



CONTENTS

Agenda item 76:

<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>	105
---	-----

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.1-5; A/SPC/L.71 and Corr.1 and Add.1-4, L.72/Rev.1) (continued)

1. Mr. SARNEY (Brazil) categorically condemned racial prejudice; it was without any scientific, religious or moral foundation, and was designed only to maintain positions of privilege in disregard of all human rights. In countries where there was a common national purpose, policies of "apartheid" could not survive. In Brazil, for example, where whites, Negroes and Indians were all animated by the desire to make their country a great nation, and where the common ideal had enabled questions of private interest to take second place, there was no racial segregation. Only thus had the rapid economic development of the country been possible. In 1959, Brazil had known the highest rate of industrial growth of all the countries of the Western world, with an increase of 97 per cent, comparable only to that of Japan, and considerably higher than that of the socialist countries. The policy of the Brazilian Government was in every way opposed to segregation and under the Afonso Arinos Act it was a crime to practise racial segregation. The contribution of the Negro race and of Africa to Brazil's civilization and history could not go unmentioned.

2. The Republic of South Africa was following a policy that ran counter to present world trends and jeopardized its own future and was maintaining a political, administrative and legal system solely in the interests of a white minority. The South African Parliament represented only about one tenth of the population. The group in power was mainly representative of the Afrikaners. The latter were considerably better favoured by the electoral system than the rest of the white population and still more so than the coloured citizens of African origin, not Bantus. The Bantus were no longer represented at all. The English-speaking whites were also subjected to a certain form of discrimination. Such a Parliament protected the interests of the minority without considering the interests of the country.

3. The South African Government's policy was based not so much on "apartheid" as on "baasskap", or the notion that every white man was a master and every black man a servant. In fact, therefore, the policy which the present Government was pursuing was one of racial discrimination and it was the least educated Afrikaners, those who had most to fear from the competition of the coloured population, who were most easily won over to the fanciful theories regarding the superiority of the white race. As for "apartheid", understood in the best sense as a policy of "separate development" for the various communities, it had shown itself to be impracticable.

4. Owing to the fact that trends had been favourable to its mining industry, South Africa had seen a rapid economic advance during the last twenty-five years. Whereas the average level of living of the white population had increased by 46 per cent, that of the African population had decreased by 6.5 per cent. That of the Indian and coloured populations had decreased by more than 11 per cent. The fall in the level of living of the African populations was explained by their being relegated to reserves which were becoming more and more impoverished, and particularly by the fact that the rise in the cost of living had affected the African populations more, owing to differences in ways of life. That was sufficient to condemn the policy of "apartheid", which was interpreted as a policy of separate development, but was really an odious form of discrimination. That development could only serve to illustrate the thesis of increasing pauperism, and fitted the most pessimistic descriptions of capitalism. Needless to say, such a situation was prejudicial to the economic development of the country and extremely dangerous for the whites themselves. The only way to avoid the complete collapse which had been predicted, was to ensure a balanced political and economic development, in which all sectors of the population would co-operate equally. South Africa, which was the richest country in the African continent, could play an important part in the evolution of Africa. The racial question was admittedly difficult, but it must be approached in a spirit of justice and indeed of generosity.

5. The Brazilian delegation would support any objective measure which the United Nations might take to put an end to the South African Government's policies of racial discrimination.

6. Mr. HAJRO (Albania) recalled that the question of race conflict in South Africa had been before the General Assembly since 1952 and year after year it had condemned the policies of racial discrimination of the Government of the Republic of South Africa and addressed appeals to that Government, without result. Indeed, new discriminatory laws and repressive measures had been adopted, as in March 1960. The situation worsened daily. The racist régime of the South African Republic was painfully reminiscent of

that of Hitler's Germany. Three million whites imposed their will on the non-white population, which consisted of eleven million people. The labour of that population and the resources of the country were exploited for the benefit of national and foreign monopolies. That was a new manifestation of colonialism and, moreover, the South African Government enjoyed the support of its Western allies. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO) which were headed by the United States of America, were used to serve that colonialist and reactionary policy, and NATO had a committee especially responsible for African affairs which co-ordinated activities designed to suppress the liberation movements of the African peoples. The South African Government obtained the weapons it required from NATO; 20,000 rifles had recently been sold to that country by the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany.

