

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records

## SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 600th MEETING

Monday, 28 October 1968,  
at 3.20 p.m.



NEW YORK

### CONTENTS

#### Agenda item 31:

*The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa: report of the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued) . . . . .* 1

Chairman: Mr. Abdulrahim Abby FARAH  
(Somalia).

### AGENDA ITEM 31

The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa: report of the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued) A/7254, A/7259, A/7270)

1. Mr. HANEEF KHAN (Pakistan) said that the report of the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid (A/7254) and the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa (A/7270) were a recognition of the fact that the inhuman racial policies of Pretoria were repugnant to human dignity and a clear violation of the principles of the United Nations Charter. His delegation was in complete agreement with the recommendations and conclusions of the Special Committee and the Committee of Trustees of the Trust Fund paid tribute to the work of both.

2. Repeated debates and resolutions in the General Assembly and Security Council had failed to produce the desired chain reaction which would eradicate the evil of apartheid. During the twenty years that the question had been before the Organization, the South African Government has never shown the slightest willingness to implement any United Nations resolution calling for the abandonment of apartheid. Indeed, it had greatly intensified its monstrous policy of racial segregation under which tens of thousands of non-white Africans had been uprooted from their homes in urban areas, harassed and huddled together in separate areas designated bantustans, with 87 per cent of available land reserved from the white minority. The bantustans could not sustain even two fifths of the African population and the ruling clique had established them in order to ensure a steady supply of cheap labour and to make them a target in case of revolt. The rulers in Pretoria had steadily increased their repressive powers and could now ban, detain or banish anyone indefinitely without trial, denying him all protection of the courts and cutting him off from contact with his family and friends. The promulgation of such draconian

laws as the Bantu Laws Amendment Act, 1964, had completely suppressed the fundamental freedoms of Africans and had created a suffocating atmosphere.

3. The intensified application of the policies of apartheid had engendered an explosive situation and southern Africa was now plagued by violence and the fear of violence. South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia, the presence of some of its security forces in Southern Rhodesia and its increasing collaboration with the Portuguese colonialists were manifestations of its expansionist policy. As a result, there was a mounting threat to peace and security in the region.

4. If South Africa had disregarded all United Nations resolutions concerning the policies of apartheid, it was because those same resolutions had not been implemented by its major trading partners. Those major Powers had, in fact, increased their investments and shipped military equipment to South Africa. Their failure to apply pressure on South Africa to abandon its dangerous course amounted virtually to indirect aid. His own country had no relations of any kind with South Africa. He appealed to all Member States to sever diplomatic relations with that Government to give full effect to the Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. Every Member State of the United Nations should see that South Africa was totally cut off from the world with a ban on the entry or exit of visitors.

5. His Government had fully implemented all United Nations resolutions on the question of apartheid; it considered any philosophy of racial superiority repugnant to its heritage. Apartheid was no more than the establishment of a caste system based on colour and his delegation urged that the Organization should issue an unequivocal condemnation of South Africa's racist policies in such terms as to produce a tangible effect. The people of South Africa were waging a grim struggle against South African oppression and the United Nations could help them by continuing to work for the social, political, cultural and economic isolation of South Africa. Voluntary organizations working against apartheid should be given adequate assistance in their humanitarian activities and world public opinion should be educated on the evils of the system. His delegation endorsed the Secretary-General's appeal in the introduction to his annual report that financial support should be provided to humanitarian programmes through which the international community could show its determination to alleviate the plight of the victims of racial discrimination (A/7201/Add.1, para. 141). It hoped that any draft resolution emerging from the current debate would meet those objectives fully and assured the Committee that it would not lag

behind in respect of any proposal put forward to abolish racial discrimination.

