

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 272nd
MEETING

Monday, 30 October 1961,
at 10.50 a.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 76:</i>	
<i>The question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of "apartheid" of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued)</i>	61

Chairman: Mr. Yordan TCHOBANOV (Bulgaria).

AGENDA ITEM 76

The question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of "apartheid" of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (A/4804 and Add.1 to 5) (continued)

1. Mr. KIZIA (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), exercising his right of reply, said that at the 271st meeting the representative of Belgium had been unable to deny any of the facts adduced by the Ukraine about the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)'s role in supporting the colonialist oppressors. The Belgian representative had seen fit to mention the massacres committed by the Nazis in 1941 at Kiev and Babi Yar. Yet now the Nazis were again lording it over West Germany, which, like Belgium, belonged to NATO. The Belgian contingent in NATO was under the orders of the war criminal Speidel, who might one day send them to commit crimes like that of Babi Yar. The Ukraine would never hesitate to denounce the aggressive designs of NATO and of the other imperialists.

2. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy), speaking on a point of order, observed that the Committee was not discussing the activities of NATO, but the question of "apartheid".

3. Mr. BARNES (Liberia) noted that racial conflict in South Africa deeply moved world opinion and gravely endangered the ideal of equality set forth in the Charter. It was therefore not surprising that the United Nations had been concerned with the question since 1952. The question was covered by the provisions of the Charter, in particular the second paragraph of the Preamble and Article 1, paragraph 3, and Articles 55 and 56. The Assembly had adopted many resolutions condemning "apartheid", but the Government of South Africa had always refused to comply with them. Far from revising its evil policy, it was stepping up its systematic repression of the Africans.

4. On 11 October the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs had had the audacity to tell the Assembly (1033rd plenary meeting) of the alleged advantages of the "apartheid" policy, which he thought preferable to the democratic freedoms which were the happy lot of the Liberian people and of other African peoples. The recent vote of censure (1034th

plenary meeting) should be a drastic warning to South Africa to end a policy condemned by the whole world, particularly since it was now virtually isolated from the rest of the world since leaving the Commonwealth. A strong movement had appeared within the United Nations for the adoption of political and economic sanctions against the Republic of South Africa, and even for its expulsion from the Organization. It was particularly difficult for the African States to see such unparalleled discrimination practised against their brothers and on their own continent. The situation was still more serious because racial discrimination was the official policy of the Government of the country.

5. What exactly was "apartheid"? A doctrine of racial superiority, which held that the Africans were mentally inferior to the whites. Official bodies in South Africa had carried out tests to prove that claim but under such conditions that the conclusions could not be impartial. As Mr. Myrdal, the eminent Swedish sociologist, had found, it was impossible to make valid comparisons between children whose home environment and state of nutrition differed as widely as did those of the African and the European children in South Africa. Obviously the African peoples, like all other so-called coloured peoples, rejected that false doctrine out of hand, since its only purpose was to continue the exploitation of the cheap labour of the indigenous population by a privileged white class. The representative of South Africa had claimed that the aim of "apartheid" was to help the Bantu. The facts proved that that was not so. "Apartheid" deprived peoples of the most elementary rights and freedoms of the human person and hindered their development as human beings. Racial discrimination was also a source of internal disorder, as the Sharpeville incident had shown, and might lead to still more serious conflicts if that unjustifiable situation were to continue. Although the Africans made up over two-thirds of the population, they owned less than 10 per cent of the land, while the small white minority owned more than 90 per cent. In plantations belonging to white settlers, over a million people worked in conditions close to slavery.

