

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 269th
MEETING**

Wednesday, 25 October 1961,
at 10.30 a.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 76:</i>	
<i>Question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of "apartheid" of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued)</i>	45

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) (continued)

1. Mr. DOBROWOLSKI (Poland) reiterated his country's categorical condemnation of the discrimination practised against the great majority of the citizens of South Africa by means of a whole series of Draconian measures. No European nation had as much right to sound the alarm in face of the national and racial oppression practised in South Africa as Poland, which, for five years had been the victim of a policy of extermination at the hands of the Nazi occupiers. That policy had affected, firstly, the Jews, and secondly the gipsy population. The Polish population had been divided into those who were to be immediately put to death and those who were to be transformed into serfs, educated only sufficiently to read and to count. Moreover, in keeping with the master-race philosophy, the code of the occupiers provided only for two penalties for any offence: a fine or the death penalty. Of the six million Polish victims of the Second World War, 5.4 million had died in death camps and prisons.

2. The total eradication of racialism would have seemed to be a matter of paramount importance to the conquering allies. Yet, sixteen years after the end of the Second World War, there was a resurgence of the activities of former Nazi groups, particularly in the Federal Republic of Germany, and political theories based on racial discrimination and segregation were being defended and supported by supposedly scientific and moral arguments. The condemnation of racial discrimination must be so categorical and universal that that policy would disappear not only from the legislation of all States but from ordinary language as well, as the concepts of slavery and serfdom had done.

3. Since that item had last been before the General Assembly, other events had taken place which should be noted, such as the January repressions in Pondoland and Tembuland, where the army and air force had been used against a defenceless civilian popula-

tion; the arrest and imprisonment of more than 10,000 persons at the end of May; the passage in June of the General Law Amendment Bill, permitting arbitrary arrests and obliging arrested persons to prove their innocence; the promulgation of the Undesirable Publications Bill, providing for severe penalties against those found in possession of publications displeasing to the authorities; the outlawing of the African National Congress, the Indian National Congress and the Union of Coloured Peoples; and finally the large-scale arrests in the Orange Free State and at Durban. In the latter town, African workers had been arrested because they had dared to ask for a wage equal to that of the whites for the same work. Finally, the Prime Minister of South Africa had made a statement proclaiming the recent elections results to be a victory for an ideal, a statement which indicated that the policies of exploitation and enslavement being practised in a State which had just conferred upon itself the exalted title of res publica were to be continued.

4. On the international scene, South Africa was indulging in open moral and material assistance to those who might not otherwise have the capacity to resist the irreversible movement to abolish colonialism. The General Assembly had heard a statement supporting the manoeuvres of the colonialists against the unity of the Congo and the armed resistance of the rulers of Katanga to the United Nations forces. It was known too, that Mr. Tshombé's white mercenaries came from South Africa, and that that country was also assisting the Portuguese colonialists and encouraging the leaders of Southern Rhodesia in the further development of a racialist system.

5. In conclusion, he would ask the representative of South Africa whose long-term interests were served by the system which he was defending. For the African, mulatto and Indo-Pakistan population, that system entailed suffering and discrimination. The inhabitants of British origin, including their clergy, were also largely opposed to it. As for the population of Netherlands origin, which had given its majority vote to the Government and which in the past had won universal respect in its fight against the British invaders, the policy of exploitation which it was now supporting could only lead eventually to the forfeiture of citizenship on the African continent by settlers who had toiled the land for more than two centuries and had then been converted into exploiters of ill-treated and ill-paid workers. The ranks of the Nationalist Government's allies were dwindling to such a point that even the clergy of the South African Dutch Reformed Church, which had devised the moral justification for racialism, was now apparently in opposition. A professor of theology of Pretoria had been charged with heresy for having condemned racial segregation. But the tide of history would not stand still and the only wise course open to the South

African Government was to abolish without delay the system which it was now attempting to defend.

The meeting was suspended at 11.5 a.m. and resumed at 11.10 a.m.

6. Mr. QUAISON-SACKEY (Ghana) requested the South African representative to convey the congratulations of the Ghanaian delegation to Chief Albert Luthuli on his nomination as winner of the Nobel Peace Prize for 1960; the award was a lesson in tolerance that all would do well to heed.

