



Monday, 19 October 1970,
at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

Chairman: Mr. Abdul Samad GHAUS
(Afghanistan).

AGENDA ITEM 34

The policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa: report of the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued) (A/8022 and Add.1, A/8109, A/8117, A/SPC/L.181)

1. Mr. NAVEIRO de la SERNA (Argentina) described the repudiation of any form of discrimination, and in particular racial discrimination, as being deeply rooted in the minds of the Argentine people as a result, on the one hand, of their Spanish heritage and, on the other, of the cultural contribution of people from all parts of the world who had found a new homeland in Argentina. Argentina had abolished slavery in 1813, together with the privileges of descent and nobility, and its 1853 Constitution, which was still in force, established the fundamental freedoms of the population, rejected all forms of discrimination, including racial and religious discrimination, and proclaimed the equality of all men.

2. His delegation found it all the more regrettable, therefore, that the United Nations resolutions condemning the policies of *apartheid* and indubitably reflecting the views of the international community had remained a dead letter.

3. The study entitled "*Apartheid in Practice*"¹ gave a set of examples providing a clear and objective picture of *apartheid* in terms of the laws and regulations applied to the non-white population in South Africa. Those laws and regulations, with their matter-of-fact language, showed how closely the life of the non-white inhabitants of South Africa was regulated even in its most intimate aspects. Such legislation was a caricature of law, for there could be no civilized law which was not based on freedom and justice. A perusal of the document conjured up visions reminiscent of an Orwellian nightmare or the "brave new world" described by Huxley. *Apartheid* was in fact an anachronism and marked a step backward for all mankind. A régime based on the superiority of the white man was inadmissible in the modern world.

4. Actually that régime was conscious of its own weakness, judging from chapter IX of the aforementioned study

dealing with freedom of opinion and expression where it was stated that a white man who told a group of Africans that the *apartheid* laws were unjust and should be disobeyed was guilty of an offence. The system of *apartheid* was a reality which neither the white man nor the black man could dispute. It could never be repeated often enough that *apartheid* was contrary to human dignity, since it removed any possibility of social advancement and constituted the most serious violation of the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the spirit of the United Nations Charter.

5. The work of the United Nations, the specialized agencies and other bodies concerned with *apartheid*, while not yet having produced very visible results, had nevertheless created in international public opinion an opposition to the policy of *apartheid*, and in that connexion, the report (A/8022) of the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa referred to the attitude of the International Olympic Committee and other sports groups which had excluded South Africa from a number of sports events. In that respect, the work of the Special Committee's Sub-Committee on Information on *Apartheid* was of great value in facilitating an evaluation of the precise scope of *apartheid*. His delegation endorsed the Special Committee's conclusion on that subject appearing in paragraphs 87 to 94 of its report.

6. His delegation agreed with UNESCO that not only was the policy of *apartheid* not an acceptable solution to conflicts between races or different categories of the population, but that it was in fact the main factor leading to such conflicts. His delegation would therefore continue to support any action by the United Nations to eliminate racial discrimination.

7. He protested against the reference, in the Special Committee's report, to the statements by Mr. Abdul S. Minty, Honorary Secretary of the Anti-*Apartheid* Movement of the United Kingdom, to the effect that South Africa had established naval links with countries in South America, as a result of which its Navy was due to take part in joint exercises with Argentine warships in 1971, and that it intended to form a South Atlantic Treaty Organization with Portugal, Argentina and Brazil. His delegation had already issued repeated denials of those rumours, which were without any foundation and which recurred in several of the Special Committee's reports. The matter would be of scant importance, since Mr. Minty himself had described the rumours as such, but for the fact that some delegations had seized upon them to condemn the policy pursued by Argentina and to question the good faith of his Government.

¹ Document ST/PSCA/SER.A/9, issued by the Unit on *Apartheid*.

8. In that connexion, he referred to the letter dated 2 June 1969 (A/AC.115/L.258)² from the Permanent Mission of Argentina to the United Nations addressed to the Chairman of the Special Committee, in which it was clearly stated that “none of the Argentine authorities had considered . . . the possibility of concluding any pact of the nature referred to in the dispatches of the agencies in question”. He was surprised that the misunderstanding persisted, and categorically reaffirmed that his country had never considered concluding a treaty or organizing naval exercises with South Africa. He hoped that the necessary steps would be taken in the future to avoid spreading rumours of that kind.

