite all the appeals addressed to it.

54. The draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council went in the right direction, but it basically proposed the same measures that had failed in the past, largely because of the unwillingness of some Members to make sacrifices. The resolution should recommend positive new steps: he believed that the Third Committee was competent to make new recommendations in questions relating to human rights; a legalistic objection in that matter would be no more valid than the recent finding of the International Court of Justice in the South West Africa case. If, as was generally agreed, the Committee had a moral and humanitarian duty, it had every right to recommend action. He read out a series of amendments^{1/} which the delegations of India, Nigeria and Pakistan were submitting to strengthen the draft resolution; the sponsors of the amendments regretted that they had not had the Malagasy representative's suggestions in writing at the time of preparing their proposal. In connexion with their proposed new paragraph on the question of trade with and investment in South Africa, he cited the following 1964 trade figures: for the United Kingdom \$1,028 million, for the United States \$524 million, for France \$110 million, for Japan \$232 million, for Italy \$120 million, for Canada \$87 million, for the Netherlands \$84 million, for Belgium \$79 million and for Australia \$40 million; in addition, most of the major banks of the United Kingdom and the United States still invested freely in South Africa.

55. Mr. NGYESSE (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said that his country placed emphasis in its Constitution on the rights and freedoms of Congolese citizens and it had consistently condemned and fought racial discrimination and segregation, which were unknown in the Congo itself. Apartheid was stubbornly practised by the South African Government despite the Universal

Declaration of Human Rights and countless United Nations resolutions. South Africa paid no heed to the criticisms even of its friends and allies and seemed not to fear expulsion from the United Nations. It had dared to extend apartheid to South West Africa, which it administered under an international Mandate that would have to be withdrawn because of South Africa's failure to carry it out in a proper manner.

56. Under his country's Constitution, all Congolese were equal before the law and entitled to equal protection under the law; education and government employment were open to all without distinction; the human person was inviolable; freedom of the Press and of association were guaranteed, as were the freedoms of thought, conscience, expression and religion; and so on. Those were some of the rights and freedoms that were not granted to their coloured populations by South Africa and Portugal, to name but two countries.

57. The Congo had gone further in the protection of human rights. On 7 June 1966 it had enacted legislation to combat racialism and tribalism throughout the country. For example, it was now a punishable offence to manifest racial, ethnic, tribal or regional aversion or hatred by means of words, gestures, writings, pictures or emblems. Also, organizations dedicated to or practising racial, ethnic, tribal or regional discrimination were to be dissolved by order of the President of the Republic.

58. The Congo earnestly appealed to those countries that persisted in violating human rights to change their ways for the good of all mankind. It was highly indignant at the flagrant violations of human rights in dependent territories, particularly Angola, Mozambique, so-called Portuguese Guinea, Southern Rhodesia and South West Africa. Those violations were no more nor less than crimes against humanity.

59. Turning to the draft resolution before the Committee, he expressed appreciation for the work done by the Commission on Human Rights and the Economic and Social Council and urged all social and humanitarian organs of the United Nations to persevere in their efforts and not to lose heart in the face of the manoeuvres and systematic sabotage carried out by certain countries that were well known for their hypocrisy and destructive actions. His delegation could support the draft resolution, which was in line with its own position that the United Nations had the right to demand that Member States put an end to all forms of racial discrimination and that the solution for dependent territories was the granting of independence. His delegation also supported in principle the three-Power amendments just introduced, but would await their appearance in writing before stating its final position on them.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.

^{1/} Subsequently circulated as document A/C.3/L.1335.