

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 564th MEETING

Friday, 10 November 1967,
at 3.25 p.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 35:

<i>The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued):</i>	
(a) Report of the Special Committee on the Policies of <u>Apartheid</u> of the Government of the Republic of South Africa;	
(b) Report of the Secretary-General.	73
Request for a hearing by a petitioner	75

Chairman: Mr. Humberto LOPEZ VILLAMIL
(Honduras).

AGENDA ITEM 35

The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued) (A/6688, A/6818 and Corr.1):

- (a) Report of the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (A/6864 and Add.1);
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General (A/6825, A/6873 and Corr.1)

1. Mr. TAUSHANI (Albania) said that the Committee had before it once again the question of the racist policy of the fascist Government of South Africa, known as apartheid, which caused the African people such suffering and want and whose end object was their systematic extermination. Apartheid was the most savage and the most barbarous manifestation of colonial domination and the policy of enslavement which the lackeys of United States imperialists, the racist fascists of South Africa, imposed by fire and sword. The reactionary system facilitated the domination and exploitation of non-white ethnic groups and was designed to perpetuate the division of society on the basis of colour, depriving the 14 million non-white South Africans of their most elementary civil rights and democratic freedoms.

2. World opinions condemned the policy of apartheid, which it regarded as a crime against humanity and a threat to international peace and security, but the racist South African Government, unheeding, pursued its policy with added zeal, intensifying its oppression and rendering the situation of the non-white population more and more intolerable. That infamous policy made itself felt in all aspects of life. It was a veritable system of slavery, sanctioned by legislation which constituted the harshest code of racism ever known and which even determined the wages that a non-White could receive—less than one seventh the amount paid to a White. Any effort to resist was mercilessly repressed; persecution, terror and mass arrests and

imprisonment were the order of the day. Judicial proceedings recalled the Inquisition. All those measures were designed to perpetuate apartheid not only in South Africa but also in South West Africa, which had been colonized against the will of its people and despite the repeated appeals of the African countries, international opinion and United Nations resolutions. South Africa was supporting Ian Smith and was co-operating with the Portuguese to put down the struggle for liberation of the peoples of Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Angola and so-called Portuguese Guinea, and at the same time threatening the integrity and independence of neighbouring States.

3. The non-white South African inhabitants had never accepted the policy of apartheid; they knew that the imperialists and the racist colonialists would never voluntarily abandon their policy of oppression and exploitation and that the only course open to them was a mass revolution. They were therefore gradually succeeding in organizing their resistance to oppression in order to regain their independence and their right to live as free men in the land of their ancestors.

4. The South African racist régime was only able to remain in power because of the support and protection of the imperialist Powers, particularly the United States, the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany. The assistance provided by those countries was no accident; it was dictated by the interests of foreign monopolies which poured capital into South Africa and participated in the exploitation of the mineral and human resources of that country. The support of the United States was also to be explained by the fact that discrimination was an integral part of its national policy. South Africa served the plans for world hegemony of the United States, for which it was an instrument of economic enslavement, itself a means of putting down revolutionary movements and intimidating independent peoples. The revisionist leaders of the Soviet Union were also playing an unworthy and iniquitous role, despite their hypocritical declarations, and were accomplices of the oppressors of peoples, particularly the United States.

5. As long as the collusion between the Soviet Union and the United States continued, United Nations resolutions would remain a dead letter, and until the United Nations was freed from the baneful influence of those two great Powers, it would be helpless, as the events in the Middle East had shown.

6. Consequently, the people of South Africa, cognizant of the situation and aware that they had to rely on themselves to win their freedom, had taken up the struggle against their oppressors.

7. His people and Government, guided by the great socialist principles of the equality of peoples and their

right to self-determination, strongly condemned the policy of apartheid of the South African Government and the complicity of the imperialist Powers with the Pretoria clique. His country did not and would not maintain relations of any kind with that Government.