9. He also drew the Committee’s attention to paragraph 173 of annex II (A/8022/Add.1) to the Special Committee’s report, in which reference was made to the visit to Cape Town of a training frigate of the Argentine Navy and to the calls which its commanding officer paid on the South African Ministers of Defence and Foreign Affairs. He emphasized that the frigate in question had not simply put into port in South Africa but had been engaged in an annual training cruise for officer-cadets which had no political aim and involved no military co-operation with the countries visited.

10. His delegation categorically reaffirmed that it condemned the system of *apartheid* and that it would support any action designed to eliminate *apartheid* policies provided that it complied with the spirit and letter of the Charter. It was in that spirit that it had voted in favour of the resolution concerning the arms embargo which had recently been adopted by the General Assembly (resolution 2264 (XXV)).

11. Mr. TEYMOUR (United Arab Republic) raising a point of order, referred to the statement which he had made at the 699th meeting and to the statement made by the representative of Israel in the exercise of his right of reply; he noted with regret that the summary record of that meeting did not accurately reflect what he had said. He therefore asked the Secretariat to reproduce the texts of the two statements *in extenso*.

12. Mr. SEMAOUI (Algeria) and Mr. CACERES (Peru) supported the request of the representative of the United Arab Republic.

13. Mr. VARGA (Hungary) noted that it was not the first time that members had raised the question of summary records which failed to give a true idea of statements made in the Committee. He therefore supported the representative of the United Arab Republic.

14. The CHAIRMAN recapitulated the exchange which had just taken place: the representative of the United Arab Republic had said that the summary record of the 699th meeting did not accurately reflect either the statement he had made at that time or that which the representative of Israel had subsequently made in the exercise of his right of reply, and had asked that both statements should be issued

in extenso. That request had been supported by the Algerian, Peruvian and Hungarian delegations.

*It was so decided.*³

15. Mr. AVKSENYEV (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) felt that although the question was of long standing, the services of an historian were hardly required; the Special Committee’s report and statements of the various representatives provided sufficient material to form a convincing picture of the truly distressing condition in which the South African racist régime kept the non-white majority of the people.

16. Since the struggle against *apartheid* had been on the agenda of United Nations organs for many years, and in view of the Committee’s work-load during the commemorative session, celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Organization, his delegation would deal with only one aspect of the question: it would inquire into the forces which permitted the South African régime to practice *apartheid* with impunity, and would seek to discover why all the efforts exerted by the United Nations had been unable to bring any noticeable relief to the South African people. The reply was to be found in the greed of certain imperialist Powers who purposely reduced to nought the goodwill of millions of people.

17. Recalling the constant build-up of South African military and police forces referred to in the Special Committee’s report, and the development of the arms industry in South Africa, he noted that, according to the 1969 White Paper on Defence (see A/8022/Add.1, para. 144), the country’s military budget would undoubtedly continue to grow each year. Where was the threat against which the Pretoria régime was claiming to defend itself? South Africa was not threatened in any way. The growth of its military potential was therefore aimed only at satisfying expansionist aims, permitting the inhuman repression of all opponents of *apartheid* and perpetuating manifestations of colonialism which had long since been condemned.

18. With the aim of misleading public opinion, the South African Government nevertheless claimed that the country’s defence needs compelled it to engage in that systematic arms build-up. Those who supplied it with arms were themselves seeking to spread the myth of an external danger and made a distinction between arms for external defence and arms for imposing *apartheid*, although the Special Committee had repeatedly stated that the distinction was not valid and that the arms embargo must be implemented fully. Experience had shown the correctness of that thesis. Now that the South African people’s legitimate struggle for their liberation had assumed the proportions of a guerrilla war, the South African authorities were not content to carry out simple police operations; they felt they had to use military techniques to fight the opponents of *apartheid*. Clearly, the authorities were quite obviously advancing the argument of external defence to camouflage their plan to impede the social and national liberation of the non-white majority.

² Mimeographed.

³ Text subsequently circulated as document A/SPC/PV.699.

19. Another conclusion emerged just as clearly: the racist régime was assuming the role of policing the continent in order to repress the legitimate struggle of the peoples of Rhodesia, Angola, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau) and other African countries against those who enslaved them. If that were not so, the South African Government would have no need to deploy its forces in that way on its northern frontier, nor to squander such large sums on armaments when they could be devoted more usefully to economic and cultural progress.

20. References to so-called communist threats seemed just as absurd. Nevertheless, oblivious to ridicule, the Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom had stated, according to *The New York Times* of 23 June 1970, that the United Kingdom's strategic interests lay in guarding against any communist threat to the security of sea-routes round the Cape of Good Hope. It would be as well to abandon that argument, which had been used all too often; only simpletons or inveterate revanchists could nibble at the rusty hook of anti-communist propaganda.

