

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records

**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 470th
MEETING**



Tuesday, 30 November 1965,
at 11.10 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 36:</i>	
<i>The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued):</i>	
<i>(a) Reports of the Special Committee on the Policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa;</i>	
<i>(b) Reports of the Secretary-General.</i>	<i>1</i>

Chairman: Mr. Carlet R. AUGUSTE (Haiti).

AGENDA ITEM 36

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

- (a) Reports of the Special Committee on the Policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (A/5692, A/5707, A/5825 and Add.1, A/5932, A/5957);
- (b) Reports of the Secretary-General (A/5850 and Add.1, A/6025 and Add.1)

1. The CHAIRMAN reminded the members of the Committee that the list of speakers would be closed at the next meeting, at 6 p.m.

2. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) said that the practice of apartheid was a disgrace to the entire human race. Along with the other Afro-Asian States, Jordan had helped to draft the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on that question. However, it was a well-known fact that the South African Government had paid no heed to the Security Council's resolutions. It had failed to renounce the arbitrary executions of persons sentenced to death for their opposition to the policy of apartheid and had not granted amnesty to the persons detained or on trial.

3. During the past two years the Security Council had tried to remedy the situation. In resolution 182 (1963) it had set up a group of experts to examine methods of resolving the situation in South Africa. In resolution 191 (1964) it had called on all States to cease the sale of arms to South Africa and had set up a Committee of Experts to report to the Security Council as to the feasibility, effectiveness and implications of measures which could be taken against South Africa under the United Nations Charter. But since the adoption of those two resolutions, the situation, far from improving, had further deteriorated. The South African Government had rejected the conclusion of the group of experts set up under resolution 182 (1963) that all the people of South Africa should be brought into consultation and should thus be enabled to decide the future of their country at the national level.

Available reports showed that the South African Government was not only pursuing its policy of apartheid but was intensifying it by enacting further discriminatory legislation. Acts of repression continued against non-whites in the area, and the consequences could be disastrous, as the reports of the Special Committee indicated.

4. The Council had already adopted a resolution calling for an embargo on arms shipments, but it had not proved an effective remedy. The General Assembly had therefore to consider now what other methods it should take or recommend to the Council. The Security Council must act, or its authority would be undermined. Decisive steps must be taken to induce the South African Government to comply with the United Nations resolutions. It must be remembered that the Members of the United Nations had taken a unanimous stand against South Africa's racial policy; that was evident from the debates of the General Assembly, which expressed the voice of world opinion.

5. The Committee had before it the report of the Special Committee on the Policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa and he would like to pay a tribute to the members of that Committee, and to its Chairman, for their excellent work. His delegation felt that economic sanctions were the only effective peaceful means available to solve the problem, as the report suggested. It had been claimed that sanctions were feasible in theory but unworkable in practice and that a naval blockade such as would be needed would cost over \$100 million. All that could be avoided by securing the active participation of the main trading partners of the Republic of South Africa. The bulk of South Africa's trade depended on a few Member States only. Without their co-operation and agreement, neither the invocation of Chapter VII of the Charter, nor any other resolution or decision could be effective.

6. Serious consideration should be given at the present stage to the question of enforceability of resolutions. The non-implementation or partial implementation of any resolution would have disastrous consequences not only for the question itself but for the Organization. The Powers which had the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security must play a more active part. They could not be indifferent to so serious a matter, which affected all States anxious to see the provisions of the Charter observed and conscious of their moral obligations.

7. Mr. GHERIB (Tunisia), speaking on a point of order, noted that the delegation of the South African Republic, the Member State directly concerned with the question of apartheid, had not taken part

in the work of the Committee either at the previous meeting or at the present meeting, although in other Assembly Committees the representative of the Republic of South Africa had not hesitated to make long statements. The Tunisian delegation deplored that attitude on the part of the South African Government, which was answerable to the world for its inhuman policy towards 13 million Africans. It might be useful to remind the South African delegation that the question under consideration was of direct concern to it and that its presence and participation in the Committee's debates were wanted. The Chairman should decide what form such an approach should take.

8. Mr. DOSUMO-JOHNSON (Liberia) endorsed the Tunisian representative's statement that the Chairman should request the representative of South Africa to attend the Committee's debates. The absence of South Africa was an insult to the Committee. The South African delegation could not be forced to attend, but an appeal could at least be made to its good sense and the good sense of those supporting South Africa. Its trading partners represented on the Committee might draw the attention of the South African delegation to the indignity implied in its behaviour.

