

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records

## SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 602nd MEETING

Wednesday, 30 October 1968,  
at 3.30 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. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the publication Foreign Investment in the Republic of South Africa,<sup>1/</sup> which had been prepared by the Unit on Apartheid of the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs, in accordance with the request made to the Secretary-General in paragraph 14 of General Assembly resolution 2307 (XXII).

2. Mr. MANDEFRO (Ethiopia) said that, notwithstanding the noble aims of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, apartheid had been allowed to flourish in South Africa. As a result of the repressive policies directed against non-Whites, and of the increasingly obdurate attitude of the Government, the situation in South Africa was becoming worse than ever. Among the multitude of racist laws that were being enacted and applied there, he would single out the Group Areas Act of 1950, under which the town of Pietersburg was to be proclaimed the first white city. That represented the climax of the Government's infamous plan to divide the Republic into black and white areas; his delegation submitted that no civilized nation had gone so far in curtailing freedom of movement, a principle embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It was a source of shame to the United Nations and to all Member States of the Organization that those racial policies should come to fruition in the current year—the International Year for Human Rights.

3. It was hardly surprising that apartheid was growing more virulent, since the Pretoria Government had never been confronted with collective and effective opposition by the Organization. In spite of urgent condemnations of apartheid by the General Assembly,

certain groups of countries still refused to consider that policy as a crime against humanity; whatever their motives, those countries were South Africa's accomplices. In the heyday of colonialism, those accomplices had exploited the subjugated peoples, but nowadays, they had assumed the role of South Africa's partners, helping the Republic to become more industrialized and to build its uranium plants.

4. In the past three years, the defence budget of South Africa had increased sixfold; the purpose of such a military build-up, as the representative of Nepal had pointed out (598th meeting), was to intimidate opponents of apartheid within South Africa and in neighbouring countries. South Africa's aggressive campaign against surrounding territories could best be exemplified by the fate of Namibia. The Ethiopian Minister for Foreign Affairs had in his speech before the General Assembly on 7 October 1968 (1683rd plenary meeting) noted that South Africa was engaged in extending apartheid to the Territory of Namibia, a ward of the international community, and that the African peoples were being confronted by an alliance of colonial forces aimed at frustrating United Nations efforts on behalf of indigenous peoples. Seventy miles from the Rhodesian border, 5,000 South African troops were being trained in guerrilla warfare on the pretext that South Africa could be provoked into attacking countries which fomented troubles on its territory. His delegation, in a fresh spirit of dedication to the Charter of the United Nations, could only emphasize the urgency of implementing the resolutions calling for an embargo on the export of arms to South Africa.

5. In his address to the General Assembly (1680th plenary meeting), the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs had spoken about the industrial growth of his country as compared to that of other countries of the world. However, he had failed to mention that it was based on the labour of the subjugated Africans and on the formidable investments of the Western industrial nations, who shared the profits. His delegation failed to understand how even Japan, a country well acquainted with human suffering, could maintain, and indeed increase, its trading links with South Africa. History should have made it clear that connivance in the oppression that was being practised in South Africa was doomed to failure. By tolerating racial discrimination, the Western Powers were merely heaping acrimony upon themselves, contributing to the collapse of their own livelihood and rendering their own human rights meaningless. Still striving after freedom and independence, the Africans on the other hand, under the ægis of the Organization of African Unity, were organizing their own determined liberation movements, whose methods would be far from lenient until the

<sup>1/</sup> United Nations publication, Sales No.: 67.II.K.10.

goals of the non-Whites in South Africa had been achieved. Once again, his delegation urged the trading partners of South Africa—those responsible for the perpetuation of apartheid—to re-examine their policies and enable the collective will of the United Nations to be truly effective. They must desist from buttressing the unholy alliance between the South African, Portuguese and Rhodesian oppressors before racial war broke out in the southern part of the African continent.

6. Turning to the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa (A/7270), he commended highly its lucid account of the needs of the victims of apartheid and associated himself with the views expressed by the Chairman of the Committee of Trustees of the Trust Fund (598th meeting). There was every reason, especially after the illuminating statement by Canon L. John Collins (599th meeting) for Members of the Organization to contribute generously to the fund and to help in combining the humanitarian activities of the United Nations and those of voluntary organizations.

7. With regard to the report of the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (A/7254), his delegation paid a tribute to the members of the Committee and took due note of the comprehensive information reflecting the Secretary-General's apprehension at the worsening situation in South Africa. Referring to the conclusions and recommendations of the Sub-Committee on Information on Apartheid (*ibid.*, annex I, paras. 92-101), his delegation submitted that dissemination of information about the abhorrent practices of apartheid might be the most effective method of combating the Vorster régime short of force, or total measures of mandatory sanctions which had failed in flagrant violation of United Nations resolutions. The Secretariat's information services should intensify the campaign against apartheid to ensure that it was given prominence in all mass media.