21. As to the conflict in attitudes within the Organization concerning that important question, he saw it as one way of characterizing the position of individual countries with regard to military, economic and commercial co-operation with the Pretoria régime.

22. In July 1970 the Security Council (resolution 282 (1970)) had again called on all the States to implement fully the arms embargo established under a resolution adopted previously by the Council (resolution 181 (1963)). That measure could have been useful in depriving South Africa of the means of further strengthening its military supremacy over its neighbours and of moral and material support in its application of *apartheid*; it had been a reasonable one from the political standpoint and a necessary one from the practical standpoint. While the vast majority of Member States had supported that resolution, thus proving their sincerity, a number of States, including Security Council members, had invoked casuistic arguments to continue their supplies of arms to South Africa, claiming that they had to supply spare parts for equipment already sold under earlier contracts.

23. His delegation welcomed the adoption at the 696th meeting of draft resolution A/SPC/L.182/Rev.1, which it had supported without reservation and which had just been adopted by the General Assembly (resolution 2624 (XXV)). His country, which knew no racial prejudice, had followed with interest and sympathy the struggle of the peoples of South Africa and other parts of Africa against *apartheid* and colonialist oppression. It condemned that inhuman policy and those who gave it material and moral backing, and staunchly championed the aspirations of the African peoples and of the entire progressive world. His delegation was optimistic and looked forward with confidence, drawn from its revolutionary experience, to the triumph of the just cause of the peoples.

24. Mr. PIERRE-LOUIS (Haiti) noted that the struggle against *apartheid* had lasted 24 years but that, despite the adoption of more than 110 resolutions, the efforts of the United Nations had been fruitless. The problem had even been aggravated and extended, since it now also encom-

passed the questions of South West Africa and Southern Rhodesia. Under the system of *apartheid*, the whites of South Africa—one fifth of the population—were imposing on the blacks restrictions worse than under slavery. Though condemned by the United Nations and repudiated by the entire world, that system nevertheless continued to be applied by South Africa, whose wealth was based on the exploitation of the blacks.

25. He recalled certain dates in the development of *apartheid*, and certain stages in the struggle which the Organization had waged against that system of segregation and economic and social domination of whites over non-whites. General Assembly resolution 103 (I), adopted in 1946, had been directed against religious and racial discrimination, while Assembly resolution 217 (III), adopted in 1948, had been an International Bill of Human Rights. It was in 1948, and thanks to Mr. Malan, that the word *apartheid* had taken on its political meaning of domination of whites over non-whites, although, from the time of the establishment of the Union of South Africa in 1910, its successive governments had regarded *apartheid* as the appropriate system for ensuring white supremacy, an ideal recalled by Mr. Verwoerd in January 1963. Starting from 1911 the policy of discrimination had been consolidated by laws obviously inspired by racism. The Native Labour Regulation Act, 1911, had excluded natives from well-paid employment. In 1913 the Native Land Act had deprived natives of the right to land-ownership, and they had been segregated on reservations. Under the Coloured Persons Settlement Act and the Asiatic Land Tenure and Indian Representation Act, the coloureds had been relegated to special areas and Asians excluded from entry into South Africa. The Population Registration Act, 1950, had introduced passes and racial identity cards, designed to prevent the native population from residing in areas reserved for whites. The Group Areas Act had established geographical segregation; the ostensible aim, according to Mr. Verwoerd, was to separate the races so that each individual could enjoy all rights and opportunities among his own people and, if possible, in his own territory. In 1951 the Native Building Workers Act and the Separate Representation of Voters Act had still further strengthened *apartheid*.

26. The General Assembly had been observing and studying that system since 1952. It had adopted resolutions and the Security Council had made recommendations, all of which had been flouted by the Pretoria Government. World opinion condemned the white rulers of South Africa and their policy which, according to the United Nations, was incompatible with the forces of progress and co-operation mobilized to promote the ideals of equality, freedom and justice; but that policy, which the General Assembly had called a crime against humanity and the Security Council an affront to humanity, was nevertheless being extended to the neighbouring countries.