7. The spontaneous and unprecedented vote to censure (1034th meeting) the statement (1033rd meeting) made by the South African Minister of External Affairs in plenary meeting was a striking indication of world reaction to the policy of "apartheid". That reaction had been exemplified by the statement in The Times of London of 31 May 1961 that the tyrannical racist policy pursued by South Africa had lost it the friendship and respect of the entire world, and by the declaration issued during that same month by the Principal and 245 members of the staff of the University of Cape Town calling for the adoption of a new policy in order to avoid catastrophe. If the Minister's contention that the majority of non-whites in South Africa favoured "apartheid" were true, South Africa would have been the first to call for debate on the item instead of boycotting the Committee year after year. In the past, several delegations had tried to prevent discussion of the item by claiming that it would violate Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. He hoped that that argument had been disposed of once and for all by the vote on General Assembly resolution 1598 (XV), in which only Portugal had cast a negative ballot. The Minister of External Affairs himself had at long last agreed that his Government's racial policy was of international concern, that the Assembly should accordingly discuss it and that he would participate in the debate.

8. Since the Committee had last discussed the item, the policy of "apartheid" had led South Africa to withdraw from the Commonwealth and had caused the ILO to ask its Governing Body to take steps to bring about that country's withdrawal from its ranks.^{1/} The reasons for South Africa's growing isolation were not far to seek. The Minister's claim that the African population of his country was better off than that of any other part of Africa was not only fallacious but also beside the point, for the important thing was not the difference between the condition of Africans in South Africa and in other countries but the difference between the condition of Africans and Europeans within South Africa itself. With reference to another matter raised by the Minister, he did not wish to argue whether the Bantu had arrived earlier than or simultaneously with the whites, but emphasized that Africa belonged to the Africans and that the Boers could remain there only on sufferance, for in African eyes there was nothing sacrosanct about positions won by European conquest. If the Boer thesis were carried to its logical conclusion, it would mean that the Hottentots and bushmen had the right to drive out whites and Bantu alike. In a modern South Africa, whites and blacks who were contributing to the country's industrial and economic growth should have equal opportunities. Europeans should be able to live there in peace if they were willing to accept the

fundamental principles of human dignity and equality. That would mean recognizing that every South African, whatever his colour, should have one vote and thus enjoy direct representation in Parliament.

9. The Minister had stated that "apartheid" could be regarded as discrimination against whites, since they could not enter Bantu residential areas without permits and did not enjoy trading rights in Bantu townships. The answer to that disingenuous argument was that the Bantus had not imposed such restrictions. The Minister had further sought to bolster his arguments by referring to chiefs and councillors in South and South West Africa who were allegedly in favour of the "Bantustan" programme. It was well known, however, that the persons in question were Government appointees who had no choice but to echo their masters. If the Bantu areas were to have self-government, as referred to in the South African propaganda publication South Africa Scope in June 1961, it would be logical to inquire whether they would have their own foreign relations and international trade policies. Government in the Bantu areas which was not based on the consent of the Africans themselves could not be called self-government.

10. The truth of the situation in South Africa could be deduced from a few telling examples. Labour was being increasingly drawn into the towns because of the appalling living conditions in rural areas, yet, under the Natives (Urban Areas) Consolidation Act, no African enjoyed the unquestioned right to have his wife and children living with him in a town and the police could at any time turn them out of their homes. No African was entitled to acquire freehold land, even in the Bantu areas. Even Africans with no police record who had lived continuously in one town for fifty years were not entitled to have Africans visit them for more than seventy-two hours. Slavery existed in all but name: Africans arrested for minor technical offences, such as not carrying a pass, could be drafted for farm labour instead of receiving a proper hearing in court. Flogging was so common that in 1956-1957, the last period for which statistics were available, over 13,000 Africans had been subjected to that form of punishment.

11. Yet "apartheid" not only hurt the Africans but was also beginning to have an adverse effect on the morale of the white population. The New York Times had reported, on 28 May 1961, that the uncertain situation in South Africa was causing many persons in the liberal professions to leave the country; indeed, figures recently released showed that the number of persons emigrating had exceeded that of immigrants in the year under review. The Chairman of the Anglo-American Corporation of South Africa, in his address to the company's annual general meeting in June 1961, had confirmed that the Government's racial policy was also having a serious effect on the country's economy. If other countries were to express their opposition to "apartheid" by imposing restrictions on trade, the Government would be obliged to reconsider its policy. United States exports to South Africa in 1960 had totalled \$277 million, while the corresponding figure for imports had been \$109 million. If the United States Government could bring pressure to bear, through the legislative authority which it had, the Verwoerd Government would be forced to reconsider its "apartheid" policies. An ominous aspect of trade with South Africa was the recent sale to that country of 20,000 firearms by the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany,

