

U.N. Council Acts To Fight South Africa Segregation

By PAUL W. WARD

[Sun Staff Correspondent]

New York, Dec. 4—The United Nations initiated today an unprecedented effort to make South Africa's "white minority" regime adopt racial desegregation laws and eventually give way to a "multiracial" government.

The action was taken by the Security Council with United States support and approval, proclaimed by Adlai E. Stevenson, United States Ambassador.

"President Johnson's first message to our Congress," Stevenson said, "featured a moving call for action to wipe out the remnants of racial discrimination in this country.

First Unanimous Vote

"No less firm is our opposition to racial discrimination anywhere, for we believe that no longer can any society long endure in peace, really live with itself, really prosper economically, if in that society one race discriminates against another and deprives it of human and political rights."

The action taken by the Secur-

ity Council in an effort to make South Africa's Verwoerd regime repeal its apartheid, or racial separation, laws was unprecedented in more than one respect.

In the first place, it was produced by the first unanimous vote that the Council's eleven members have ever cast on an anti-apartheid resolution. In April, 1960, when the Council adopted its first resolution of that kind, Britain and France abstained, as they also did when it adopted its second four months ago.

Proposals Dropped

The unanimity displayed by the Council's members was, moreover, the only consolation South Africa's mainly Asian and African prosecutors here could draw from the proceedings. For the Council's action was limited in its coercive aspect to broadening an arms embargo it had ordered against South Africa on August 7.

Afro - Asian bloc members,

(Continued, Page 4, Column 1)

speaking in the Council just before the vote, proclaimed their disappointment that more punitive measures were not being instituted. They had been prepared to propose a number but did not do so on discovering that they could not command enough votes to get them adopted or even to evoke a veto by, for example, Britain or France.

Contributing to the resolution's unprecedented character was a provision projecting an attempt by the United Nations to work out a system for changing South Africa into a state where 12,700,000 blacks, browns and mulattos would be able to outvote 3,300,000 whites.

"Human Rights"

That involves an attempt by the United Nations to assert jurisdiction over affairs in one of its member states that had been treated as strictly "domestic" and therefore none of the international community's business before World War II.

Hitler changed all that with his Nuremberg laws and the slaughter of "non-Aryans" that they produced. They also led, in turn, to a decision by the victors at the end of World War II that the new world organization, whose Charter they were then drafting at San Francisco, should "promote and encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion."

Proceedings Boycotted

Moreover, the late Field Marshal Jan Smuts, then South Africa's Premier, was the chief advocate of that provision in the United Nations Charter, as Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, of India, has just reminded the Security Council.

She also noted that a year later—that is, in 1946—Smuts made the first of many "states rights" speeches that spokesmen for South Africa have since delivered here against attempts to enforce

that Charter provision against any member state and, particularly, their own country.

Still maintaining that South Africa's racial laws are a "domestic" matter outside United Nations' jurisdiction, Pretoria's delegation boycotted the Security Council proceedings that ended this afternoon in the production of a resolution "hat:

1. Enjoins the Verwoerd regime to "cease forthwith its continued imposition of discriminatory and repressive measures . . . in violation of its obligations as a member of the United Nations and of . . . the universal declaration of human rights."

2. "Condemns" the Government at Pretoria for "noncompliance" with not only the Council's two previous resolutions but also the 27 of like effect that the General Assembly has produced since 1946.

3. Renews the Council's August 7 call upon the Verwoerd regime to "liberate all persons imprisoned, interned or subjected to other restrictions for having opposed the policy of apartheid."

4. Enjoins "all states to cease forthwith the sale and shipment of equipment and materials for the manufacture and maintenance of arms and ammunition in South Africa."

5. Provides for the establishment of "a small group of recognized experts to examine methods of resolving the present situation in South Africa through full, peaceful and orderly application of human rights . . . and to consider what part the United Nations might play in the achievement of that end."

"Orderly Transformation"

Finally, besides calling on the Verwoerd regime to "avail itself of the assistance of this (experts) group in order to bring about such peaceful and orderly transformation" of South Africa's racial-political system, the resolution projects a Security Council session in six months to survey Pretoria's compliance with all the Council's injunctions.

The resolution's section about the experts group occasioned the most controversy. Ahmed Taibi Benhima, the Council's Moroccan member, and Alex Quason-Saeky, its Ghanaian member, voiced fears that it might operate to "muzzle" the Verwoerd regime's foes here.

They sought assurances that the Council would not have to

await a report by the experts group before taking further action against South Africa, which, they predicted, will ignore the group and deny it on-the-spot investigation privileges.

They did not mention the cold-shoulder Afro-Asian bloc members effectively had given in 1961 to the Verwoerd regime when it suggested that three past presidents of the Assembly — Prince Wan Waitayakon, of Thailand, Frederick H. Boland, of Ireland, and Victor Andrews Belaunde, of Peru — make an inspection tour of South Africa.

They also voiced fears that the experts group's operations might interfere with those of the Assembly's own "Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of . . . South Africa."

Headed by Diallo Telli, of Guinea, that committee also includes Algeria, Costa Rica, Ghana, Haiti, Hungary, Malaysia, Nepal, Nigeria, the Philippines and Somalia.

"Certain States"

It had called for a ruling that South Africa's stand is "incompatible with membership" in the United Nations and for censure of "certain states which have taken measures contrary" to Assembly and Security Council resolutions against South Africa.

In addition, it had urged that South Africa's neighbors be called on to provide "asylum and relief" for foes of the Verwoerd regime and that the United Nations provide "relief and assistance" for the families of political prisoners.

The special committee also had called for a ban on foreign training assistance to South Africa's military personnel and on "any form" of cooperation with its po-

lice; for an embargo on "strategic materials" shipments to South Africa; for "prohibition or discouragement" of foreign investments in or loans to South Africa; for like restrictions on emigration to that country and for a denial of port facilities to ships and planes bound to or from South Africa, and for "a blockade, if necessary, under the aegis of the United Nations" to cut off South Africa's oil supply.

The fears the Security Council's

African members expressed about interference with the special committee's operations by those of the experts group, as well as their more general misgivings about the latter, were seconded by Nikolai T. Fedorenko, Soviet member of the Council, as well as all the petitioners appearing for the Afro-Asian bloc.

The latter included the foreign ministers of Liberia, Madagascar, Sierra Leone and Tunisia, plus Mrs. Pandit.