7. The policy of the South African Government was a threat to peace and security and caused anxiety to the countries of Africa and the whole world. It was contrary to the Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)). The time had come for genuinely effective measures to put an end to the policies in question. The Albanian delegation could not regard consideration of the question of race conflict in South Africa as an interference in the internal affairs of that country. It should be recalled that at its forty-fifth session, in June 1961, the ILO had condemned the racist policies of South Africa and had unanimously adopted a resolution requesting South Africa to withdraw from the Organization.^{1/}

8. The Albanian delegation, which categorically condemned the South African Government's "apartheid" policies, would support any steps which might put an end to the pitiful plight of the non-white population of that country.

9. Mr. JUARBE Y JUARBE (Cuba) said that the cumulative effects of the policy of injustice, exploitation and humiliation practised by the South African Government in the name of "apartheid" and in violation of the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights today overstepped the frontiers of South Africa and were being felt not only in the neighbouring countries, but even in the most distant lands. They were an obvious threat to international peace and security. And the sole pretext for that policy was a difference in the colour of the human skin.

10. The policy of "apartheid" was also practised, more or less openly, in certain neighbouring countries under such delusive names as "parallel development" and the champions of that policy were endeavouring to buttress the worst colonial régimes in Africa, when necessary by means of mercenaries, as in the Congo. At the same time, within South Africa itself, public opinion, as reflected in the Press, was becoming increasingly aware of the isolation into which that disastrous policy was pushing the country, while the African and Asian populations, forced into clandestine action, were in growing danger of having to resort to violent methods.

11. Riots had recently broken out in Basutoland in protest against the extradition of a South African political refugee. The free countries of Africa, in their turn, felt themselves directly affected by the exploitation and humiliations of the black population of South Africa.

12. Within the United Nations itself an action against South Africa had been brought before the International Court of Justice,^{2/} several countries had called for the expulsion of that country from the United Nations, and others were demanding that energetic steps be taken to avoid bloodshed before it was too late.

13. Despite the explosive situation, the Republic of South Africa had refused to heed the voice of world opinion and the resolutions of the United Nations. It had refused to see that all over the world peoples of different races, political systems and stages of economic development were unanimous in their condemnation. The most conservative foreign circles, like those for which *The Times* of London spoke, and even some elements in South Africa itself, like the teaching faculty of the University of Cape Town, were aware that, unless it changed its policy, the South African Government was courting catastrophe.

14. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa had maintained before the General Assembly (1033rd plenary meeting) that "apartheid" was the traditional policy of South Africa and was intended to safeguard what had been built up by the whites over three centuries. The policy had indeed been invented by the whites and imposed on the black population to the detriment of the latter and the benefit of the former. It was the natural product of a social order based on slavery. Since the arrival of the first Dutchmen the European régime had been based partly on the slave trade and partly on the exploitation, by means of slave labour, of land taken by force from its African owners. "Apartheid" was neo-slavery and sought to perpetuate that policy of enslaving the blacks for the benefit of the whites.

15. The policy of "apartheid" thus represented a survival of European colonialism in South Africa. The Europeans of South Africa, even those who by accident were born there, remained there as conquerors. Only those who did not exploit or humiliate the non-white Africans could claim to be sons of Africa: all the others were exploiters of Africa.

16. South Africa's wealth, particularly its mining resources, was exploited through the forced labour of 11.5 million non-white inhabitants, while the profits went to the whites in South Africa and abroad. Thus various colonial and non-colonial Powers were accomplices in the exploitation of the South African people. That was why those Powers had hesitated—and were still hesitating—to support effective measures for the abolition of the policy of "apartheid", although, as the representative of Ghana had recalled (269th meeting), such abolition was the only means not only of unleashing the great intellectual resources of the Africans, but also of allowing South Africa to assume its full stature in Africa.

17. The Cuban delegation, on the other hand, had no hesitation in condemning that particular form of colonialism, just as it condemned all other forms, whether overt, as in Algeria or, as in Latin America,

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

^{2/} I.C.J., *South West Africa Case, Application instituting proceedings*, 1960 General List, Nos. 46 and 47.

disguised under the misleading title of "Alliance for Progress". It would therefore support any measure which was genuinely designed to eliminate the inhuman policy of "apartheid" practised by the South African Government.

18. Mr. ABRAHAMSON (Denmark) said that his delegation, which was one of those to request the inclusion in the Committee's agenda of the item now before it (A/4804 and Add.1-5), shared the general anxiety at the conditions prevailing in South Africa, and associated itself with those representatives who had condemned the policy of racial discrimination practised by the Government of the Republic of South Africa. The Danish people deplored the fact that for many years the majority of the population of that country had been exposed to degrading measures and denied the exercise of elementary human rights. The reiterated appeals addressed to the Government of the Republic of South Africa by the United Nations had remained unheeded and that Government, by maintaining its policy of "apartheid", had placed itself in an untenable position. What was now needed was to reach agreement on the best means of bringing that Government to change its position.