6. Mr. ABDELLAOUI (Algeria) said that, despite United Nations endeavours since 1946 to put an end to the policies of apartheid, those policies were becoming increasingly harsh and the racist régime at Pretoria was now openly stating the claims to hegemony over Africa in general and southern Africa in particular that it had always nurtured. United Nations endeavours to extirpate an evil generally recognized as a crime against humanity had now reached an impasse which must be overcome. The Committee should examine the problem in its true context—that of a colonial enclave based on racism, brutal force, exploitation and contempt for indigenous people. The same phenomenon had led to the establishment of the Zionist State of Israel in the Middle East. The colonial enclave in South Africa was part of the bastion of ultra-colonialism in southern Africa composed of Southern Rhodesia, Angola, Mozambique and Namibia. Thus, to reduce apartheid to a question of the violation of human rights was to neglect the root of the evil. That colonialist bastion, which could find its salvation only in the permanent use of force, was unquestionably preparing for war and was a grave threat to the security and freedom of the newly-independent African States.

7. The United Nations could assume its full responsibilities only if it decided to shape all its action in the light of those main ideas. It should be recognized finally that apartheid could be eradicated only through resolute action with means better suited to the situation now emerging. It was no secret that Pretoria had committed its oppressive forces on the side of the usurpers in Southern Rhodesia, uniting with them and Portugal to consolidate their imperialist position on the flanks of Africa. Apartheid was assuming a new dimension as an instrument of aggression and blackmail.

8. The growing tension could degenerate into a violent conflagration imperilling peace in Africa and the world. It should not be forgotten that because the United Nations had failed to find a just solution to a similar problem—that of the usurpation in Palestine—it had been a powerless spectator of Zionist aggression against the Arab States. The international community's first duty was to support the liberation movements. Although the primary responsibility for their liberation lay with the colonial people themselves, such support—however modest—was highly valuable to them; they were looking to the United Nations for the political, moral and material support which would enable them to liberate themselves.

9. The major western Powers were fully committed in the confrontation; the attitude of South Africa's main trading partners had already been condemned. Not only were those Powers sharing in South Africa's economic prosperity through trade and investments, they were also supplying massive quantities of arms, and were in no position to proclaim their aversion to apartheid. That ambiguity must be vigorously denounced before world public opinion and such practices, designed solely to thwart United Nations action, must be condemned. It would be delusive to expect the major western Powers to persuade Pretoria radically to alter its present course. Moreover, there was irre-

futable proof of a tendency to give increased military assistance to the Pretoria régime to convert it into an impregnable bastion of minority racism in Africa, and more particularly, a permanent imperialist base for aggression. It was, for example, extremely significant that as a result of the purely provisional and fortuitous passage of tankers via the Cape, international public opinion was being led to believe that South Africa must be given the means to play a greater role in the defence of shipping lanes through the strengthening of its military protection.

10. The African peoples would not be deceived. They knew what to think of the régimes of Pretoria, Salisbury, and Lisbon and their NATO allies—who were waging a shameful war in Viet-Nam or arming the Zionists in the Middle East with jet aircraft. Nor would the African people be deluded by the international propaganda campaign launched by the South African racists following the Zionist example of Palestine. That campaign had two objectives—the first, to persuade the world that a peaceful, definitive solution to the racial problem in South Africa was possible. Yet the world would not be tricked by any so-called "separate development" or by the electoral pantomime in the Transkei, which should be considered null and void by the United Nations. Secondly, the racists wished to propagate the idea that South Africa wanted fruitful co-operation with neighbouring African States. Nothing could be more sordid than to promise those States technical and financial assistance provided that they abandoned their principles by showing "understanding", which was tantamount to their becoming accomplices in the policies of apartheid.

11. The martyred indigenous peoples subjected to that shameless régime were justifiably feeling great disappointment at the ineffectiveness of United Nations action over the years. The South African liberation movement had engaged in an armed struggle which had become the only effective available means to secure dignity and freedom for the South African people. By joining its forces with those of the peoples of Zimbabwe, Angola, Mozambique, and Namibia, it had created new conditions for a struggle which was bound ultimately to be successful. Every effort must be made to obtain more assistance from the United Nations, the specialized agencies and benevolent non-governmental organizations. Constructive suggestions relating to the struggle in southern Africa, which he fully supported, were to be found in the report of the Special Committee (A/7254).

12. His delegation did not wish to despair of the United Nations which should draw a lesson from the failure of its endeavours to eradicate apartheid. The Organization must recognize that it was confronted with a colonial problem calling for a new approach and positive and constructive methods.