8. His delegation pledged its maximum support for any draft resolution aimed at eradicating apartheid and restoring the dignity of the oppressed non-Whites in South Africa.

9. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland) said that the Committee's repeated consideration of apartheid was tinged with deep indignation. South Africa's measures to perfect its methods of oppressing the African population and the opponents of apartheid were based on a belief in the supremacy of Whites over non-Whites, which was one of the many racist theories professed in the world. In fact, there was no basic difference between Hitler's fascism and Vorster's policy. While Hitler had been proclaiming the supremacy of the German race, Vorster had started his political career as an ardent supporter of German fascism and the organizer of a fascist society in South Africa. He was now Prime Minister in a State where he had been detained during the Second World War because of his views. Such facts might be of significance in the growing political, economic and technical co-operation between the Federal Republic of Germany and South Africa.

10. Not only Africa, but all continents, were threatened by apartheid, which was actively helping to main-

tain the colonial system in southern Africa and undermining United Nations efforts to save the people of Rhodesia from white racists. Apartheid had already strangled the economy of some independent African countries by using links developed during British colonial rule. South Africa had practically annexed Namibia, its military forces were now superior to those of all other countries in that region, and it was attempting to propagate racism in Europe and elsewhere.

11. The numerous forms and manifestations of apartheid had been ably described by other representatives, as well as in the report of the Special Committee (A/7254). The moral case against apartheid had also been well established. Obstacles to United Nations action against that policy still existed, however, despite the apparent unanimity prevalent during discussions on the subject. There had been no positive reaction on the part of the Government of South Africa to the numerous resolutions and recommendations adopted by the United Nations nor any positive action by those Member States which, while voting for the resolutions, consistently refused to implement them. The measures recommended by those resolutions had therefore not failed, since they had never really been put to a test. The United Kingdom, which in the past had largely contributed to shaping that part of the African continent, led the ranks of the countries which were developing and enlarging their economic relations with South Africa. That country had never had serious difficulties in obtaining military equipment and, with the help of its main trading partners, had been able to expand its domestic production of arms and ammunition.

12. There was little doubt that an effective oil embargo would impair the economy of South Africa, but discussions on it had never gone beyond the preliminary stage. Perhaps when the wide-scale prospecting for oil at present being carried on in South Africa with the participation of foreign capital proved successful, there would be an unanimous decision to stop exports of oil to that country.

13. Member States should be under no illusion that hardcore racists could be persuaded by moral pressure to give up the policy of apartheid. Moral pressure and other such methods constituted only passive support for the brave men—Black and White—who, because of their opposition to apartheid, were being executed and interned in South African prisons and concentration camps. His delegation was convinced that those men's courageous struggle would eventually be successful, but when and how largely depended on the attitude of countries outside Africa and primarily on those Powers whose economic, military and direct or indirect political support would be decisive at the present stage. The existence and expansion of apartheid would lead to violent conflicts that would not be confined to the Republic of South Africa.

14. A feeling of frustration was evident in the present discussions on apartheid, but his delegation thought it unfair to blame the United Nations for the failure to solve the problem. The vast majority of Member States had sincerely and faithfully implemented the resolutions on apartheid. As in previous years, his delegation

would support all proposals designed to make United Nations actions against apartheid more effective.

15. Mr. MIAM KOREKI (Ivory Coast) said that, for over twenty years, the United Nations had been condemning the policy of apartheid and voting resolutions to eliminate it. Every year, movements, organizations and personalities of worldwide renown sent memoranda to the United Nations, indicating ways of changing the attitude of the South African Government. The causes of the abysmal failure to change the policy of the white minority in South Africa were well known. But the United Nations action might be strengthened by improving the methods used in the struggle against apartheid, by the strength of one's faith, by revolutionary eloquence, by violence that could be appropriate to the situation and above all by total realism, which was one of the forces of efficiency and success.