19. Several representatives had pointed to the need for effective measures. In the operative part of the joint draft resolution A/SPC/L.71 and Corr.1 and Add.1-4 the sponsors had raised the question of the right of the Republic of South Africa to continue as a Member of the United Nations and had recommended a number of sanctions. The Danish delegation understood full well the temptation, when persuasion proved of no avail, to resort to stronger measures. It doubted, however, whether strict sanctions and, possibly, the expulsion of the Republic of South Africa from the United Nations, were the best means of attaining the desired end. A calm and considered approach to the matter was necessary. It would be unwise to do anything that might further embitter the atmosphere or even, if the worst came to the worst, unleash civil war in South Africa. The Danish delegation agreed with the United Kingdom delegation that the expulsion of the Republic of South Africa from the United Nations would be a purely negative measure. The sanctions advocated would also probably lead to a sealing off of the country, which would certainly not improve the situation of the South African people. Furthermore, a large part of the white population was opposed to the Government's policy of "apartheid" and, in those conditions, any sealing off of the country could lead to bloodshed and the oppression of those South Africans who were fighting for the abolition of "apartheid". With those considerations in mind, the Danish delegation had co-sponsored draft resolution A/SPC/L.72/Rev.1.

20. Finally, he deplored the fact that the debate should have been made the occasion for outbursts of propaganda and, in particular, that the representative of Albania should have linked NATO to the present situation in the Republic of South Africa. He failed to see how such allegations could serve the cause of the suffering people of South Africa.

21. Mr. STAMBOLIEV (Bulgaria) said that the question of "apartheid" had been on the agenda since 1952. The General Assembly and other United Nations bodies had repeatedly denounced the régime of poverty, exploitation and cruelty under which the indigenous people of South Africa were living and condemned the legislation of South Africa, which was

entirely designed to perpetuate the slavery of the non-white population and to introduce a régime of discrimination in the economic, political, cultural and other spheres. The South African Government, however, had remained deaf to those resolutions, to the warnings of certain Governments and to world public opinion, which had urged it to reconsider its policy so as to bring it into greater conformity with the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. On the contrary, there had been a steady intensification of repressive measures and mass arrests, and South Africa had gradually been transformed into the largest gaol in the world.

22. It might have been hoped that the presence of the representative of South Africa in the Committee signified a change of attitude. That hope had not survived the statements made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of South Africa, who had not only defended his Government's policy but had endeavoured, in the face of all logic, to prove that the United Nations had no moral right to assume the protection of the rights and dignity of 11.5 million inhabitants of South Africa.

23. It might be asked why the efforts of the United Nations had failed and whence South Africa had drawn the moral courage openly to defy its authority. In the opinion of the Bulgarian representative, one of the chief reasons was the interest of certain powerful groups of international financiers in maintaining in South Africa a régime of slavery which was a source of profit to them. The investments of the Western Powers in South Africa depended on the exploitation of South Africa's black population; consequently, those Powers had not only prevented the United Nations from taking vigorous steps within the framework of the Charter to oppose the policy of the South African Government, but had provided the latter with moral and material support. Quite recently, it had been reported that the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany and France had supplied South Africa with arms which were obviously to be used to defeat the struggle of the non-white population for freedom and equality.

24. It was true that the United States representative, speaking in the Committee (268th meeting) had denounced the South African Government. His speech had followed the lines of the policy of the present United States Government, which was endeavouring to dissociate itself from traditional colonialism and to win the favour of the new African States. The United States and its NATO allies were, in fact, afraid that if the policy of "apartheid" were continued the rest of Africa would rise up against economic colonialism. They were therefore prepared to denounce it officially, while preventing any definite steps from being taken in opposition; and they had even gone so far as to exercise pressure on certain States, such as Ghana, to induce them to change their attitude. It was significant that the United States representative had invoked the spirit of the American Declaration of Independence. Slavery in the United States had continued for eighty years after the Declaration and racial discrimination was still rife there. He wondered whether the fact that the United States refused to go beyond a purely moral condemnation meant that it was prepared to tolerate slavery for eighty or indeed one hundred and sixty years.