13. Mr. ERELL (Israel), speaking on a point of order, said that his delegation considered it unfortunate that the previous speaker should have brought up in his remarks the conflict between the Arab States and the State of Israel, which was not currently under discussion by the Committee. It was well known that the Arab-Israel dispute was now the subject of very active efforts on the part of the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General, on the basis of the Security

Council resolution of 22 November 1967 (242 (1967)). Ambassador Jarring, with whom Israel was co-operating in full measure, would not be assisted in the discharge of his task by polemics or invectives directed at one or other of the parties concerned. Therefore, his delegation urged that speakers should be reminded of the need to confine their remarks to the item under discussion, in accordance with proper procedure. He rejected the allegations made against Israel by the representative of Algeria as entirely unfounded.

14. Mr. AZOUNI (Saudi Arabia), speaking on a point of order, deplored the Israel representative's statement. The representative of Algeria had attempted to make an analogy between two identical crimes; one committed in South Africa against the indigenous people of that country, and another committed by Zionists who were transplanted into Palestine, causing misery, death and deprivation among the indigenous Christian and Moslem Arabs of Palestine.

15. The CHAIRMAN appealed to members to confine their remarks to the subject under discussion, namely, the apartheid policy of the Government of South Africa.

16. Mr. ESCUDERO (Ecuador) said that his delegation wished to reaffirm its severe condemnation of the apartheid policy practised with deliberate cruelty by the Government of the Republic of South Africa. That shameful policy was contemptuous of human dignity and negated the spiritual and moral values common to all civilized societies. It was the policy of a system of racial persecution and discrimination, in which a large majority was subjugated by a privileged minority in an omnipotent police State founded on the principle that might was right.

17. It was not for nothing that the fundamental principles of human rights had been incorporated into the United Nations Charter, both in the preamble and in Article 55 (c), or that the General Assembly had adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights Declaration and the International Covenants on Human Rights. In pursuing the policy of apartheid, the South African Government was cynically rebelling against the universal conscience which had upheld those principles.

18. The resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly had been ineffective in preventing the perpetuation of apartheid. Article 2, paragraph 2 of the United Nations Charter provided that "all Members, in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, should fulfil in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the Charter". However, South Africa continued to enjoy those rights without assuming its duties in respect of human rights, thus enjoying an unjustly privileged situation while perpetuating an inadmissible régime.

19. There was a close relationship between the systematic violation of human rights and breaches of international peace. It came as no surprise that the Government of South Africa, which had originated the apartheid régime, was the same Government that had occupied Namibia, that was giving increasing support to the racist minority régime of Southern Rhodesia and that was plotting against the collective efforts of

the United Nations to liberate the Territories of southern Africa from colonial domination. The Government of South Africa was increasing the scope of its territorial expansion and provoking a warlike situation which undermined international security. It was increasing its war capacity by acquiring arms from its foreign customers, thus flouting the requests of the Security Council and the General Assembly that all States should impose an embargo on the shipment of arms to South Africa. The appeal directed to all States and in particular to the major trading partners of South Africa to refrain from trading with it had remained a dead letter owing to the greed of foreign interests which encouraged that Government to persist in its inhuman racial policy in flagrant violation of the resolutions of the United Nations.

20. The General Assembly had already restated its condemnation of the policy of apartheid as a crime against humanity; it had proved useless to attempt to apply the binding economic sanctions provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter; the tense international situation provoked by the South African Government, which obviously constituted a breach of peace and security, had seriously worsened. His delegation regarded as valid all legitimate proceedings which would lead to the abolition of apartheid, starting with the moral and material assistance of all free Governments and people to ensure that the heroic struggle of the people of South Africa against the brutal despotism which oppressed them would end in the victory that all mankind was waiting for. However, the most important instrument of all was action by the Security Council, which, under Article 24 of the Charter, was entrusted with the responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. It should resume its consideration of the problem and exert its authority to compel all Members of the United Nations to comply with its resolutions and to observe any measures it considered effective with a view to achieving the abolition of apartheid. Only in that way could the Security Council, which had abandoned the problem since June 1964, recover its prestige and authority; in failing to act, it would renounce its responsibilities.