8. His delegation once again assured the people of South Africa of the full support of the Albanian people and Government, which were convinced that its just struggle against its oppressors would be crowned with victory. His delegation would support any measure to maintain the resolute struggle of the non-white African population of South Africa.

9. Mr. BEAULIEU (Canada) said that, as far as southern Africa was concerned, the United Nations had recently been mainly interested in immediate problems, such as the consequences of the unlawful proclamation of independence by the minority régime of Ian Smith and the question of South West Africa. Those two problems and apartheid in South Africa had one factor in common, namely, the question of human rights.

10. Belief in the equality of all men was one of the fundamental principles of the United Nations, and his country, like most States Members of the Organization, believed that the existence of a society such as the one in South Africa ran counter to all the principles of justice. It could not be denied that a number of non-white inhabitants in South Africa had a rather high standard of living; the contrary would be surprising in a country so rich in human and natural resources. But that could not be regarded as a gift to the ruling groups. Racial discrimination could still be found in a number of countries, but in none except South Africa was it sanctioned by legislation. Whatever his material success or intellectual achievement, a non-White in South Africa continued to be subject to the degrading laws of apartheid. Canada, like the majority of Members of the United Nations, could not accept racial discrimination, which was contrary to the spirit and letter of the United Nations Charter and to United Nations declarations and conventions on human rights, which was incompatible with human dignity.

11. His country faithfully respected the resolutions concerning the export of arms and military equipment to South Africa, adopted on 7 August 1963 (181 (1963)) and 4 December 1963 (182 (1963)) by the Security Council, thereby showing its determination to dissociate itself from the policy of apartheid practised by the South African Government, and it shared the belief that the United Nations should adopt constructive measures with a view to eliminating apartheid. For that reason his Government had sent a participant to the International Seminar on Apartheid, Racial Discrimination and Colonialism in Southern Africa, held at Kitwe, Zambia, in July and August 1967, which had been useful, though he had not been able to subscribe entirely to its conclusions and recommendations (A/6818, para. 123). In that connexion he wished to thank Zambia for its co-operation. Canada also favoured any measure to assist the victims of apartheid and it had contributed \$25,000 to the educational and training programme for South Africans.

12. In recent years the Committee had had placed before it draft resolutions which described the situa-

tion in South Africa as a threat to international peace and security and called upon the Security Council to take measures under Chapter VII of the Charter. His delegation was aware of the tensions existing in South Africa and of the potential consequences of the continuation of the policy of apartheid not only for South Africa but for all southern Africa. However, although the situation in that region might eventually threaten international peace and security, it seemed at least doubtful to his delegation whether the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter were applicable in the present circumstances. His delegation reserved its position on this point. Moreover, if the General Assembly called for sanctions in the absence of an agreement of the Security Council, it would be advocating measures which might not be applied, and thus would damage the reputation of the United Nations as an effective instrument for the maintenance of world peace.

13. His country's policy regarding the independent African States was entirely separate from its policy regarding South African questions. Canada maintained bilateral relations with those States based on mutual respect and a desire to contribute to their development; for that purpose it had organized a programme of assistance to African countries, both members of the Commonwealth and French-speaking countries. The example given by those States of multiracial collaboration showed the world that the solution did not lie in apartheid and the denial of human rights.

14. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) said that the statements made in the Committee on the question of apartheid fell into two categories: those, including virtually all the African statements, which dealt with apartheid and those by speakers who, regrettably, had used apartheid as a pretext for raising irrelevant and contentious issues. The United States intended to address itself strictly to the question of apartheid.