25. It was no longer sufficient to show sympathy for the oppressed peoples; action must be taken against

the oppressors. After so many resolutions had remained a dead letter, the United Nations must take rapid and effective steps. After the General Assembly's adoption of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, a régime of economic and political oppression and racial discrimination which was the equivalent of the worst form of colonialism could no longer be tolerated. It was the duty of the United Nations to take steps to put an end to it.

26. The Bulgarian delegation associated itself with those representatives who had advocated the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations on the grounds of its systematic violation of the principles of the Charter and the imposition of political and economic sanctions within the framework of the Charter. It would therefore support the joint draft resolution A/SPC/L.71 and Corr.1 and Add.1-4, whose adoption would be a definite and effective step towards ending the policy of "apartheid".

27. Mrs. CHURCH (United States of America) said she had been surprised to hear the Bulgarian representative embark on a diatribe against the United States of America during a debate on the question of "apartheid". If other countries had made as much effort and achieved as much progress as the United States in bettering conditions between the races within their borders, the whole world would rejoice. If the Communist countries, including Bulgaria, were to grant human freedom and self-determination to their nationals, they would be better able to solve the problems not only of South Africa but of the human race in general.

28. Mr. HOOD (Australia) said the Australian delegation had consistently affirmed that it shared the virtually universal repugnance to the policy of "apartheid", that it deplored the unjust and sometimes tragic results of the enforcement of that policy and that despite its adherence to the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, it considered that the special nature of the question of "apartheid" justified its examination by the United Nations. As the United Kingdom representative had pointed out (274th meeting) that policy gave rise to international repercussions, although that was not the same thing as a threat to international peace and security. The Australian delegation would be guided by that consideration in its vote on parts of the two draft resolutions before the Committee. The situation had obvious similarities with that which had existed at the time when the question of "apartheid" had been debated by the Committee at the last session of the General Assembly. The South African Government, far from complying with the recommendations of the General Assembly, had persisted in and even intensified a policy which had repeatedly been condemned. Once again there were two draft resolutions before the Committee. In his opinion, the second resolution (A/SPC/L.72/Rev.1) was more appropriate, although the Australian delegation could not support it unreservedly. For the reasons he had already stated, it had some doubts about operative paragraph 6, and it interpreted operative paragraph 4 literally, as meaning that steps taken under it must fall within the terms of the Charter. Action taken under it might, for instance, include advice or diplomatic representations to the Government of South Africa or offers of assistance to that Government in overcoming its problems. Since the adoption of the previous General Assembly resolution (1598 (XV)),

the Australian Government had clearly intimated to the South African Government, through diplomatic channels, its opposition to the policy of "apartheid". If separate votes were taken on operative paragraphs 4 and 6 of the draft resolution, he would therefore abstain. However, he would vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, since it formulated, generally speaking, opinions his delegation could share and recommended processes of persuasion which it could follow.

29. The joint draft resolution (A/SPC/L.71 and Corr.1 and Add.1-4) contained many elements which the Australian delegation could accept. Nevertheless, the steps recommended in operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 did not appear to be in accordance with the clear terms of the Charter regarding the circumstances under which sanctions were applicable, nor to be likely to produce the desired result. If it were accepted, as provided in operative paragraph 3, that South Africa's racial policies were incompatible with membership of the United Nations, it did not automatically follow that South Africa should be expelled from the Organization. Expulsion was not the best way of inducing a State to modify a policy which was inconsistent with its obligations under the Charter. Instead, efforts should be made to persuade it to change its policy. Furthermore, it was hard to see how some of those who argued for the principle of universality of membership could at the same time urge the expulsion of a Member State. For the reasons already set forth by the representatives of the United Kingdom, Japan, Ireland and Sweden, the Australian delegation would vote against operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7. It considered that in the long run moral pressure would be more effective than physical pressure in the form of sanctions. Moreover, the isolation in which expulsion and the breaking off of diplomatic relations would place the South African Government would destroy forever the one prospect the United Nations had of influencing that Government, namely the prospect of persuasion made possible by continued contact with the outside world. The other proposed sanctions would be indiscriminate in their effect within South Africa, would harden the Government in its present attitude, and might disrupt normal international trade and economic development while producing no change for the better in South African policies. If operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 were adopted, the Australian delegation would vote against the joint draft resolution as a whole.