16. His delegation did not presume to propose the means of eliminating the South African régime but wished to make certain suggestions concerning possible action. South African propaganda in Europe and America was based on two main contentions: first, that the Republic of South Africa and South West Africa had the highest national income in Africa and secondly, that apartheid was separate development, inspired and necessitated by the great diversity of peoples living in those territories and enthusiastically accepted by the majority of the ethnic groups concerned. The South African Government denied the crimes of which it was accused because it did not consider itself immune from punishment, should the truth be known about the true nature of its policy of separate development. Its propaganda was most active in the countries whose adverse reactions it feared, namely, the great Powers, their direct trading partners. Without pressure from them, the South African Government would never abandon its policy of domination; yet, it was those Powers which were unwilling to form part of the Special Committee or to vote for any resolution or to apply any decision of the General Assembly adopted within the context of the struggle against that policy. That was the principal cause of the failure of that struggle that had lasted for twenty years. However, the violent and insulting speeches in the General Assembly and in its Committee were alienating those very Powers whose assistance was essential if apartheid was to be eliminated. All the calm and realism of the leaders of the surrounding States like Zambia and the enclaves of Lesotho, Swaziland and Bechuanaland were required to ward off the danger threatening them.

17. Other Powers promised total and unconditional support to their suffering brothers in those regions and at the same time maintained discreet trade relations with the racist Government of South Africa. All trade with countries which maintained trade relations with Southern Rhodesia or South Africa amounted, in fact, to trade with those racist States.

18. The vital role played by the white South Africans who condemned the odious régime of their racist Government and had espoused the cause of the non-Whites, despite the risks to their safety and that of their families, was not fully appreciated. The true artisans of great social upheavals had always been courageous philosophers who had identified them-

selves with the people and followed them, confident in victory. The struggle against apartheid should not be that of the African States alone; it should be that of the whole international community, headed by the great Powers. Those Powers which had abolished slavery would certainly react to a well-formulated appeal by their African brethren.

19. The Power which, upon the injunction of some of its nationals, had instituted a partial embargo upon the sale of weapons to South Africa, and in which anti-apartheid movements were the most numerous and active, perhaps because they were better informed, must wake up to its responsibilities in connexion with the situation in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. It should however be realized, that it was difficult for a true democracy to take a capital and courageous decision.

20. Another Power, the champion of decolonization in the second half of the twentieth century, which had already decreased its investments in South Africa, perhaps for economic reasons but also perhaps pursuant to the application of sanctions against that régime, might be better fitted to give the South African Government the secret of its colonizing genius, since it had colonized in particular territories inhabited by a diversity of peoples. For example, there were different ethnic groups in Mali, Niger and his own country. France had united the tribes in its Territories, giving them a sense of nationhood and abolishing outdated practices. His country's leaders had built on those foundations, consolidating national unity to a point where all citizens of the Ivory Coast were equal. That same Power, which had lost in the decolonization process possessions greater than its investments in South Africa, would not hesitate to make further sacrifices.

21. All those Powers would eventually teach South Africa's white minority how a Christian civilization was to be defended, namely, through the martyrdom of apostles who had sworn to uphold the precepts of justice, charity and equality among all men. It was in that sense that the great Powers should be urged to participate effectively in the peaceful struggle against apartheid. It would be unrealistic to ask them to send squadrons to raze Cape Town or Pretoria or to force the white minority to show themselves worthy exponents of Christian civilization. Rather, the great Powers were being asked to ensure that once apartheid was eliminated, all races in South Africa and Namibia would live together as brothers. Thirteen million human beings suffering under the domination of a minority—even a powerful one—would eventually gain their freedom, filled with hatred and vengeance—not against Mr. Vorster but against his grandchildren or great grandchildren. Then, what the defenders of Christian civilization had feared would indeed happen. That was the opinion of all those who sincerely desired justice and democracy to prevail in South Africa.

22. Mr. MUMPANSHA (Zambia) said that the United Nations had condemned the policies of apartheid for a number of years and the South African Government had been persuaded that its Calvinistic fanaticism was at variance with the universal concern for international and racial peace. Nevertheless, that Govern-

ment was confident and bold enough to justify its policies as long as the United Nations was unable to enforce any of its resolutions. There was no question of South Africa being powerful enough in itself; it drew its strength from some Member States. United Nations resolutions had been ineffective because some had considered the Afro-Asian countries as over-emotional on the question of apartheid. The problem therefore concerned not only South Africa but also those Member States trading with that country. It was regrettable that those with vested interests in South Africa should not understand the extent to which they were endangering their investments in a country where the seeds of racial hatred were being sown. His delegation's condemnation of the policies of apartheid was moral, factual and prophetic because the freedom fighters were on the march.