15. The present situation in South Africa was rightly a matter of concern to virtually all Members of the Organization, for apartheid represented nothing less than the usurpation of the political, social and economic rights of the black majority by a white minority. The situation had not improved during the past year; it had followed the same deplorable trend which had been a subject of concern since the founding of the United Nations. Internally, the Government continued to close avenues of peaceful change, making accommodation more difficult. Externally, the South African Government had decided to extend its repugnant policy to South West Africa in violation of the human rights of the inhabitants and its obligations originally specified by the mandate. It had ignored and defied the efforts of the United Nations to bring to an end the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia and its police had now intervened in that country by force of arms. The situation in South Africa therefore warranted the most serious attention of the United Nations and all Member States.

16. Although apartheid was abhorrent to the whole international community, it was clear from the Committee's debate that there were different views on the means to be employed to induce South Africa to change its tragic and dangerous course; and what was needed now was a redoubling of practical and

peaceful efforts. The United States for its part had scrupulously implemented the Security Council resolutions, including resolutions 181 (1963) and 182 (1963) of August and December 1963. At the cost of hundreds of millions of dollars, it had imposed a strict embargo on the sale of arms to South Africa, and the embargo would be maintained. Contrary to the allegations of some representatives, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as an organization was not furnishing arms or military equipment to South Africa, although weapons supplied by some members of NATO on their own account were being used in southern Africa. It was ironic that Communist spokesmen had avoided naming them, obviously for their own political motives. The United States, committed by its own anti-colonial beginnings to equality and justice under law, and engaged in a continuing struggle for racial justice at home, was fully prepared to co-operate in collective efforts to alleviate the damaging effects of apartheid and to secure observance by the South African Government of the human rights and fundamental freedoms to which the United Nations was dedicated. Everyone knew that the South African Government had violated all those rights and refused to change its deplorable policies. In the circumstances it was understandable that some members of the Committee, in their impatience to lift the burden of apartheid from the people of South Africa, should dismiss the complexities of the situation in South Africa and the limitations imposed on the United Nations by its Charter. Others were wrongly confusing the reluctance of some Member States to embark on measures which they regarded as ineffective with sympathy for apartheid. The discussions at the International Seminar on Apartheid, held at Kitwe, had demonstrated the dangers inherent in that mistaken view, which complicated the search for practical solutions for the United Nations to apply to South Africa.

17. There was an international consensus that apartheid was incompatible with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and that the United Nations had a duty to persuade South Africa to abandon policies which served to perpetuate and intensify the tragedy of racism; but no informed observer of the situation could underestimate the difficulties which lay ahead. The South African Government which was wrongly convinced that racial equality would mean the destruction of the ruling white minority, and which even now was being driven by unreasoning fear to intensify the police repression which weighed upon all communities in South Africa, would not easily be coerced. In order to convince that misguided Government that the racism it was defending was doomed to failure, the United Nations must be able to devise means which could be endorsed by all Member States. Some representatives had spoken of a choice between peaceful and violent means to secure observance of fundamental rights in South Africa. The United States believed that, if the steps taken were to be consistent with the provisions of the Charter and with common sense, they should be practical, peaceful and the international community should be capable of achieving them.

18. However abhorrent apartheid might be, the Committee should not infer automatically that the situation

in South Africa presently constituted a threat to international peace and security as defined by the Charter of the United Nations and warranted application of the measures prescribed in Chapter VII of the Charter. Due attention should also be paid to the serious reservations expressed by many Governments, including his own, as to the effectiveness and appropriateness of economic sanctions in the present circumstances. Nevertheless, in spite of all the difficulties, the United States still hoped that new and constructive measures could be devised to deal with the problem. It looked forward to the day when a combination of pressures would bring an end to apartheid, and when all men in South Africa could enjoy freedom, dignity and justice.

Request for a hearing by a petitioner

19. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) said that his delegation had been informed some days previously that Mr. James Forman, director of international affairs for the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, was intending to request a hearing by the Committee in order to plead the cause of the struggle against apartheid. Mr. Forman was making his application for the same reasons that had led him to attend the International Seminar on Apartheid at Kitwe. The odious policies of apartheid should arouse the indignation of all countries and all men; and it was in that spirit that Mr. Forman wished, in all good faith, to plead the cause of human justice before the Committee. He therefore proposed that the Committee should accede to Mr. Forman's request and authorize him to submit his petition at the next meeting.