9. Mr. GALLIN-DOUATHE (Central African Republic) agreed with the Liberian representative and firmly supported the Tunisian representative's proposal. The Central African Republic strongly condemned apartheid both politically and morally, and regarded it as a vital issue for Africa. From the moment the accusation was made, South Africa should co-operate with the Committee. The Chairman would render a service to the African members of the Committee by reminding the South African delegation that the United Nations would like to have its co-operation with a view to finding a solution acceptable to all.

10. Mr. JUARBE Y JUARBE (Cuba) said that the question of apartheid was just as important for the Latin American countries as for countries in other parts of the world. He associated himself with the other delegations in expressing strong disapproval of the stubborn persistence of the South African delegation in bypassing the debates on the question. South Africa must realize the strength of world public opinion as represented by the Committee in regard to its apartheid policies.

11. Mr. CHERNUSCHENKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) agreed with the previous speakers. The attitude of South Africa was not only strange; it was a challenge flung at the United Nations. The absence of South Africa was a further sign of that country's contempt for the other Members concerned with the issue. The Chairman should find some means of letting South Africa know how the Committee felt.

12. Mr. HINIT (Ethiopia) said that South Africa had repeatedly defied United Nations resolutions, and its absence from the debates on the apartheid question were an additional affront. He supported the Tunisian representative's proposal.

13. Mr. DOTSEY (Togo) likewise felt that the representatives of Member States friendly towards South Africa should be asked to assist the Chairman in

endeavouring to obtain the co-operation of South Africa in the examination of the question of apartheid with a view to seeking a peaceful solution.

14. The CHAIRMAN observed that the Tunisian representative's motion had been supported by the majority of the members of the Committee. According to his interpretation, he was to intimate to the South African representative the Committee's surprise and disappointment at his absence and to invite him to take part in the debates on the important item now before the Committee.

15. Mr. MENDOUGA (Cameroon) noted that certain delegations had been silent, particularly those of the NATO countries. His delegation would not wish to interpret their reluctance as an indication of their proposed attitude from now onwards in the debate. But it might be well to take a vote so as to discover what was the precise position of each delegation. It would be easy for certain delegations to give the Chairman tacit instructions to make the proposed overture while at the same time assuring South Africa that they had not taken any official stand. His delegation gave the Chairman its blessing in regard to making the approach; but it was clear that if the voices of some of the other delegations could be heard in the Committee, the Chairman would have greater authority in carrying out a task which would require, no doubt, a good deal of courage.

16. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) said that, whether or not the South African delegation was present, it certainly could not prevent the debate on apartheid going on. Nevertheless, that delegation should attend the meetings in order to face its responsibilities. The South African delegation's attitude was nothing new; it was displayed each time the United Nations considered the question of apartheid. The South African Government had denied the competence of the General Assembly in respect of South West Africa, that of the Special Political Committee and the General Assembly in respect of apartheid, and even that of the International Court of Justice. Since it had thus appointed itself a universal arbiter, the members of the Committee had the right to hear what the representative of the "master race" might say to justify apartheid before the conscience of mankind.

17. For that reason, having himself been Chairman of one of the Committees dealing with the question of South West Africa and having thus found out at first hand what apartheid meant, he endorsed the remarks of the representative of Cameroon. He agreed with the representative of Cuba that the members of the Committee, who were called upon to defend the principles of the United Nations had the right to call for the presence of the South African representative.

18. His delegation joined in asking the Chairman to transmit the Committee's message to the delegation of the Republic of South Africa.

19. Mr. HAMID (Sudan) said he would not enlarge upon the position of his country and the Arab countries in general, since Tunisia had spoken on behalf of all those countries.

20. He endorsed the remarks of the representative of Cameroon and hoped, as he did, that the various

groups of States represented in the Committee would state their views in all clarity.

21. Mr. HILMY (United Arab Republic) said that it was obviously the wish of the Committee that the Chairman should approach the South African delegation. If, therefore any delegation objected, it should say so at once; otherwise the Chairman would have the right to speak on behalf of all members of the Committee.

22. He hoped that the Committee would be informed of the South African delegation's reply.

23. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) said that the South African Government's acceptance of the Committee's invitation would obviously indicate its intention of entering into discussions with a view to a definite solution of the problem of apartheid. While there might be some doubt about the invitation's being accepted, it was appropriate that an attempt should be made. There was no reason, however, to depart from the customary procedure of considering that, in the absence of any objections, a proposal had been adopted unanimously.

