

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 267th MEETING

Monday, 23 October 1961,
at 3.15 p.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

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* 37

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)**

1. Mr. LOUW (South Africa) said that he had no intention of once more arguing South Africa's case against interference in its domestic affairs, nor of dealing with the policy of separate development for the non-white population of South Africa, which was no concern to the United Nations, the Committee, or to any nation, great or small.

2. The question was whether those who had proposed the inclusion in the agenda of the item now before the Committee had either the constitutional or the moral right to do so. South Africa's attitude on the constitutional aspect had been stated when inscription of the item was discussed at the 1014th plenary meeting of the Assembly. Until Article 2, paragraph 7, was deleted from the Charter by the General Assembly, the injunction contained in it should be observed. By discussing the item, the Committee was committing a violation of the Charter.

3. From the moral point of view, there was no denying that there was an increasing tendency for the United Nations to apply a "double standard" in its dealings with certain Member States; it was thus guilty of the discrimination with which South Africa was being charged. The United Nations could not condemn the actions of one State as unconstitutional and contrary to the Charter or to the spirit of the Charter, while regarding similar acts by another Member State as constitutional and in conformity with the Charter. For instance, the Soviet Union, which blatantly and falsely accused South Africa of having embarked on "a policy of bloody repression and massacres" and of being a "private domain of slave-owners" had acquired throughout the civilized world the reputation of a perpetrator of acts of terrorization and repression, not only within its own borders, but beyond. But the Soviet Union was a great military and nuclear Power, and although the United Nations did not hesitate to adopt resolutions that were hostile to a small country like South Africa, it had never taken effective measures against the Soviet Union. He was thinking particularly of the case of Hungary

in 1956 and, more recently, of the case of Berlin. Similarly, at the fifteenth session, when a resolution on the Cuban question declaring that the "principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of any State imposes an obligation on Members of the United Nations to refrain from encouraging or promoting civil strife in other States" had been put to the vote in Committee,^{1/} it had obtained the affirmative votes of the very same delegations that were in the habit of interfering in the internal affairs of South Africa, and the Cuban delegation itself, which objected so strongly to any interference in its own domestic affairs, had been quite prepared to join the other delegations that had proposed the inclusion of the present item in the agenda (A/4804 and Add.1-5). Once again that amounted to a double standard.

4. The discussions that had taken place at past sessions had, in fact, had the effect of promoting civil strife in South Africa.

5. The radio stations of certain Member States, for example, a station broadcasting from Cairo—capital of a State whose Government was a sponsor of the item under discussion—regularly incited the non-white population of South Africa to civil war in extremely violent and sometimes offensive language, but no one protested. Similarly, although many African and Asian countries frequently had recourse to police measures that often involved bloodshed, only the measures taken by the South African Government to maintain public order provoked an outcry in the United Nations. During approximately one year, disturbances or violence in thirteen countries in Africa alone had necessitated strong police action, and in some cases, military action, resulting in large numbers of persons being killed.

6. Only recently, the General Assembly had taken an unprecedented decision and voted a motion (1034th plenary meeting) censuring the statement which he had made in the general debate (1033rd plenary meeting), the bulk of which had been an exposition of South Africa's policy of separate development for whites and non-whites. That was the latest instance of the application of the double standard.

7. But that was not all. Many of the countries that made bold to accuse South Africa were far from having clean hands themselves and were denying their people the fundamental human rights enshrined in the Charter, particularly in Article 55, which was only too often ignored. In several of the African countries that had proposed the inclusion of the item in the agenda, there was a dictatorship of one man or one party; in another, hundreds of people were being detained under a preventive detention act, and lastly, there were two in which the people had no voting rights whatsoever, as could be seen from Annex 1,

^{1/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 90, document A/4744, para. 6.

Table III of document A/4824 issued by the Secretary-General.

8. Those countries and others in which similar conditions existed had no moral right to accuse South Africa or to interfere in its domestic affairs.