27. To carry out its policy of *apartheid*, the South African Government had felt obliged to divide its population into whites (people of European descent), Bantus (the indigenous people of Africa), Asians (people of Asian origin) and Coloured (special groups, such as the Cape Coloured), and had introduced a racial identity card which must be carried by every inhabitant of the country, although, on 26

September 1967, experts working under the auspices of UNESCO had come to the conclusion that all men living today belonged to the same species and descended from the same stock; the division of the human species into "races" was partly conventional and partly arbitrary and implied no hierarchy whatsoever; current biological knowledge did not permit the imputation of cultural achievements of peoples to differences in genetic potential, and the peoples of the modern world appeared to possess equal biological potentialities for attaining any level of civilization.⁴

28. It was nonetheless true that in South Africa the non-white lived under a régime of oppression—a situation which Haiti, an off-shoot of Africa on the American continent, viewed with concern and indignation. Haiti, the first black republic in the world, sympathized with the suffering populations of southern Africa and made common cause with the Zimbabwe people in their fight for freedom. It rejoiced at the successes of the peoples of Africa, felt with them in their difficulties, disapproved of their persecution in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, condemned the illegal trials instituted by the South African Government against the opponents of *apartheid* and protested against South Africa's annexation of South West Africa. The Republic of Haiti, like the other States Members of the United Nations, would like to see the question of discrimination in South West Africa effectively settle in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

29. Because the South African Government objected to the rise of the Coloured peoples, it had built up a vast military potential, in order to quell the national liberation movements and intimidate the African States in southern Africa. As that arms build-up was accompanied by the development of the country's technical, economic and financial potential, the perpetuation of the discriminatory régime appeared to be assured.

30. Although the United Nations had not been able to put an end to *apartheid*, it had at least been able to mobilize world opinion against it. He congratulated the Rapporteur of the Special Committee and called upon delegations to support the recommendations made in paragraph 43 of that Committee's report (A/8022), because the suggested measures might lead South Africa to reconsider its policy. The people and Government of Haiti welcomed all measures designed to eliminate *apartheid* and his delegation appealed to the members of the Committee to consider all means of supporting the black population in its fight. The Republic of Haiti was ready to support all practical measures likely to change the intransigent attitude of the Pretoria Government and to prevent any collaboration with it.

31. Lastly, his delegation supported the Mexican proposal (693rd and 701st meetings) that the Republic of South Africa should be expelled from the United Nations.

32. Mr. FRELEK (Poland) said that the problem of *apartheid* had become one of the chronic problems before the United Nations. The appeals made, the adoption of some 80 resolutions on the subject and moral condemnation, had brought no change in that policy.

33. On the contrary, the South African Government had intensified its policy of *apartheid* and racial domination over the African majority of the inhabitants by imposing new laws, such as the Suppression of Communism Act and the Terrorism Act, and by increasing its repressive measures against all opponents of its racist policies. Expansion of the *apartheid* régime to other countries, in particular to Namibia, which had been illegally annexed by South Africa, had been going on for several years. The Pretoria régime was also helping to strengthen the régime in Southern Rhodesia and was actively supporting Portugal in its colonial wars in Mozambique and Angola.

34. South Africa was constantly building up its military potential, which was now much greater than the combined defence potential of all the independent African States and constituted a serious danger to the independence of African States and to peace in that region.

35. It might well be asked how, despite all the resolutions adopted by the United Nations organs and universal condemnation by public opinion, a criminal régime so incompatible with fundamental human rights could continue to exist. Over the past twenty-five years, South Africa had clearly shown that it would not change its policy of its own free will. On the contrary, every government of that country had done everything possible to maintain a régime based on colonial exploitation and racist ideology. It was evident that the régime of *apartheid* could not stay in power without outside support, especially since the liberation and accession to independence of most African countries, which made common cause against the régime and supported the national liberation movement.

36. South Africa was co-operating with all the forces of colonialism and neo-colonialism, those of Portugal and those of Southern Rhodesia, and with all neo-colonialist actions, such as that against the Republic of the Congo a few years before. Furthermore, despite the many appeals made by the United Nations, economic co-operation between the Western countries and South Africa was constantly increasing, as were foreign investments in that country, especially those of the United Kingdom, the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany. Lastly, the South African régime received significant support from military blocs, especially from NATO. The suppliers of arms claimed that they were provided only for external defence and not for enforcing the policy of *apartheid*.

37. Poland had already protested in the Security Council against artificial distinctions of that kind. It understood that the resolution just adopted by the General Assembly called for an embargo on all kinds of arms, without any exception.

38. The South African Government tried to justify its repression of the African population and the arms race by the need to fight communism. In reality, anti-communism once more served as a slogan to stifle the oppressed and exploited peoples' hopes for freedom. The socialist countries were naturally proud of being identified with all fights for freedom and progress throughout the world.

