

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 333rd
MEETING



Thursday, 18 October 1962,
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 87:

The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued):

(a) Race conflict in South Africa;

(b) Treatment of people of Indian and Indo-Pakistan origin in the Republic of South Africa

Page

31

Chairman: Mr. Leopoldo BENITES (Ecuador).

AGENDA ITEM 87

The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (A/5167 and Add.1-6) (continued):

(a) Race conflict in South Africa;

(b) Treatment of people of Indian and Indo-Pakistan origin in the Republic of South Africa (A/5166, A/5173)

1. Mr. VASQUEZ (Chile), in the exercise of his right of reply, noted that the Bolivian representative had referred in his statement at the 332nd meeting to the question of his country's lack of access to the sea. He had not referred to Chile by name, but since Chile was one of Bolivia's neighbours, he felt that he should take up the point, although it was hardly relevant to the item under discussion. He would merely recall that the question had already been raised by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Bolivia during the general debate in the Assembly and that the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Chile had made a reply at the 1137th plenary meeting.

2. Mr. MOLLINEDO (Bolivia) thought that the Chilean representative's reply to what had been a very general reference was perhaps evidence of an uneasy conscience. He did not wish to distract the Committee's attention from the item under discussion but desired that it should be established clearly that Bolivia was lawfully entitled to access to the sea and had appealed, therefore, to the solidarity of all peoples, in a similar situation.

3. Mr. WOLNIAK (Poland) said that the admission of five new States to the United Nations at the current session of the General Assembly was a further demonstration of the disintegration of the colonial system and the gradual elimination of its traces throughout the world. The ideals of human rights and the equality of all peoples set forth in the Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights had become guiding principles for all civilized societies. There was still one State, however, which brutally oppressed the majority of its inhabitants because of the colour of their skins and made that the paramount principle of its policy and the very foundation of its philosophy and conduct.

4. The two questions now combined in one item were manifestations of the policy of genocide which the South African Government was waging in open defiance of the United Nations and of world public opinion. The plight of the indigenous non-white population of the Republic of South Africa was too well known to the members of the Committee to require further description. It was clear from the debate that there was a growing feeling that the time for words had passed, and that decisive action must be taken if the shameful and dangerous situation was to be dealt with effectively. Despite numerous resolutions adopted in the past, the Government of South Africa was not only persisting in its practices unabated but intensifying its discriminatory policies. Of that the General Law Amendment Act, popularly called the Sabotage Act, rushed through the South African Parliament in June 1962, was but the most recent manifestation.

5. It was difficult to avoid the conclusion, after studying the legislation in South Africa and the general situation in that country, that the nazi ideology had not, as the world had hoped, been completely wiped out. It had taken the Second World War and a world-wide coalition against nazism to destroy one notion of racial supremacy. The tragic memory of that not-too-distant past was still vivid in Poland. The Polish people, too, had been considered inferior by their conquerors. They too had been treated like slaves, robbed of their land, expelled from their homes, deprived of educational opportunities, subjected to segregation, forced labour and imprisonment without trial, and sentenced to death for the slightest violation of arbitrary laws. It had taken five years of war and countless millions of victims to end that nightmare and now fascist ideology appeared to be reviving in South Africa. It must not be allowed to continue and to threaten the peace of the world. It must be dealt with in a way which would remind fascist elements everywhere that there was no place for them in the family of nations.

6. The South African Government's policy of apartheid served a very practical purpose. It was a cover for the brutal economic exploitation of the entire non-white population. The main purpose of all the discriminatory legislation was to perpetuate a state of affairs under which the destitute indigenous masses were at the mercy of the great monopolistic enterprises and land-owners, whose connexions and influence extended far beyond the South African frontiers. That was undoubtedly the reason why the South African Government had been able to continue for so long in open defiance of the United Nations.

7. The representative of Ghana (327th meeting) and many other representatives from Africa and Asia had already described to the Committee many instances of the suffering caused to the non-white population of South Africa by the policy and practice of apartheid.

Reports from South Africa showed that the tension was growing and that the situation there might explode into violence, the consequences of which were unforseeable. Warnings and censure were therefore not enough. The racist Government of South Africa had found it safe to defy the Charter of the United Nations and to ignore the decisions of the Organization. It was for every Member State to see that the will of the nations on that crucial issue was finally imposed on the Republic of South Africa. Any decision by the United Nations should help to ensure that the change which was bound to come in South Africa sooner or later was orderly and non-violent.