20. Mr. AL-DAOUD (Iraq) supported the proposal.

21. Mr. DOSUMU-JOHNSON (Liberia) asked for some clarification on the reasons for the petition concerned. Was the request really being made in the interests of the struggle against apartheid in South Africa? Was the representative of Guinea intending to convert the Committee into an African forum and to resuscitate the All-African Peoples' Conference? The question of apartheid and the Committee's work as a whole were too serious and important to allow it to hear petitioners who might not have any new information to offer. The reasons given by the Guinean representative were not convincing, and Mr. Forman's credentials should in any case be examined very carefully before a decision was taken.

22. Mr. ALO (Nigeria) pointed out that there was an established procedure for dealing with requests from petitioners. At the present session the Reverend Canon L. John Collins had addressed a request for a hearing (A/SPC/L.146) to the Chairman; the request had been circulated to members, and the Committee had then decided what action should be taken. The Committee should, therefore, be in possession of a formal request from Mr. Forman before it took any decision.

23. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) said that Mr. Forman had addressed a letter to the Chairman of the Committee, but that apparently the letter had not yet arrived. It was for that reason, and because the general debate on apartheid was drawing to a close, that he had himself proposed that the petitioner should be heard.

He had no wish to transform the Committee into an African forum. Mr. Forman had been heard at the International Seminar at Kitwe, and every member of the Committee could vote on whether the request for a hearing should be granted. He, too, was in favour of abiding by the normal procedure, and he assured the Committee that a letter from Mr. Forman would be received shortly.

24. Mr. FATTAL (Syria) supported the Guinean representative's proposal. In his view, Mr. Forman's motives were legitimate, and his statement would be a useful contribution to the Committee's work on apartheid.

25. Mr. DOSUMU-JOHNSON (Liberia) stated that the Committee had always been concerned with specific issues and not with general considerations of racial discrimination. Problems of that kind should be considered by other bodies, particularly those dealing with the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination, and Mr. Forman should submit his request to those bodies. For the moment, the Committee was dealing exclusively with apartheid in South Africa, which was a clearly defined subject and should not be used as a pretext for a general consideration of discrimination in the racial context. He urged the Chairman to have Mr. Forman's request transmitted to the appropriate bodies.

26. Mr. ALO (Nigeria) appealed to the Guinean representative, and those who had supported his proposal, to agree that the Committee's decision on Mr. Forman's request should be postponed until the next meeting. Consultations would have to be held first. If the Guinean representative did not respond to his appeal, he would formally propose that the Com-

mittee should not take a decision on the request for a hearing at the present meeting.

27. Mr. FARAH (Somalia) proposed that consideration of the request for a hearing should be deferred until the next meeting, by which time members would have seen Mr. Forman's letter.

28. Mr. RYAN (Australia) endorsed the remarks of the Nigerian and Somalian representatives. The Secretary of the Committee might provide members with some information about Mr. Forman, so that they could decide whether he was qualified to speak on the question of apartheid.

29. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) thought that it would be easier for the Committee to take a decision when the request for a hearing had been circulated, in accordance with the rules of procedure.

30. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) noted that the Committee had been informed of the request for a hearing in a letter which would be submitted to the Secretariat and could be circulated by 13 November. He was ready to accept that procedure and believed that the Committee could at its meeting on 13 November take a decision on a formal request.

31. The CHAIRMAN, after summing up the views expressed, said that it was important that all requests for a hearing should not only be brought to the notice of the Chairman but also appear as working documents, so that all representatives could take a decision on them. It was for the Committee, and not the Chairman, to take the decision. The representative of Guinea had indicated that the letter could be circulated by 13 November and considered by the Committee. A decision would then be taken.

The meeting rose at 4.40 p.m.