6. For ten years "apartheid" had been condemned on many occasions by various international bodies. Most recently the Conference of Heads of African and Malagasy States, meeting at Monrovia in May 1960, had unanimously adopted a resolution unreservedly condemning "apartheid", calling on States taking part immediately to apply sanctions against the Government of South Africa and to give all material and moral support to the Africans and Asians of that country, and affirming that the authority of the United Nations extended to South West Africa. Liberia and several other African States had individually broken off diplomatic and economic relations with South Africa. Liberia and Ethiopia had also brought before the International Court of Justice a case relating to

South West Africa.^{1/} Liberia's attitude in the United Nations was inspired by the following purposes: to alleviate the living conditions of the African population, to help to bring about a change in the attitudes of the white South Africans, to focus world attention on that most unhappy spectacle, and to help the United Nations to translate its high principles into living realities. A resolution^{2/} adopted by the Committee at the fifteenth session, which had fallen slightly short of obtaining the necessary two-thirds majority in the Assembly, had recommended that the sanctions described in operative paragraphs 1 to 5 should be applied against the South African Government. Those who opposed sanctions had argued that the South African Government should be given time to reflect, and had suggested that, if that Government did not show some willingness to change its policies, they might look favourably upon the use of more forcible measures. In view of the obstinacy of South Africa, it was time to resort to those measures. So far the United Nations had been extraordinarily patient, but, if it failed to act quickly and firmly, the present generation which it represented would stand condemned before all future generations.

7. Mr. ZUAYTER (Jordan) considered his delegation bound to condemn the "apartheid" policy of South Africa. Islam prohibited distinction between people on grounds of colour, race or creed, and Jordan considered the practice of racial discrimination in any country a disgrace to the entire human race. It was the responsibility of the United Nations to find means to force South Africa to terminate such practices.

8. The South African Minister for Foreign Affairs had not been content to refuse to take part in the debate, but had dared to accuse the United Nations once more of intervening in the domestic affairs of his country. A Government which defended a policy of racial discrimination contrary to the provisions of the Charter, the doctrine of human rights and the most basic moral principles did not qualify to be a Member of the United Nations.

9. The Jordanian delegation expressed its sympathy with the millions of victims of the "apartheid" policy of the governing minority in South Africa. The world as a whole was behind them in their struggle for human rights and freedom and in their determination to eliminate that inhuman practice. He hoped that the forces of oppression, when confronted with the united and determined effort of all mankind, would quickly disappear and be replaced by the forces of freedom, equality and justice.

10. Mr. DJIKIC (Yugoslavia) said that South Africa was displaying a certain cynicism in invoking the Charter to defend its policy of "apartheid", which was so deeply opposed to the principles of the Charter and to human dignity that it had for more than ten years been constantly condemned by the various organs of the United Nations. It was regrettable that the South African Government persisted in that policy without taking into account the dangers to which it exposed itself, the South African people, its relations with other peoples, and peace in that part of the world.

^{1/} I.C.J., *South West Africa Case, Application Instituting proceedings* (1960 General List, Nos. 46 and 47).

^{2/} See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 72, document A/4728 and Corr.1, draft resolution I.

11. His delegation had never separated the problem of "apartheid" from the whole problem of colonialism, of which "apartheid" was only one of the many manifestations. It was impossible to abolish one without combating the others, and it was fortunate that all attempts at neo-colonialism could be opposed by the growing strength of the independent African countries.

12. The problem exercised not only the United Nations but all world opinion. The policy of "apartheid" had been implicitly condemned by the recent granting of the Nobel Peace Prize to Mr. Albert Luthuli. It had been branded at the Conferences of Monrovia, Accra, Addis Ababa and Casablanca. Even more recently, in September 1961 at the Belgrade Conference of Non-Aligned Countries, President Tito had declared that the racial discrimination practised in South Africa in contempt of human dignity was arousing the growing indignation of the whole world and that, in view of the ineffectiveness of previous United Nations resolutions, it was time to resort to more severe sanctions in order to compel those responsible for the practice to comply with the decisions of the United Nations.

13. General Assembly resolution 1598 (XV) had been conceived in that spirit, since it requested States to consider taking separate and collective action to bring about abandonment of the "apartheid" policy. That policy, setting South Africa against the rest of Africa, which was prepared to liquidate colonialism, was absurd and represented a danger to peace; an effort should therefore be made, without resorting to force, to compel the South African Government to grant the majority of the population its rights.

14. His delegation hoped that the States Members of the United Nations and in particular the non-aligned countries would do everything possible to contribute to the final liquidation of the policy of "apartheid", and it would support all measures likely to achieve that goal.