9. The South African delegation was not present at meetings of the Committee for the purpose of discussing South Africa's policy, which was not the concern of the Committee nor of the United Nations. But if baseless charges were made against South Africa, as was to be expected, the South African delegation intended to expose their falsity and it would not hesitate to show that the practices complained of, including alleged contraventions of Articles 55 and 56 of the Charter, took place also in the countries of several of the complainants and of those that supported them.

10. He would add, in conclusion, that his remarks also applied to the complaints of the Governments of India (A/4803 and Add.1) and of Pakistan (A/4817), which appeared as agenda item 76.

11. Mr. JUARBE Y JUARBE (Cuba) recognized that the South African representative was in an embarrassing position and that harsh words had been used to describe the appalling situation in his country. The Cuban delegation hoped that the Committee would be able to achieve unanimity, so that there would no longer be any need to discuss cases like that of South Africa, and no longer any need to use harsh words. He, for his part, would use the most moderate language. The representative of South Africa had spoken of Cuba in terms which did not appear to be prompted by any feeling of sympathy for a people that was experiencing the difficulties that marked all revolutionary periods. He had spoken of a double standard and had expressed the view that South Africa was given different treatment from other countries. But was it not a fact that the situations were different? In that case it was surprising that South Africa and Cuba should be considered comparable. In Cuba, a country which was, incidentally, even smaller than South Africa, the situation was very simple: the population was of mixed blood, and more black than white; there was no segregation, no discrimination, no racial persecution. The Cuban Government and people did not favour any interference, in South Africa or elsewhere, and they did not believe that the United Nations decision regarding South Africa constituted interference. The attitude of the Cuban people was entirely motivated by its deep sympathy for the sufferings of the South African people. The Cuban delegation wished those sufferings to end and hoped that the representative of South Africa would co-operate with the Committee with that end in view.

12. Mr. MIDIBURO (Congo, Leopoldville) recalled that his country had been among those which had requested the inclusion of the item in the agenda and which had voted to place it second in the order of discussion (261st meeting). Despite the very clear stand taken in resolution 1598 (XV), South Africa had not made any change in its racial policy, which had only grown worse. It persisted in its attitude because it had the covert and indirect support of a number of Powers which officially condemned racial discrimination. As soon as it had attained independence, the Congo (Leopoldville) had openly condemned the South African Government's policy of "apartheid".

His delegation wished to stress that it was not hostile to the countries it was about to mention. It wished only to draw attention to certain matters which prevented them from adopting a clear and firm attitude towards "apartheid". Specifically, the policy followed by Portugal in its colonies showed that it differed little from South Africa in its attitude to the black man. So far as the United Kingdom was concerned, despite the good it had done in Africa, the policy practised in the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland did not redound to its credit. His country could not but be surprised at the attitude of certain British Conservative Members of Parliament towards Katanga. While the United States Government had made commendable efforts to put a complete end to racial segregation, some regrettable discriminatory practices still existed in that country. As for the Republic of South Africa, it unfortunately made no attempt to follow the example of the United States Government.

13. In his country's opinion, all the countries which sent mercenaries to Katanga were surreptitiously supporting "apartheid". In fact, the Congolese in Katanga did not enjoy the same rights as the Congolese in the other provinces, where there was absolutely no discrimination between blacks and whites. Some countries denied that they were sending mercenaries to Katanga, but his Government was convinced that those countries were doing everything possible to assist the mercenaries. Some of the Belgian mercenaries whom the United Nations had succeeded in expelling from Katanga had returned, and many mercenaries arrested by the United Nations troops had not been repatriated. Later on, they had attacked the United Nations Force; the first victims among the United Nations troops had been killed by bullets fired from the Belgian consulate. Certain Powers that upheld "apartheid" by supporting the secession of Katanga acted through the agency of African Governments in their pay and sought by that means to involve the Congo in conflict with other African countries. Other methods were also used to support "apartheid" indirectly. Often, when it was a matter of condemning some particular aspect of that policy, countries abstained from voting or did not take part in the vote. Well-intentioned Governments were sometimes influenced by financial circles to take a course which was harmful and detrimental to their reputation.

