

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 770th  
MEETING**



Friday, 5 November 1971,  
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

Chairman: Mr. Cornelius C. CREMIN (Ireland).

AGENDA ITEMS 37 AND 12

The policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa (*continued*) (A/8400, A/8422 and Corr.1, A/8467, A/8468, A/SPC/145, A/SPC/146, A/SPC/L.206, A/SPC/L.207);

- (a) Report of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* (A/8422 and Corr.1);
- (b) Reports of the Secretary-General (A/8467, A/8468);
- (c) Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter XVII (section C)) (A/8403)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that the United Republic of Tanzania had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.206.

2. Mr. TAIB (Malaysia) said that the failure of the United Nations efforts to bring about an end to the evil practices of *apartheid* was all the more disconcerting when it was remembered that 1971 had been declared the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. Moreover, South Africa was strengthening its policies and was receiving increased support from its main trading partners and military suppliers, which merely made it more intransigent. Not only were *apartheid* laws being applied with greater brutality and ruthlessness, but their application had been extended to larger groups of people. The death of an Indian school-teacher while in detention and the conviction of the Anglican Dean of Johannesburg under a law condemned by the United Nations were only two cases among many.

3. The list of persons detained, placed under house arrest or sentenced to long-term imprisonment grew longer every year. The Group Areas Act provided for the resettlement of half a million non-whites in camps, and the Bantustan policy was designed for the total enslavement of the African and other non-white people of South Africa. Although all those developments were described in detail in the report of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* (A/8422 and Corr.1), it was well to call them to mind again, since South Africa's defiance was intolerable. The Africans and non-white population, having been denied all avenues of peaceful change, were left with no alternative but to resort to violent means; the situation became more explosive every year.

4. The failure of the United Nations was due to the fact that all Member States were not co-operating fully. That was particularly true of South Africa's main trading partners and military suppliers, who were not complying with United Nations decisions.

5. His delegation maintained that the situation in South Africa and southern Africa constituted a real threat to international peace and security, and it urged the Security Council to act decisively to compel South Africa to abandon its abhorrent policies of *apartheid*. As the representative of Somalia had said (758th meeting, para. 5), the international campaign against *apartheid* must be continued, at any rate until the South African Government showed a willingness to accept the consultations called for by the Security Council's Group of Experts in 1964. At the very least, the Committee should urge the Security Council to implement the findings of its Group of Experts. Meanwhile, the General Assembly must not relax its efforts. In that connexion, his delegation felt that the Committee should support the recommendations of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* with regard to the international campaign. It reaffirmed the Malaysian people's solidarity with the oppressed people of southern Africa in their fight for freedom, justice and social progress. Finally, it supported the suggestion made by several delegations that at the end of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, the General Assembly should adopt a solemn declaration in which all Member States would undertake to strive tirelessly to put an end to *apartheid*.

6. Mr. SYKES (United Republic of Tanzania) said that during the past 25 years, repression in South Africa had intensified while United Nations resolutions had been ignored. Moreover, in 1971, the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, some founding Members of the Organization had not hesitated to arm South Africa to the teeth. He was referring to the United Kingdom and France in particular.

7. In February 1971 the United Kingdom Government had claimed that, in resuming the sale of arms to South Africa, it was merely fulfilling its obligations under the Simonstown Agreements.<sup>1</sup> That claim was not a valid one in view of the fact that paragraph 2 of the Agreement on the Sea Routes specified that its provisions would be carried out between 1955 and 1963 and would apply only to a specified number of warships. Furthermore, Article 103 of the United Nations Charter specified that "in the event of a conflict between the obligations of the Members of the United Nations under the present Charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present Charter shall prevail". The

<sup>1</sup> Agreement on the Defence of the Sea Routes round Southern Africa, and Agreement relating to the Transfer of the Simonstown Naval Base, 30 June 1955; see *Exchanges of Letters between the Governments of the United Kingdom and the Union of South Africa, June 1955* (London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office (Cmd. 9520)).

United Kingdom Government was therefore acting in defiance of the Charter and in violation of resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

8. France had not stopped at selling arms to South Africa but had extended its collaboration in an agreement concluded in June 1971 which provided for the manufacture of supersonic aircraft under licence in South Africa and for the sending of French technicians to South Africa.