24. Pending the result of the Chairman's representations, however, the members of the Committee should seek discussions with the countries whose attitude played an important role in the question of apartheid, namely, most of the industrialized countries of Western Europe and certain Asian countries as well. If it was possible to work out solutions with the co-operation of those countries, the Committee could be sure that South Africa's attitude would not be the decisive factor. Consequently, while it supported the Tunisian proposal in principle, his delegation would very much like to know what the countries which openly or covertly supported South Africa might propose in the face of the paralysis that seemed to have overtaken the Organization in its efforts to root out the cancer of apartheid, which threatened to spread to the entire African continent.

25. Mr. NEKROUF (Morocco) said it might be necessary to specify the mandate to be given to the Chairman. It was no doubt the last time that an attempt would be made to persuade the Republic of South Africa. It might therefore be advisable for the Committee to express plainly its reaction to that country's provocative attitude; in that way, moreover, every country would have an opportunity to make clear its own views on the question.

26. The Guinean representative had said the previous day (469th meeting) that the United Nations should put an end to the double game being played by certain countries. Care should be taken, too, to ensure all the necessary publicity for the message which the Chairman would transmit to the South African delegation. For that reason, in particular, it would be advisable for the Chairman to report the Committee's decision to the General Committee of the General Assembly.

27. Mr. BOYE (Chile) supported the Tunisian delegation's proposal. His delegation was prepared to give the officers of the Special Political Committee a free hand in the proposed representations. It might indeed be one of the last attempts at persuasion to

be made. His delegation considered, furthermore, that if no member of the Committee opposed the Tunisian proposals, that would imply that they were supported by all members without exception.

28. Miss NYARKO (Ghana) recalled that for years the attitude of the great Powers had encouraged the Government of the Republic of South Africa. The time had therefore come for those Powers to speak out and to express their disapproval of the policies of apartheid.

29. Mr. ARCHIBALD (Trinidad and Tobago) strongly supported the Tunisian representative's proposal, for even if commercial reasons might outweigh everything else in the eyes of some people, the Committee must defend the principles of the United Nations. He agreed with the representative of the United Arab Republic that the Chairman should report to the Committee immediately on the outcome of his approach.

30. Mr. CAMPOS TORRES (Guatemala) expressed firm support for the Tunisian delegation's proposal. If the Committee wished to take a vote on the matter, his delegation would vote in the affirmative. He did not think, however, that a vote was necessary; rather should it be considered that the Committee was unanimous in requesting the Chairman to take the proposed steps.

31. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) supported the Tunisian proposal.

32. Mr. BLATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it was clear from the South African delegations's attitude that it was unable to defend its position and counted on others to defend it openly or secretly. His delegation strongly supported the Tunisian proposal.

33. Mr. BARROMI (Israel) reaffirmed his country's absolute and unconditional rejection of the policies pursued by the South African Government. He supported the proposal made to the Committee and hoped that the suggested representations would lead to a dialogue with a view to the solution of the problem.

34. Mr. ANOMA (Ivory Coast) supported the Tunisian proposal. There was nothing surprising in South Africa's attitude which its delegation had displayed as early as 1960, when the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the self-styled Government of the Republic of South Africa had made a shameful plea in favour of apartheid. In any event, the Committee could carry on its work with or without South Africa, especially since that country was not the only one concerned and since the real problem was the fact that the Pretoria-Salisbury-Lisbon axis was being strengthened.

35. The CHAIRMAN noted that a number of speakers had endorsed the Tunisian proposal. The silence of the other delegations left no doubt that the proposal had the unanimous support of the Committee. It therefore seemed unnecessary for the Committee to vote on the matter.

36. In the message that he was to transmit to the South African delegation he would express the Committee's surprise at the absence of any representative of that country. In that way the message would have

a better chance of success than if it included other considerations.

37. Mr. GHERIB (Tunisia) repeated that his delegation left it to the Chairman to decide what form the message should take. He thought that the kind of approach the Chairman had proposed would indeed be the wisest.

38. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would carry out his mission as he had suggested.

It was so decided.

39. Mr. GHERIB (Tunisia) said that there should be no illusions about the reply of the Government of the South African Republic. If the reply was in the negative, however, the Committee could at least take note of the fact. It would thus have proved to those who were counselling patience and moderation that the only way to solve the problem was that provided in the United Nations Charter.