21. In conclusion, he wished to extend his congratulations to the Special Committee whose report to the twenty-third session of the General Assembly (A/7254) reviewed the tireless efforts it had made to carry out its mandate. Its suggestions to the effect that the General Assembly should co-operate effectively in the solution of the problem, inspired by a spirit of peace, freedom and justice, were constructive contributions.

22. Mr. CALERO-RODRIGUES (Brazil) said that his delegation took no pleasure in participating in the debate on the item under consideration, for its annual resumption showed that apartheid was continuing to impose untold suffering on millions of human beings by denying them their fundamental human rights.

23. The position of his delegation with respect to the problem of race relations was well known and unchanging. The people of Brazil, born of the harmonious mixture of many races, had learned to live and work together in an exemplary community; they found it difficult to understand that human beings should be considered different from each other and that rights should be granted or refused purely be-

cause of the colour of their skin. The views of his delegation were those of the Brazilian Government and people. His country neither practised nor accepted racial discrimination or segregation. When apartheid became a State philosophy, there was a violation of the essential principles of the United Nations Charter and of the duties of United Nations Members. His country had held that view ever since the question of apartheid had first been discussed in the United Nations and had repeatedly and resolutely condemned the policy of apartheid and its consequences. Although his delegation had occasionally abstained from voting on certain paragraphs of resolutions concerning apartheid, it had always voted for the resolutions as a whole in the hope that respect for human rights and for the equality of all men would be re-established in South Africa. His country was proud that its capital, Brasilia, was associated with a seminar on the problems of apartheid held there in 1966, and it had contributed, albeit modestly, to the United Nations Special Trust Fund for South Africa and supported that generous undertaking in every way.

24. Nevertheless, despite so many words so frequently repeated, despite so many resolutions adopted on so many occasions, the United Nations had not succeeded in moderating the racial policy of South Africa or in making less painful the fate of the millions of Africans who were its victims. There was nothing new in that conclusion; it was made quite clear in the report of the Special Committee (A/7254). But the mission of the United Nations was not simply to note the facts, but to correct the situation, if possible.

25. The report had attempted to tackle the whole problem of apartheid and, in its passionate search for a solution, had made perhaps too many recommendations of equal value. The programme outlined in paragraphs 105-140 of the report, appeared rather too ambitious and would cause a dispersion of effort which should if possible be avoided. For example, the regular distribution of the Anti-Apartheid News to all Permanent Missions to the United Nations (*ibid.*, annex I, para. 97, c) would hardly prevent a repetition of the unfortunate cases described in section A, annex II, chapter II, of the report. Nor would the reaffirmation of resolutions, which all had known would be impossible to implement, make their implementation any easier. On the other hand, the total boycotting and therefore complete isolation of South Africa might increase the virtually unlimited power exercised by the racist authorities over their people and make it more difficult for world public opinion to be informed of the true state of affairs in that country and to react accordingly. He recalled the opinion expressed by Bishop Crowther (*ibid.*, para. 76) that increased encouragement should be given for South African students to visit other countries, as it was impossible for a white South African student to live outside South Africa and to return unmoved by the progress in race relations in other countries. Even within South Africa many Whites who understood the problem, were ashamed of apartheid and were prepared to join their coloured brothers in the fight against it. It was the United Nations' duty to give every assistance to the internal opposition movements which already existed, as could be seen from annex II, paragraphs 75-105 of the report.

26. The peoples of Africa, like those of his own country, were understandably impatient to find immediate and radical solutions. But if such solutions proved impossible, those noble aspirations should surely be channelled into paths which might lead to effective results. The Special Rapporteur of the Commissions on Human Rights had stated that "the South African Government was not immune to the pressure of public opinion", especially in countries with which it maintained close economic relations (*ibid.*, annex I, para. 43.). A campaign of information and persuasion, carried out within as well as outside South Africa, therefore appeared to be the best and perhaps the only possible solution, even though its action might be slower than people would wish. Such a campaign should be dedicated, objective and measured if it were to combat the well-organized propaganda machine in South Africa. The truth should not be blurred by inessentials or exaggeration. The purchase or manufacture of arms by South Africa was only a problem because apartheid existed. The important thing is that apartheid cease to exist, that South Africa should rediscover the minimum morality required of members of the international community and that all South Africans of goodwill might enjoy the same rights and freedoms and live as befitted human beings.