23. In a letter dated 9 April 1968 addressed to the Secretary-General (A/7123), the Permanent Representative of the Republic of South Africa had stated that the South African Government subscribed to the ideal of eradicating the domination of one group by another. Yet the non-Whites in South Africa had not participated in the decision to establish Bantu States—which showed that the Whites were determined to keep the non-Whites in a subordinate position by huddling them together in undeveloped areas which would remain perpetually economically and therefore politically dependent on Pretoria. The Bantu leadership had been selected by Pretoria and did not enjoy popular support. The ingratitude of the White South Africans to the non-Whites was inhumanly selfish and not to be expected from those professing to be civilized and Christians. It had been stated many times that the living standards of non-Whites in South Africa were the highest in the continent, but that comparison had first been made some eighteen years previously when few African countries had been independent. He was certain that comparison with some African countries on the basis of income distribution would disprove it; in any case, the only fair comparison would have to be made within South African society itself.

24. He congratulated the Special Committee on the manner in which it had exposed South Africa's iniquitous policies, especially with regard to the Group Areas Act and the Bantustan policy, and on its unmasking of South African propaganda. The Committee was at least well informed as to the implications of the policies of apartheid and knew why United Nations resolutions had not been effective. It was time for Member States to refrain from presenting the Organization as the embodiment of hypocrisy and cynicism. It was important that, if South Africa was to be persuaded to follow a peaceful course, all Member States should duly co-operate when a resolution was adopted against the policy of apartheid. If a resolution providing for effective economic sanctions against South Africa was adopted, his delegation would support it but was doubtful as to the co-operation to be expected from certain industrialized Powers. In the final analysis, it was the people of South Africa who would decide their own destiny; violence would increase as oppression was intensified. The conflict was essentially between the oppressor and the oppressed in one and the same country.

25. Mr. TOURÉ (Guinea) observed that the problem of apartheid had caused many controversies in the international community; one school of thought held that it should be regarded as a purely humanitarian issue to be dealt with by co-operation and negotiation with the major Western Powers. The other view was that all possibilities of a peaceful solution having been exhausted, the issue should be settled by a violent struggle for national liberation.

26. To prevent the Committee from becoming involved in negotiations with the major Powers, he recalled that in its resolution 2054 (XX), the General Assembly had made an appeal to those Powers and requested them to co-operate with the Special Committee. To date, none of them—with the exception of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—had wished to join an enlarged Special Committee to find a solution to the problem of apartheid. Let no one advocate a solution of collaboration and negotiation, for the African States did not intend to go down on their knees before those Powers which had colonized their continent and continued to arm South Africa to the detriment of their national sovereignty. The problem was not a humanitarian one—it was a political issue.

27. If certain delegations wished to entrap the United Nations in ambiguous negotiations—and his delegation would not participate in such an undertaking—he would refer them to resolution 2054 (XX) which showed that the Organization had already sought for such a solution to no avail. South Africa was an ethnic mixture as were the other African countries which had welded their ethnic groups into nations in their struggle for national independence. In African political science, there was a concept opposed to the Western concept of the nation state, that nations were formed in the struggle for national independence. Until such nations were formed, neo-colonialism would persist in Africa, sowing discord within certain States. For that reason, his own country had revolutionized its social structures, systematically abolishing traditional power patterns which, in the past, had furthered colonial domination. Similarly, the political struggle in South Africa would give rise not only to a South African State shaped by the non-white majority, but also to a South African nation. The reply of the major Powers to the appeal in resolution 2054 (XX) was still awaited; their place on the Special Committee had still to be filled. So long as the economic sanctions envisaged had not been applied, the non-white majority of the South African population should not be chided for taking the only course open to them—that of national liberation through violence.

28. Mr. DOSUMU-JOHNSON (Liberia) said that he assumed the Guinean representative's remarks to refer to his own statement at the Committee's previous meeting. He wondered who had designated that representative as primus inter pares to tell delegations when they were supposed to express their opinions. All delegations were aware of the existence of resolution 2054 (XX). If certain delegations had not participated in the work of the Committee in question, it was through fear that the avant-garde would attempt to prevent them from expressing their views in the Committee. He would ask the Chairman to rule

that no member of the Committee should in future attempt to tell delegations what they should say.

29. The CHAIRMAN said that he had given the floor to the representative of Guinea in the context of the Committee's debate of the item on the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa. He had assumed that the Guinean representative was expressing the views of his delegation, not those of the African or any other group of States.

30. Mr. TOURÉ (Guinea) said that his remarks had been designed merely to remind the Committee of the existence of resolution 2054 (XX). Had he thought it necessary to refer to the Liberian representative's statement, he would have done so during the previous meeting.

31. Mr. DOSUMU-JOHNSON (Liberia) said that he had every reason to believe that the Guinean representative had been referring directly to his own delegation's statement. In view of that representative's explanation, however, his delegation waived its objections.

32. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the list of speakers in the general debate on the question of the policies of apartheid would be closed at the end of the Committee's 603rd meeting.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 5 p.m.*