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

as reported by The Times of London on 11 August 1961. That newspaper had also stated that almost 90,000 firearms, consisting mostly of revolvers and pistols, had been imported into the country during the preceding eighteen-month period. It would be difficult for the countries concerned to convince Africans that they were really in favour of the abolition of "apartheid" so long as they continued selling firearms to the whites of South Africa which would obviously be used to maintain the non-white population in subjection. In subsequent articles The Times had reported that South Africa, which intended to increase the size of its army, had concluded two agreements with France for the acquisition of tanks and jet fighters. According to The Christian Science Monitor, another member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the United Kingdom, had very recently signed a treaty with South Africa for the defence of the latter's territorial waters against invasion by the Soviet Union. He would like to hear the comments of both the United Kingdom and Soviet delegations on that report. Finally, the South African Minister of Defence had stated that, should war break out between West and East, South Africa would be used by the Western Powers as a base from which to attack the Soviet Union with nuclear weapons.

12. Increasingly concerned about the effects of the free flow of information into South Africa, the authorities had, according to Government Notice No. 57-16 published in the Government Gazette No. 17/16 of June 1961, made it an offence to publish, or furnish to another person for publication, any news or information received solely by radio. It should also be noted that South African radio programmes were being put on a very high frequency, a change which some South Africans interpreted as meaning that the Government wanted to encourage people to buy locally made radios capable of receiving those programmes instead of sets that could pick up foreign broadcasts.

13. The Government of Ghana, although sceptical of the argument that a mild policy towards South Africa should be pursued in order not to interfere with changes taking place inside the country which might ultimately benefit the African inhabitants, had shown its moderation by trying to establish diplomatic relations with South Africa as a first step towards breaching the wall of racial prejudice separating that country from its neighbours. President Nkrumah had even gone so far as to invite the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs to visit Ghana and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ghana had expressed willingness to visit South Africa. Unfortunately the goodwill shown by Ghana in three years of patient effort had been exploited by South Africa for the purpose of deceiving public opinion abroad with regard to Ghana's attitude on "apartheid", and in 1960 President Nkrumah had finally withdrawn his invitation.

14. Ghana was convinced that the only solution of the problem created by "apartheid" was to ostracize South Africa from the community of civilized nations. He could not support the argument that such an action would be harmful to Africans, for many leaders of the South African resistance to "apartheid" had requested his country to support any action taken by the United Nations with a view to a total diplomatic, political and economic boycott. His delegation therefore urged that all States should implement resolution 1598 (XV) adopted at the second part of the fifteenth session at the earliest opportunity and act on the appeal issued by the Second Conference of

Independent African States held at Addis Ababa in June 1960 to break off diplomatic relations with South Africa, to close their ports to all vessels flying its flag, to enact legislation prohibiting their ships from entering its ports, to boycott its goods, to refuse landing and passage facilities to all its aircraft and to interrupt air, postal, telegraphic, radio and other means of communication with it.

15. If the United Nations acted now it might avoid bloodshed in the future. The fact that there had as yet been no large-scale outburst of violence was due largely to the fact that the Africans were not by nature a vengeful people, yet that praiseworthy characteristic was being exploited by the South African Government in its efforts to convince world public opinion that the Africans were happy with the conditions which it was able to impose on them thanks to its powerful military and police apparatus. Ghana accordingly called upon every nation to apply sanctions of some kind against the Government of South Africa and asked the Committee to consider whether the Security Council should be requested to examine the possibility of expelling that country from the United Nations.

16. Mr. TEVOEDJRE (Dahomey) said that Dahomey was a young republic jealous of its sovereignty and loath to interfere in the affairs of other States. It was therefore all the more significant that, on the eve of the first anniversary of Dahomey's independence, the President had made a public statement vigorously condemning racialism in South Africa. There could be no justification for continuing to tolerate a régime which systematically flouted elementary human rights, violated the United Nations Charter, defied the conscience of the world and constituted a threat to international peace. In his statement at the 1033rd plenary meeting of the General Assembly, the South African Minister of External Affairs had attempted to prove that the Bantu had no greater claim to South Africa than the whites, on the grounds that the ancestors of the Bantu had entered South Africa at the same time as the original Dutch settlers. However, the Minister's statement had been self-contradictory, since earlier, in criticizing the view that the western parliamentary system could be transplanted to Africa, with its age-old traditions, he had clearly implied that the Bantu were more at home in South Africa than the settlers.