8. The Polish delegation felt that the demands of so many African and Asian representatives, both in the General Assembly and in the Committee, for decisive action and for firm measures against the Government of the Republic of South Africa and its policy of apartheid were fully justified. Their aim was to put an end to further suffering and to avert the danger of war and they would accordingly have the full support of the Polish delegation.

9. Mr. USHER (Ivory Coast) said that ten years had elapsed since the United Nations had first been called upon to deal with the problem of race conflict in South Africa, brought about by the policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa. During that time, despite the reiterated appeals of the General Assembly, that Government had vigorously pursued what the Foreign Minister of South Africa was pleased to call the policy of "separate development" (1033rd plenary meeting). Separate development for the Bantus in South Africa meant confinement in native reserves, the humiliating pass system, segregation in all areas of life, the prohibition of trade union activities and exclusion from political representation. That policy was unacceptable to any reasonable being and had to be imposed by force, with every attendant humiliation. Perhaps the most horrifying aspect of that policy was that its proponents sought to justify it by a philosophy which they claimed to be drawn from the Bible. Whole generations had been brought up in that theory, and many persons in South Africa were totally unable to understand the world's condemnation of apartheid. The Foreign Minister of South Africa had referred to the existence of discrimination in other countries, as though that could serve as an excuse. The Ivory Coast condemned discrimination wherever it was to be found, but at the same time, it was objective enough to recognize the efforts that were being made by other Governments to combat it.

10. The South African Foreign Minister had told the General Assembly (1128th plenary meeting) at its current session that South Africa would not be deterred by criticism or by threats from moving forward towards what he called the South African "New Frontier". That phrase called for an analysis of the settlement and conquest of South Africa. The original Zulu and Bantu inhabitants had helped the British and the Afrikaners to establish themselves there. Only when the expansionist designs of the colonists became apparent had armed conflict broken out, in which, after heroic resistance, the Africans had been overcome. The present leaders of South Africa were still animated by the warlike ambitions of nearly a century before. After their victory, the white colonists had forced the original inhabitants of the land into a state of poverty-stricken dependence, ignorance and disease. Notwithstanding, the Bantus had made

a great contribution to the development of South Africa. The whole political, commercial and industrial structure of the country had been built upon their labour. Nor had they made only a physical contribution; they had increased its religious and cultural heritage also. There had been an inevitable process of mingling and collaboration between the races.

11. The Ivory Coast, a peace-loving country that believed not only in peaceful coexistence but in brotherly love between the races, perceived a yet greater tragedy in the present situation, for it was beginning to believe that there was a vast plot in the southern part of Africa against the independent African States, a plot which might have accomplices in other parts of the world. There was a disturbing attitude of indifference towards the refusal to liberate the colonies surrounding South Africa. The United Nations must insist on independence for Angola, Southern Rhodesia, Mozambique, South West Africa and the Protectorates of Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland. It was there that the United Kingdom, which had never refused its help to the United Nations, could do a great deal. It was to be hoped that now that it knew what the South African leaders were capable of, it would never agree to yield any of its protectorates to that country. Pressure must also be brought on the Government of South Africa to abandon its policy of apartheid. The system of pressure advocated by the Charter was economic sanctions. The Ivory Coast considered, therefore, that the Security Council should be asked to note that the situation in South Africa due to the Government's persistent violation of the Charter, constituted a menace to international peace and security; the Council should be asked to apply economic sanctions in accordance with Article 41 of the Charter and should threaten to apply Articles 42 and 6.

12. An appeal should be made to all those free countries which had fought against nazism to be vigilant for nazism was not dead; it had merely moved to a different continent. It was because Hitler had aspired to a "New Frontier" that there had been a Second World War. Africa had not been absent from that fight to save freedom in Europe and human dignity as a whole. All the countries of the world, therefore, and the European countries in particular, had a duty to help the Africans, since human dignity was once again threatened, now on African soil. Africa needed peace, and all possible sources of conflict must be removed. The independent African States had shown that racial coexistence was possible. Even in Algeria, after seven years of war, Europeans were still accorded their rightful place in the Government and the administration, and even in the delegation to the United Nations. The Bantus could be counted upon to display a similar forbearance. They should be helped now to regain their democratic rights, lest in desperation they embark upon a campaign the consequences of which could not be foreseen.

13. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) said that he wished to restate his Government's position concerning the inhumane and discriminatory practice of apartheid practised against the non-white population in the Republic of South Africa and in South West Africa. Indeed, the status of South West Africa had many points in common with the question now under consideration by the Committee. Both matters had been the subject of grave anxiety to the United Nations and had given rise to countless resolutions; the

origin of both was due to flagrant violations of the Charter by the South African Government, which stubbornly defied every decision of the United Nations. The population of South West Africa was similarly the victim of racial sadism and had been oppressed and dispossessed of its rights by the South African Government while an insignificant white minority enjoyed all conceivable rights and privileges to which it considered itself entitled as a superior race.

14. The Guatemalan delegation had always held the view that there were no grounds for invoking Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter on that subject. First, it was generally agreed—and as such had become an accepted standard of international law—that systematic violation of human rights and all matters relating to the welfare and administration of the peoples of dependent territories, were questions of international concern. On the other hand, actions which in themselves constituted a violation of the United Nations Charter, could not escape the jurisdiction or condemnation of the Organization. Besides being contrary to natural law, the policy of apartheid and the brutal discrimination practised by the Government of South Africa violated the fundamental principles of the Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It was accordingly preposterous and cynical to invoke the Charter in order to obviate any action by the Organization.

15. It was interesting to note how colonialism in Africa had persistently aided the totalitarian forces at work in South Africa and South West Africa. A broad belt of subjugated territory extended from the Atlantic to the Indian Ocean to the north of both those countries, affording complete protection to the South African Government in its arbitrary rule over the unfortunate native population. The latter could expect no help from neighbouring areas where the population was similarly oppressed. The future of that protective belt, however, was daily becoming more uncertain and it would eventually disappear for ever. There was thus an important new element in the situation, for the common frontier between the Republic of South Africa and South West Africa on one side, and the newly independent African States on the other, would inevitably become a continual source of friction constituting a danger to peace and to the stability of the new States. In one direction, there would be a steady stream of refugees across that frontier in search of freedom while, in the other, there would be a flow of enlightened ideas and information. It might even become impossible to prevent the smuggling of arms across the frontier and support for rebel action—or even revolution—might come from outside. The situation was considerably aggravated by the armaments race in which the Government of South Africa was at present engaged. The quantities of weapons accumulated far exceeded defence needs and could only be intended to crush any internal liberation movement and deter neighbouring nations from providing aid. It was reasonable to suppose that any further massacre of the native population of South Africa would induce the free peoples of Africa to come to the aid of their brothers. Therefore the United Nations must act in time or else it might be too late to prevent a catastrophe. The Guatemalan delegation believed that the status of South West Africa should be decided at the same time.

16. Guatemala had consistently maintained that the United Nations should take over the administration

of South West Africa from the South African Government in order to prepare the Territory for democracy and independence by means of the trusteeship system.

17. As an immediate measure, the General Assembly should call upon all Member States to refrain from supplying and selling arms to the Republic of South Africa. It was clearly a crime to furnish arms to a totalitarian State engaged in the genocidal extermination of its native population, for the policy and practices of that State endangered peace in the area and the security of its neighbours. With respect to the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations, Guatemala was convinced that that nation's policies were quite incompatible with the letter and spirit of the Charter; no nation could persistently violate its obligations as a Member and at the same time continue to enjoy the privileges of membership. Nevertheless, Guatemala also considered that the General Assembly had no power to impose sanctions on any State and that, under the Charter, such a course was exclusively the prerogative of the Security Council. The Assembly might thus invite the Security Council to examine the situation and take the necessary action.

18. In conclusion, he wished to extend Guatemala's sympathy to the unfortunate people who had to live under a brutal totalitarian régime which none the less set itself up as an authority on the interpretation of the Charter. Guatemala would support any constructive proposal for a solution of the grave situation under consideration that would be in the interests of the indigenous and other oppressed inhabitants of South Africa and South West Africa.

19. Mr. PAPAGOS (Greece) reiterated his delegation's stand in consistently opposing any doctrine in favour of discrimination. That position was in keeping both with the spirit and the letter of the Charter and with Greece's domestic legislation under which all men were equal before the law.

20. It was gratifying to note that two items that had been considered separately at previous sessions were now combined under one general heading. Discussion of two such similar items individually would only serve unnecessarily to prolong the work of the Committee and to create distinctions where none existed. It was apparent from the lengthy discussions devoted to the subject at previous sessions that South Africa's policies of discrimination met with general condemnation. The present debate would but confirm that opinion since no violation of principles could be condoned with the passage of time.

21. The United Nations should bring constant pressure to bear on the Government of South Africa to induce it to abandon its policy of apartheid. The Greek delegation considered that in order to achieve that end, the Committee should seek a solution that would gain the widest possible support among its members.