40. Mr. HINIT (Ethiopia) expressed his appreciation of the reports of the Special Committee on the Policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (A/5957 and A/5932), which should prove a useful guide for the discussions in the Special Political Committee.

41. In view of the increased intensity with which the Government of the Republic of South Africa had pursued its iniquitous policy of apartheid, the situation had become ever graver and the problem required an urgent solution. South Africa was relying upon time to compel the world finally to accept its odious scheme, which was in contravention of the ideals of the United Nations and the sense of decency of mankind.

42. Behind the South African policy lay the cynical concept that any country was prepared to do business with South Africa if it could thereby enrich itself, whatever the noble sentiments and high ideals to which it might publicly subscribe. The fact was that certain great Powers maintained relations with the South African Government for the sake of gain and in violation of the principles of the United Nations. Yet it was precisely those nations which should serve as guides and examples to mankind. The States Members of the Organization would do well to remember that they had undertaken a solemn commitment at all times to uphold the ideals for which the United Nations stood, which were clearly set forth in Article 1 of the Charter. It was clear that, in pursuing its policy of apartheid, the Republic of South Africa was acting in violation of those basic principles. Its policy endangered international peace and security, violated the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples and trampled upon human rights and fundamental freedoms.

43. The reports of the Special Committee on the Policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa gave a particularly eloquent account of the unspeakable indignities and humiliating conditions which 13 million Africans were forced to accept. There was no doubt that the great majority of the Members of the United Nations were shocked by the intolerable situation in the Republic of South Africa and were sincerely determined to put an end to such defiance of mankind and of the United Nations.

44. The South African Government's reaction to the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council since 1952 had been to intensify its repressive measures against the non-white population. Since 1960 the situation in South Africa had continued to deteriorate and the South African Government had expanded its military and police forces to suppress all resistance. The situation in South Africa had come to constitute a real and growing menace to international peace and security, bearing the seeds of a conflagration liable to sweep the whole continent of Africa and perhaps the world. Those were the considerations which had led the General Assembly, at its fifteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth sessions, to adopt resolutions condemning the policy of the South African Government and requesting all States to adopt measures against that Government. The Security Council, for its part, had adopted resolutions in 1963 and 1964 requesting States to cease all military aid to South Africa. All those resolutions had gone unheeded and some Member States—the major trading partners of South Africa—had continued to extend assistance to the South African Government in establishing an aircraft industry for military purposes; furthermore, several Member States had recently expanded their trade with South Africa or established new commercial contacts with it.

45. When the similarity between the status of South Africa at the turn of the century and that of Southern Rhodesia until recent days was considered, and when it was remembered that the condemnation of Southern Rhodesia's unilateral declaration of independence had been opposed in the General Assembly by Portugal and South Africa only and that those two countries had refused to participate in the Security Council's deliberations on the subject, it became obvious that, unless drastic measures were immediately adopted to eradicate apartheid in South Africa, the international community might be faced with a very grave problem. The bitter experience of the Ethiopian nation, resulting from the vacillation of the international community about taking effective steps to stop fascist aggression, could serve as a lesson to the Special Political Committee.

46. Since the United Kingdom Government had done nothing to nip the Rhodesian rebellion in the bud and since there was conspiracy between the racists of South Africa and those of Southern Rhodesia, nothing less than a total economic blockade of the three countries whose Governments championed white supremacy in Africa would ensure the peace and security of the African continent. The United Nations should not forget that the dissolution of the League of Nations had been brought about by the lack of decisive and timely action on the part of the States Members of that Organization. The African peoples had suffered all forms of humiliation, had been deprived of human, social, educational and political rights and had been subjected to slavery and colonialism, but the most monstrous form of exploitation was apartheid. What was now happening in South Africa was unprecedented in the history of civilized nations. It was within the power of the United Nations and its agencies to eradicate that intolerable situation, which was a stain on mankind's honour.

47. The Ethiopian delegation strongly supported the whole series of measures recommended by the Special Committee to the General Assembly and the Security Council in the third part of its report (A/5957). Those recommendations deserved the closest study, since they might well be the key to the solution of the problem of apartheid in South Africa. It should also be emphasized that, since the United Nations was not yet a world government capable of enforcing

its decisions, all its Members should ensure that those decisions were heeded and respected. It devolved upon the great Powers, in particular, to set an example of genuine and selfless concern. South Africa was a test case and the Ethiopian delegation hoped that Member States would have the will and the ability to meet the challenge.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.