9. By arming South Africa, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America were helping the *apartheid* régime not only to exterminate non-whites inside South Africa but also to attack independent African States to the north, in application of what military experts called the doctrine of "anticipatory counter-attack". Moreover, the South African Government maintained a military presence in Zimbabwe, Mozambique and Angola in support of the Smith régime and of Portuguese colonialism.

10. The South African Government was a minority government which excluded four fifths of the citizens from any participation. The flagrant inequality of whites and non-whites was reflected in every field of activity. Thus Africans, who constituted 68 per cent of the population, accounted for less than 20 per cent of the total income. The amount allocated to whites for educational purposes was nearly 20 times greater than that allocated to Africans, with the result that Africans had to meet almost all their educational expenses by themselves while whites benefited from free education. Thus, by keeping Africans from developing their mental faculties, the South African régime denied them equal employment opportunities and equal standards of living.

11. In any case, no one could ask the people of South Africa to refrain from taking up arms in the struggle against racism. His country and Africa as a whole supported the freedom-fighters. His delegation was gratified that the World Council of Churches had decided to make grants of nearly \$200,000 to liberation movements and other organizations opposed to racism and had made a grant of \$95,000 for the formulation of an anti-racism strategy. The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the World Federation of Trade Unions, the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organization, the International Defence and Aid Fund, UNESCO and the ILO, to mention only a few, were also making an effort to combat the minority régimes in southern Africa.

12. He thanked the Special Committee on *Apartheid* for its work.

13. Mr. SPÁČIL (Czechoslovakia) said that the decolonization process had brought about a national and social awakening which would seem to have relegated colonialism to the annals of history. However, although more than a quarter of a century had elapsed since the end of the Second World War, fascism, though defeated, had successfully survived. Just as, under Hitler, millions of human beings in Germany had been condemned to forced labour and extermination for the sake of a race which claimed to be superior, so in South Africa the black population was being subjected to the kinds of hardship prevalent in Nazi Germany to ensure the well-being of the whites, who

represented only 19 per cent of the population. How long would a minority group be allowed to defend its interests by pursuing a racist policy that undermined human dignity and violated the principles of the United Nations Charter, which South Africa had signed? An analysis of *apartheid* showed that it was a form of colonialism, which was flourishing and growing stronger.

14. The ineffectiveness of the resolutions adopted on the question since the inception of the United Nations had given rise to feelings of pessimism. However, his delegation had noted a few promising developments. The policy of socialism was increasingly influencing the course of history, and imperialism, in all its forms, had already been condemned by the determinism of social laws. The South African régime would have collapsed long ago if it had not received economic, financial, military and technical assistance from imperialist Governments and the monopolies supported by them, which let the prospect of large profits outweigh the rights of Africans and the demands made by United Nations resolutions. However, world public opinion was becoming alerted to the situation, which was another promising development.

15. His delegation urged an increased effort to mobilize the masses against *apartheid*. It found it surprising and regrettable that some countries were advocating a dialogue with South Africa, claiming that they wished to persuade that country to put an end to its abhorrent policies. How could a dialogue be held with a country which did not conceal its utter contempt for the unanimous view of other Member States expressed in United Nations resolutions? His country did not maintain relations of any kind with South Africa, and his delegation had supported and would continue to support all measures taken by the United Nations to eliminate racism and discrimination. With a view to combating *apartheid* effectively, the Committee should first condemn countries which did not adhere to resolutions adopted by the various United Nations bodies. He pointed out that Guinea and the Soviet Union had submitted<sup>2</sup> a draft international convention on *apartheid* to the Third Committee. Though that draft was under consideration by the Third Committee, it might usefully be transmitted to the Special Political Committee.

16. He thanked the Special Committee on *Apartheid*, on behalf of his delegation, for its report (A/8422 and Corr.1) which he found excellent. In conclusion, he stressed the importance of the Special Political Committee's activities and expressed particular pleasure at the co-operation it had developed with numerous international organizations, such as those that had been invited to speak in the current debate.