15. Mr. ASTAPENKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his country was emphatically opposed to any form of discrimination. In the socialist countries all citizens were equal before the law, and any discrimination based on race or nationality, or any incitement to racial or national hatred, was punished by law.

16. His delegation had always condemned South Africa's "apartheid" policy and supported any steps designed to protect its indigenous population. In defiance of the resolutions of the United Nations and of world public opinion, the Government of the Republic of South Africa was continuing and intensifying its policy of discrimination against the non-white population. At the Committee's 267th meeting the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of South Africa had claimed that the question was outside the jurisdiction of the United Nations and that the countries which had requested the inclusion of the item in the agenda had unclean hands. However, that attempt to divert attention from the substance of the question had failed, as the ensuing discussion had shown.

17. In the Republic of South Africa racial discrimination had been erected into an official policy. The racist laws served the interests of a white minority and consolidated its domination of the country. The indigenous population had neither freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, right to take part in elections, nor access to any post in the administration. Year

after year the system of oppression was intensified and improved. Moreover, the Government of the Republic of South Africa also imposed a reign of terror and a policy of discrimination in South West Africa, which had become a colony deprived of the most elementary rights. In carrying out its colonialist and racist policy the Republic of South Africa was supported by its allies and protectors. Thus the United States of America, its chief ally, had granted it three-quarters of all the loans it had obtained since the end of the Second World War. The aggressive military alliances, NATO, the South-East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) and the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO), all led by the United States of America, also served the South African Government's colonialist policy. In particular NATO had a special committee on African matters which co-ordinated activities for suppressing the aspirations of the African peoples to freedom and independence. In Katanga, mercenaries from the Republic of South Africa were serving the interests of the colonialists to the detriment of the Congolese people.

18. In sum, South Africa's policy threatened international peace and security; it was contrary to the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (resolution 1514 (XV)). It must be ended; and, since no United Nations resolution had so far had any effect, the time had come to act firmly and take really effective steps. His delegation would support any proposal likely to put an end as quickly as possible to South Africa's policy of racial discrimination.

19. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) thought that in dealing with a problem as complex as "apartheid", and in view of the present tension in international relations, it was important to take a realistic and constructive attitude and to speak the language of moderation if the cause of peace was really to be served. In order to solve the question before it, the Special Political Committee should take the principles of the Charter as its guide, keep in mind the main purpose of the United Nations, which was the maintenance of peace, and remain in close touch with reality.

20. Racial discrimination was contrary to the principles of the Charter. The Republic of South Africa was bound to respect those principles not only, like

all Member States, by Article 2, paragraph 2, of the Charter, but also because, as a founding Member of the Organization, it had an even greater moral responsibility. The Republic of South Africa could not, therefore, take shelter behind Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter; and, when a question like that of "apartheid" arose, the moral authority of the United Nations must have a way to express itself. Moreover, the principles enunciated in the United Nations Charter were more than the mere expression of an ideal: they corresponded to the present trends in mankind's development, which it was harmful to try to resist. The time had come for all peoples to live in dignity, no longer in slavery under the yoke of repressive régimes. Just as the reactionary régimes of the totalitarian police States must grant all their citizens freedom of thought and expression, so all racial intolerance must cease.

21. The unity of Italy had been forged a century before under the banner of equality, justice and democracy; and in the name of those principles he appealed to the Government of the Republic of South Africa to heed the past resolutions of the United Nations. The denial to the people of South Africa of the most fundamental human rights could obviously not long continue. Denial of human rights was reprehensible, whether it concerned the non-white population of South Africa or the people of East Berlin. In no country could human rights and freedoms be violated with impunity. In every case the real stake was human dignity. His delegation sincerely hoped that the South African Government would realize the need to comply quickly with the resolutions of the United Nations and to prove by deeds that the non-whites living in its territory were full citizens. It should show by acts, not merely by words, that it was aware of the political aspirations and of the traditions, culture and needs of its non-white population, and should take with the support of that population the necessary economic and social measures. Thus the situation might improve quickly. He also hoped that the Committee would not take excessively drastic action which might defeat its own ends and harm the interests of the African peoples the Committee wished to help.

The meeting rose at 12.5 p.m.