22. In conclusion he expressed disappointment over various allegations that had been made concerning the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), which had been quite out of place in a discussion of the policy of apartheid. If any such allegations were to be made, it would be more appropriate to criticize the apologists of apartheid as Members of the United Nations and signatories of the Charter.

23. Mr. KANE (Senegal) said that his delegation's position on the subject under discussion was un-

changed. Senegal objected most strongly to the discriminatory policies of the Government of South Africa and was prepared to submit or support a draft resolution that would lead to a solution.

24. The United Nations was supposed to be an institution to which nations came either to contribute to a solution of the world's difficulties or to submit specific questions with a view to their peaceful settlement. Far from sharing that view, South Africa came to the United Nations merely to proclaim and applaud a system of Government that had been universally condemned and to reject any solution proposed by the other Member States. Even though representatives of the South African Government were no longer attending the Committee's discussions, other States would continue to speak their indignation at South Africa's continued disregard for the fundamental rights of the native inhabitants of that country.

25. Race conflict constituted inherently a false issue. At a time when representatives of all racial geographical groups were seated together at the same conference table to discuss means of resolving the world's ills, it was no longer appropriate to speak of "races" in the plural. All were members of the human race—including those who practised, or were the victims of, apartheid.

26. The South African Minister for Foreign Affairs had stated that his Government had done a great deal to improve the standard of living of the indigenous inhabitants. Dignity was as essential to man as his daily food. Even if the South African Government gave its population the highest standard of living in Africa, that did not justify the ignoble practice of segregation. The South African Government possibly feared that by allowing the black inhabitants of South Africa equal educational opportunities with the whites, the myth of their inferiority would be dispelled. But it had no right to deprive mankind of the untapped resources of human intelligence.

27. The stubbornness of the South African Government would be surprising, in view of the scant support it enjoyed at home, if it were not for the support it received from countries which claimed to uphold humanitarian ideals. Such a nation could not continue to belong to an Organization that had voted for the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and similar enlightened measures, were it not for the complicity of certain States which still nurtured ambitions of domination.

28. Nevertheless, the Pretoria Government would be bound to capitulate sooner or later. Racial equality would come to South Africa through peaceful means or by force—as the result of internal or external pressure. Perhaps then the South African Government would invoke those arguments in its defence which it had formerly so contemptuously rejected. Instead of adopting mere recommendations, it was time for the

United Nations to impose its will. The only solution that remained to it was to expel Members that refused to apply the fundamental principles of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. At the appropriate time, his delegation, together with others, would submit proposals for decisive action by the United Nations. There was nothing spectacular or even extremist about demanding South Africa's expulsion from the Organization; the crime of discrimination was so serious that no Member State could shirk its responsibilities.

29. U ON SEIN (Burma) remarked that the treatment of the non-white population of South Africa was essentially a human question. Although the matter had been discussed for over a decade in the United Nations, the South African Government persisted in its negative attitude. In the meantime, the situation of the unfortunate inhabitants had deteriorated as a result of the strict application of discriminatory legislative measures, passed by an all-white South African Parliament. As a result of the policy of apartheid, the majority of the inhabitants of South Africa were deprived of all political, economic and social rights and the enactment of the Sabotage Act in June 1962 had shocked the entire world.

30. The Government of South Africa had refused to honour its commitments as a signatory of the United Nations Charter and to co-operate with other Members in upholding the principles of equality. Not only were the South African Government's policies condemned by the rest of the world but they were even criticized at home by a minority of liberal whites and by representatives of various religious associations. The non-aligned States of Africa and Asia had denounced it at Bandung in 1955, Accra in 1958, Monrovia in 1959, Addis Ababa in 1960 and Casablanca and Belgrade in 1961.

31. Other countries were similarly afflicted with racial problems, but were ashamed of that affliction and did their best to alleviate its effects by appropriate legislation or other measures. In South Africa, instead, racial discrimination was the official policy.

32. It would be noted that South Africa had left the Commonwealth and had been expelled from the International Labour Organisation.^{1/}

33. The Burmese delegation deplored the intransigence of the South African Government, which showed a complete lack of realism. It felt that the United Nations should keep alive the pressure of world opinion to awaken the conscience of Africa and it would support any resolution that would usefully contribute towards a solution.

The meeting rose at 4.40 p.m.

^{1/} International Labour Organisation, Records of Proceedings, Forty-Fifth Session, resolution I.