17. Mr. OMRAN (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the relentless struggle waged by his country and the third world against imperialism and colonialism, as manifested in the policy of *apartheid*, brooked of no compromise with the supporters of a system which exploited human suffering. *Apartheid* was a means towards the perpetuation of colonial exploitation: indeed, segregation was applied to black people not only on account of the colour of their

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 54, document A/8542, para. 32.

skin: it also marked the frontier that separated the exploiter from the exploited.

18. He recalled that, at the twenty-fifth session, his country—firmly believing that *apartheid* was, in the words of the representative of Ireland, the enemy of all humanity—had been a sponsor of all the resolutions adopted. The Special Committee on *Apartheid*, the United Nations Secretariat and the developing countries had made every effort to discharge their responsibilities under those resolutions. It was regrettable, however, that certain great Powers, including the United States of America, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany and Japan, had once again disregarded those resolutions and intensified their economic and military co-operation with the racist minority.

19. His delegation also denounced the alliance between South Africa and the racist Governments of Israel and Rhodesia, which were bastions of imperialism against the peoples of Africa and Asia. There were certain similarities between the situation of South Africa and that of Israel, which, according to the South African Prime Minister himself, was faced with an *apartheid* problem: how to handle its Arab inhabitants. Neither nation wanted to place its future in the hands of the majority and would prefer to fight. In an article in *The New York Times* of 30 April 1971, Mr. C. L. Sulzberger had said that South Africa and Israel were in a sense intruded States, and had been built by pioneers originating abroad and settling in already inhabited areas. As to military co-operation between these two States, he drew the Committee's attention to the statement by the representative of Egypt (762nd meeting) and to document A/AC.115/L.285/Add.2, concerning the implementation of the arms embargo against South Africa.

20. For all those who regarded *apartheid* as an affront to human dignity, nothing could justify co-operation between States claiming to be advocates of freedom and human dignity, and racist South Africa. Urgent action was needed to constrain those States to respect the Security Council and General Assembly resolutions condemning discrimination in all its forms. As the representative of Somalia had inferred (758th meeting), never had it been more necessary to press on with the international campaign against *apartheid* with renewed determination. Trade unions, whose principles were fundamentally opposed to *apartheid* and racial discrimination, were a strong ally in the fight. His delegation renewed its support for General Assembly resolution 2671 D (XXV) which called for an international conference of trade unions for promoting concerted action against *apartheid* at the national and international levels, and requested that such a conference be convened in the very near future.

21. In the case of sports activities, it was the duty of all countries to follow the International Olympic Committee's example in banning South Africa from all participation in the Olympic Games. Furthermore, since 1971 was the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, it was timely for the General Assembly to adopt a resolution against racism and *apartheid* in national and international sports events.

22. The suggestion of a dialogue with South Africa was designed to divert world attention from the seriousness of

the matter. If the minority régime of South Africa was sincere, it should begin an immediate dialogue with the majority of the people of South Africa, as the only partner legally entitled to participate therein.

23. It was not enough to condemn the torture and persecution of opponents of *apartheid* and the death of individual detainees: effective measures should be taken to stop the repetition of such crimes and his delegation was prepared to support any action to that end. It drew the Committee's attention to that part of the Secretary-General's report which contained information regarding measures and activities undertaken by Syria during the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination,<sup>3</sup> especially the activities of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee in Syria. The Executive Committee of the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization had held a meeting in Damascus on 23 and 24 June 1971, attended by two representatives from the Special Committee on *Apartheid* and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (see A/8422 and Corr.1, paras. 118-121). The meeting had amounted to a political rally of all those who supported the freedom-fighters in South Africa.

24. Mr. OGBU (Nigeria) stressed his interest in the report of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* and paid tribute to its Chairman, the representative of Somalia, for having championed the cause of the oppressed Africans and non-white peoples in South Africa. Having already spoken on various aspects of the problem of *apartheid*, he proposed to limit his observations to the attitude of the United Nations towards the South African Government and the question of the proposals for a dialogue with South Africa.