27. His arguments and suggestions might appear heretical but they were nevertheless sincere and, he believed, valid. Apartheid was above all a human problem. Racial discrimination was decreasing everywhere in the world, world civilization was a psychological and social reality, despite differences in technology, wealth, culture, religious or spiritual background and ideological concepts. South Africa could not hope to remain outside the broad currents of thought uniting the rest of the world and it was the international community's duty to help it to return to the fold. It was a mission not of hatred against the oppressors but of love for the oppressed, which should achieve success through feeling as well as reasoning.

*Mr. Ghaus (Afghanistan), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

28. Mr. NIMON (Togo) said that the policy of apartheid and racial segregation still being practised in South Africa had become so harmful and oppressive that no one could remain indifferent to the problem. The world could no longer be content with half measures intended to uproot that evil.

29. His delegation welcomed the report of the Special Committee (A/7254) and greatly appreciated the unceasing efforts of various personalities and organs to alleviate the sufferings of the victims of apartheid. The failure of even selective sanctions against its supporters was largely due to the lack of political will displayed by the great Powers in their application. That attitude threatened the whole foundation of society, the basis of international co-operation and human solidarity.

30. Colonization was based on no legal right because the treaties between the foreign invader and the indigenous inhabitants were products of error and violence. It could have no "civilizing" mission since civilization knew no nationality. Could nations be con-

exaggerated "civilizers" if they refused to pass on technical knowledge and to give financial assistance to the developing countries on the pretext that their capacity for handling them was limited? The colonialists maintained that colonialism was not a form of exploitation. It was certainly not a charitable enterprise. It was because of the vast human and material resources they had drained from their colonial territories that many countries could today proudly call themselves advanced. That was the first and true financial and technical assistance given by the so-called non-civilized peoples to the civilized peoples. Formerly, human beings had been regarded as living merchandise and deported thousands of miles from their countries of origin. Now, the sons of those deported martyrs were placed in reservations in their own countries, robbed, pillaged, exploited, humiliated and finally exterminated. Could such a planned and subtle form of genocide be termed Christian civilization? It was indeed deplorable that so many lies should have been spoken and so many crimes and offences committed in the name of a Christian civilization.

31. There had been a farcical pretence of voting recommendations and resolutions against South Africa and its acolytes which all Member States knew would not be implemented, yet in defiance of those recommendations and of the repeated appeals by distinguished personages to bring South Africa back to reason, that country stubbornly continued to slaughter the African nationalists and thus flout the will of the Organization and of the international community. The policy of apartheid and racial segregation was being extended

throughout southern and central Africa and the Portuguese colonies, threatening the already precarious security of the African continent and thereby the relative security of the whole world. If all measures to eliminate that social cancer failed, the Charter offered recourse to the ultimate measures which the great Powers, the guardians of international peace and security, refused to contemplate. Yet twenty-five years before, the entire world had united against the author of the doctrine of one superior race.

32. There was no fundamental difference between nazism and the policy of apartheid and racial segregation practised by South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Portugal. It had been revealed that the United Kingdom was preparing to recognize the racist régime of Ian Smith. In view of the voting on General Assembly resolution 2379 (XXIII) recently introduced by the developing countries, which called upon States Members of the United Nations not to recognize the illegal Salisbury régime, the passive attitude and guilty silence of the great Powers gave food for thought.

33. It was false to say that victory over the policy of apartheid depended on the struggle of the direct victims of that injustice. Even if the opposing forces were equal in number, the weapons used would be unequal. All peoples and all Governments of States Members of the United Nations and the international community should examine their own conscience and answer before the eyes of history and humanity.

*The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.*