30. The Australian delegation was aware of the concern and the feelings which had inspired the sponsors of the proposals before the Committee. The question was, how could their legitimate aspirations be satisfied by means that were both constitutional and effective. The best means would be to give public opinion time to take effect, while never preventing the South African Government from expressing its views. It should be remembered that there was opposition to the Government's official policy in various circles in the Republic of South Africa. That was a symptom of the doubts and fears aroused by the policy of "apartheid". With the exception of some extreme statements which would do more harm than good, the records of the debate in the United Nations would undoubtedly strengthen the growing moral, intellectual, political and religious pressure upon the Government of South Africa, which no Government could forever withstand.

31. Mr. GUDENUS (Austria) said that his country had always enjoyed friendly relations with the Republic of South Africa. He therefore regretted having to speak against the Government of that country because of its policies of "apartheid". Austria's position was based on the Austrian people's devotion to the principle of the freedom and dignity of all men, regardless of their race, and to the principle of equality before the law laid down in article 7 of its Constitution. That position was confirmed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and by the Charter. Austria was profoundly convinced of the need to convert those principles into living reality, and it had always opposed any form of discrimination. The recognition of the right to freedom and dignity for all was one of the proudest achievements of modern civilization. One of the foremost tasks of the United Nations was to secure the observance of that right, which all Member States were required to respect.

32. Mr. VALDES LARRAIN (Chile) said that it was unnecessary, after the long debates held for many years on the question of "apartheid", to give a detailed history of the racist measures enforced by the South African Government as part of its official policy. Since its achievement of independence, his country had always opposed every form of racial discrimination and had constantly advocated the equality of all men before the law. Chile had been the first country in South America to order the abolition of slavery, and as long ago as in 1811 its first political constitution had proclaimed the equality of all inhabitants of its territory. Since then, Chile had faithfully followed that policy, which was in accordance with the Charter of the Organization of American States, the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man and the Declaration of Santiago, Chile of 1959. Chile therefore had the moral authority to express its opposition to the racial discrimination practised by the South African Government and to any discrimination to which other Governments might resort in retaliation.

33. Since the South African Government had refused to change its policy, it was the duty of the United Nations to take effective decisions which could promote a peaceful settlement. Some of the measures suggested might bring about temporary solutions which would be recorded as a political victory for a particular country or bloc, but the result would be to take the question out of the hands of the United Nations. But the Organization was competent to deal with the matter, and countries which had subscribed to the Charter were required to respect its provisions and to comply with decisions of the Assembly. To be effective, however, a decision must be within the powers of the organ adopting it, and any measure which was not fully consistent with the provisions of the Charter would set a dangerous precedent for the future. Moreover, Chile was opposed to any measure which would lead South Africa to withdraw from the

Organization, since that country would then be free to intensify its policy of racial discrimination and would be beyond the reach of any moderating influence. The various possible sanctions might, by paralysing the commercial and industrial life of the country, aggravate the situation and rally elements which were now hostile to the Government's policy of racial discrimination around it. An attack from outside always strengthened national unity within a country. Such an attack would weaken the efforts of the opposition groups, which were opposing the policy of "apartheid" by democratic methods in the most varied fields. Accordingly, means should be sought by which the South African authorities might be persuaded to change their position. Those who were trying to force through a single formula and saying that to vote for any other solution would be a sign of racist thinking were acting in a totalitarian spirit, since they could not conceive that a common purpose could be pursued by different means. Radical measures were not necessarily effective. Moreover, various encouraging signs, such as the achievement of independence by a growing number of African countries and the South African delegation's participation in the debate on "apartheid" at the sixteenth session, gave grounds for some optimism.

34. The South African delegation had had the opportunity to see the unanimity with which the most various countries had protested against policies of "apartheid". It was to be hoped that it would not be deaf to the voice of reason. Moreover, there were values, such as the right to freedom and self-determination, which were higher than the material benefits which the South African representative had mentioned in support of the policy of "apartheid". The South African Government had pleaded in self-justification that the United Nations was not applying the same standards to South Africa as it did to other countries. Certainly, the arbitrary behaviour of other States Members of the United Nations in trampling human rights underfoot encouraged South Africa in its policy; and all abuses, wherever they were committed, must be ended once and for all. However, the deplorable situation which might exist in certain countries should not prevent the Assembly from acting in the case of "apartheid". He hoped that racial segregation would one day be replaced by racial harmony, that the notion of the "coloured man" would disappear from the language of men. He regretted that certain representatives had spoken of the retribution which would one day be visited on African soil. Anyone who proposed to adopt an attitude which he criticized in others made his own criticism indefensible in principle. The Chilean delegation hoped that the decisions taken by the United Nations would soon help South Africa to find the way of human co-existence which other States were already following successfully.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.