25. At the twenty-fifth session, a number of delegations, including his own, had challenged the credentials of the representatives of South Africa as having been issued by a Government which represented only a minority of the population of South Africa. Most Member States had endorsed that challenge, thereby expressing strong condemnation of the policies pursued by the South African Government, as well as a warning to it. But despite frequent repetitions of that warning in the Committee, the racist régime of Pretoria had refused to heed it, in the knowledge that it could rely on the support of its main trading partners. The Government of Pretoria was unworthy of membership of an association of decent human beings. By its cruel and barbaric deeds it had placed itself outside the pale of civilization. *Apartheid* was a crime against humanity and should be exposed and combated by all men of goodwill. His delegation invited all delegations to consider seriously the next step to be taken against the Pretoria régime. It believed, as urged in the Lusaka Manifesto (Manifesto on Southern Africa), that South Africa should be excluded from the United Nations agencies, and even from the United Nations itself. Furthermore, he recalled that at the twenty-fifth session the representative of Mexico (701st meeting) had drawn attention to Article 5 of the Charter concerning suspension of the rights and privileges of a Member State against which preventive or enforcement action had been taken by the Security Council, as was the

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, document A/8367, para. 7.

case with South Africa. Of the two possible courses of action, his delegation preferred the former, for the Government of Pretoria must be made to understand that it could no longer continue to defy the whole of mankind. However, his delegation did not rule out the possibility of invoking Article 5 of the Charter.

26. With regard to the South African Government's apparent desire for a dialogue with the independent African States, he pointed out that the representatives of one African country and at least one European country had spoken in favour of such a dialogue as a means of effecting changes in the policy of *apartheid*. His delegation believed that it was merely a bait, as was proved by the fact that the South African Government had shown nothing but contempt for the United Nations resolutions. The idea of talks between African States and the South African Government was the brain-child of Western countries which had vested interests in South Africa. Certain South African States had been subjected to pressures, bordering on blackmail, in respect of the tremendous economic advantages to be reaped from a policy of appeasement towards the South African racists. Others had been misled into believing dialogue to be the only possible course of action in view of South Africa's military might. The point to be borne in mind, however, was that the cost of the economic advantages supposedly derivable by those African States from collaboration with the South African régime would be measured in the blood and tears of the Africans of South Africa.

27. As for the so-called economic and military might of South Africa, its achievements were not beyond the reach of the independent African States. Resting as it did upon naked force and the criminal exploitation of the African population, its economic and military might was unstable. His delegation categorically rejected any suggestions for a dialogue between the independent African States and South Africa, first because the black South African leaders had rejected a dialogue and, secondly, because the racist régime had spurned the proposals of the Lusaka Manifesto for the

peaceful settlement of the South African problem by means of a dialogue within South Africa. If the South African Government sincerely wanted a dialogue, it should initiate talks with the leaders of the majority African population and other non-white peoples. His delegation considered that dialogue with South Africa would only be used for propaganda purposes or to facilitate the penetration of independent African States and weaken their opposition to *apartheid*. To accept dialogue would be to divide Africans and thereby strengthen the South African racist régime, the Portuguese colonialists and the treacherous clique of Ian Smith in Southern Rhodesia. Fraternization with the racist régime by independent African States would mean acceptance of the genocidal oppression of the African population in South Africa. How did those who believed dialogue with South Africa to be a means of effecting changes in the policy of *apartheid* explain the invasion of Zambia by South African Government forces in October 1971, the intensified torture and murders of political prisoners by the South African police force, the increase in cases of deportation, expulsion or arrests of priests and religious leaders in South Africa for opposing *apartheid* and assisting its victims? A dialogue with the Government of South Africa meant capitulation to *apartheid*.

28. No country was without its heroes who, in the darkest days of its history, had dedicated themselves to the defence of freedom and human dignity. Africans shared the same aspirations and love of freedom and human dignity as other peoples. Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia in 1936 and, more recently, President Jomo Kenyatta in Kenya, President Kamuzu Banda in Malawi, and the entire Algerian people, were cases in point: those African leaders and their peoples had rejected dialogue and refused to capitulate. Tribute should be paid to them for their courage, patriotism and dedication to the cause of freedom and human dignity. The struggle for justice and equality for all the people of South Africa might well be prolonged but in the end they would overcome.

*The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.*