39. It was the duty of the United Nations and of all its Member States to provide maximum support for the

⁴ See *Four statements on the race question* (UNESCO publication COM.69/II.2.16, A), sect. IV.

liberation movements in South Africa. Governments, especially those which had relations with South Africa, should bring pressure to bear to induce that country to change its policy; at the same time, the Security Council should consider more effective and stronger measures against South Africa, in accordance with the United Nations Charter and not excluding the provisions laid down in Chapter VII.

40. After twenty years of ineffective measures, his delegation was determined to co-operate with all progressive forces in adopting and implementing all necessary measures to put an end to the criminal policy of *apartheid*, which was the shame of the twentieth century.

41. Mr. CAHANA (Israel) expressed regret that in his absence the representative of the United Arab Republic had requested that the full texts of his own statement and the reply of the representative of Israel at the 699th meeting should be circulated. He had by no means said everything he had to say on that subject and, as the Committee had agreed to that request, he wished at least to complete his statement.

42. He wondered how the representative of the United Arab Republic, a country whose policy was based upon the late President Nasser's "philosophy of revolution", could make accusations of imperialism.

43. Mr. TEYMOUR (United Arab Republic), speaking on a point of order, pointed out that the Committee was now considering the question of *apartheid* and requested the Chairman not to allow the preceding speaker to talk about his country. He emphasized that he had not uttered the word "imperialism" when he had spoken and that was one of the reasons why he had requested that his statement should be reproduced in full. Since a decision had been taken on the matter, it would serve no purpose to go back to it.

44. The CHAIRMAN asked the representative of Israel to confine his statements to the matter under discussion.

45. Mr. CAHANA (Israel) said he merely asked that he should not be discriminated against and that he should be enabled to state his position under the same conditions as other delegations. He requested that his statement at the present meeting should also be reproduced in full.

46. The United Arab Republic was attempting to become a dominant world Power by expanding its influence to the Arab countries, to the Moslem countries and to Africa as a whole.

47. Mr. TEYMOUR (United Arab Republic), interrupting the speaker on a point of order, insisted that there should be no further reference in statements to the policy or régime of specific countries.

48. A decision had already been taken at the beginning of the meeting concerning the circulation of his statement at the 699th meeting and the reply of the representative of Israel. The latter should therefore confine himself to the agenda item under consideration.

49. Mr. CAHANA (Israel) said he wished to make a statement rather than to exercise his right of reply. The

representative of the United Arab Republic had taken the liberty of criticizing Israel, and the resulting atmosphere in the Committee had impelled him to put the record straight.

50. Egyptian imperialism was well known: it was not confined to the Arab world but extended to all the African countries.

51. Mr. TEYMOUR (United Arab Republic), speaking on a point of order, again drew attention to the fact that the Committee was now considering the question of *apartheid* and said that although a parallel could be drawn between *apartheid* and other phenomena, there was no reason for attacking a particular Government's policy.

52. Mrs. GAVRILOVA (Bulgaria) shared the views of the representative of the United Arab Republic. With regard to the assertion by the representative of Israel that he wished to make a statement rather than to exercise the right of reply, the Committee was ready to hear his statement on *apartheid*, but if he intended to discuss the Middle East, the proper forum was the General Assembly.

53. Mr. PAL (Pakistan) said that he also shared the views of the representative of the United Arab Republic.

54. The CHAIRMAN said that he wished to give the speakers the fullest freedom, but that the Committee was now concerned with the question of *apartheid*. On the matter under discussion the representatives of the United Arab Republic and Israel had already made their points of view abundantly clear. He therefore called on the representative of Israel to confine his comments to the agenda item under consideration.

55. Mr. CAHANA (Israel) said that he himself had requested on several occasions that speakers should confine themselves to the question under consideration. Referring to the Bulgarian representative's statement, he said that some members obviously preferred that a single point of view should be expressed in the United Nations and that all others should be stifled. Agreeing to set aside the question of imperialism, he asked by what right the representative of the United Arab Republic could accuse anyone of colonialism, in view of the fact that the United Arab Republic had restored colonialism to Africa and opened its territory to European armies.

56. Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico) said that the South American group of countries wished to meet immediately after the meeting in order to draw up a draft resolution on the question of *apartheid*.

57. Citing rule 119 of the General Assembly rules of procedure, he proposed that the meeting should be adjourned.

58. Mr. CAHANA (Israel) said that he could finish his statement in two minutes and that he would then be ready to support the motion for adjournment.

59. The CHAIRMAN read out rule 119 of the General Assembly rules of procedure. He pointed out that motions for adjournment could not be discussed. If there was no objection, he would therefore adjourn the meeting.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.