14. His delegation invited all the countries concerned to join in a sincere and unconditional condemnation of the policy of "apartheid" by adopting whatever measures were recommended by the Committee. He reminded the representatives of the African countries of the part they must play in efforts to save their oppressed brothers. Not only was "apartheid" harmful to the inhabitants of South Africa; the example of that policy might impede the liberation of other Territories such as Rhodesia and Angola. For those reasons, his country would lend its support to any forceful steps which were likely to recall South Africa to a conception of its obligations which was more in conformity with the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The independence movement which was spreading throughout Africa was irresistible. The South African Government should, therefore, be advised to take immediate steps to put an end to all discriminatory practices. If the individuals known as Afrikaners did not change their policy, they would be overtaken

by events and would one day be obliged to reassume their nationality of origin.

15. Mr. FEDOSEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to make some preliminary observations in reply to the statement by the South African representative, on which he would speak in greater detail at a later stage. He recalled the indignation aroused by the very recent statement by the Minister of External Affairs of the Republic of South Africa in the General Assembly (1033rd plenary meeting) and the motion of censure which the Assembly had adopted in respect of that country (1034th plenary meeting). In that connexion, it should be remembered that almost half the Members of the United Nations had requested the inclusion in the agenda of the item under discussion, and that only the South African delegation had voted against the motion of censure. Yet South Africa believed that it alone was in the right. Resorting to a simple manoeuvre often employed by the colonialists, South Africa did not hesitate to take the part of the accuser and to attempt to slander the USSR in every possible way. The reason for that attitude was very plain. It was well known that the Soviet Union was a firm opponent of all forms of racial oppression and that its domestic and foreign policies were based on the principle of complete equality of all peoples and races and were diametrically opposed to "apartheid".

16. The question of the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples had been considered at the fifteenth session of the Assembly session on the initiative of the Soviet Union,^{2/} and the historic Declaration adopted on 14 December 1960 as General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) had been warmly supported by all the nations of the world. The peoples of the colonies had taken it as a sign that the end of their century-old slavery was near at hand. At the present session, the USSR had proposed (A/4859) that the item entitled "The situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples" should be included in the agenda. In the memorandum it had submitted on that subject (A/4889), the Soviet Government had indicted the monstrous régime of racial discrimination which prevailed in South Africa.

^{2/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 87, document A/4501.

The representative of that country could not deny the existence of that situation. The Soviet delegation hoped that the manoeuvres which the colonialists had used in order to distract attention from the important question before the Committee would not succeed.

17. Mr. Mohammad RIAD (United Arab Republic) admitted that the Cairo radio violently attacked the policy of "apartheid", as it did all forms of imperialism and colonialism. Was it to be criticized because it defended freedom and human rights and expressed its solidarity with the other peoples of Africa? Those who ignored all the principles of morality should be the last to criticize the Cairo broadcasts. He proposed to make a more detailed statement during the general debate.

18. Mr. HAILEMARIAM (Ethiopia) considered that the policy followed by the South African Government did not entitle it to invoke Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. Moreover, the South African Government would not hesitate to vote against another country with which that Government did not agree, even though it based its case on that provision of the Charter. As for the discriminatory practices of which the representative of South Africa contended other countries had been guilty, it should be noted that there was no other country or Government in the world which embraced the policy of "apartheid", which was the most abominable form of discrimination. In any event, the South African Government could not use its guilt as a defence. He had been surprised to hear the South African representative criticizing double standards, since all the world knew that South Africa was practising double standards in its national policy of "apartheid". He intended to make a further statement in the course of the debate.

19. Mr. DEKEYZER (Belgium) said he proposed to make a more detailed statement concerning his Government's condemnation of the policy of "apartheid". He would like, however, formally to deny the statement by the representative of the Congo (Leopoldville) to the effect that, during the United Nations operations in Katanga, the first victims had been wounded by bullets fired from the Belgian consulate. That assertion was contrary to the established facts.

The meeting rose at 4.25 p.m.