17. Even if the South African Minister's thesis were correct, the fact remained that three million citizens were imposing their will on thirteen million others. At a time when nearly thirty African States were independent and occupied seats in the United Nations, how could such a system be justified? The reason for it was clear. The Minister had said that his Government was not able to accept the principle of "one man one vote", and it had been evident that his opposition was based on the fact that such a system would place the wealth of the country in the hands of the non-white majority. The policy of the South African Government, which was the law of the jungle, was based on its determination to preserve control of the country's resources, and sociological and moral reasons were invented to justify that. Thus, the policy of "separate development" was said to be undertaken in the interests of the Bantu people. The Minister had, in that connexion, dwelt on various social and economic achievements benefiting the Africans, and had claimed that the South African Government did more for the Bantu than other African Governments. But it was

wrong to look at the problem from that aspect since economic factors had to be taken into account. South Africa was a country rich in mineral resources, and those resources should be used for the benefit of all sectors of the population equally, since, as the Minister himself had said, the non-whites had contributed to the development of the country.

18. In any case, the social advantages which were enjoyed by the African, according to Mr. Louw, were surely designed merely to keep him contented and to maintain his usefulness to the whites.

19. Other representatives had already spoken of the degrading measures taken by the South African Government against the Bantu population, including restrictions of every kind and arbitrary acts of repression. It was incredible that such a policy should be defended on the basis of Christian principles—a policy which had already resulted in the events at Sharpeville, Pondoland, and Cape Town. The policy of "apartheid" constituted a threat to international peace and the United Nations was in duty bound to act in time to prevent further catastrophes. The United Nations must take the action which the situation demanded, for the policy of "apartheid" constituted a real international threat. Quite apart from the unjust treatment meted out to the Bantu majority, the policy had repercussions on the future of other States. The representative of the Congo (Leopoldville) had drawn the Committee's attention (267th meeting) to South African subversion in his own country. In the face of unrest at home, the South African Government was seeking allies abroad, and the action of South African mercenaries in Katanga was delaying the conclusion of a satisfactory arrangement between that province and the Central Government. The backing of the South African Government had encouraged Mr. Tshombé in his arrogant demands and prolonged the fighting, thus draining the energies and resources of the United Nations. The reference by the Minister of External Affairs of South Africa to the vast sums being spent to bring peace to the Congo was an underhand blow directed against the Organization. The United Nations had been forced to engage in the operation which had caused the tragic death of Mr. Hammarskjöld because of South Africa's attempts to foment disorder in the Congo with a view to upholding its own policy of racial discrimination. The world should know that South Africa had a moral share in the direct responsibility for Mr. Hammarskjöld's death.

20. The racist policies of South Africa had other international ramifications. In the United States of America, the Government was making a sincere effort to solve the racial problem through legislation. The racist policies of South Africa were undoubtedly encouraging anti-integration movements in the United States and harming the Western cause throughout the world. The South African Minister's speech in the General Assembly had shocked all Member States, even those which had abstained in the vote of censure, but it had been applauded by racist elements in the public gallery. The United Nations must act quickly in the face of the South African challenge to world opinion, and the risk of racial bitterness which might prevent peaceful co-operation. Abandoned by all other States, rejected by the Commonwealth, South Africa nevertheless refused to alter its policy. Yet Africa was a hospitable continent and its black indigenous inhabitants had no quarrel with whites who respected human dignity. There could be a bright future for South Africa, if the Govern-

ment would restore the legitimate rights of the Bantu population and install a truly democratic régime. South Africa could become a prosperous multi-racial society, with black and white working side by side, jointly responsible for the country's economic and political destiny. But the white settlers were afraid to accept evolution. They tried, fruitlessly, to ignore the wind of change sweeping over Africa. After 300 years, the white settlers in South Africa had learnt nothing and forgotten nothing. They had not even learnt from events in Angola and the Congo, both so close to their own borders.

21. The United Nations must compel South Africa to change its policy. No compromise was possible. The United Nations was in duty bound to prevent the international tragedy foreshadowed in the rigid determination of the South African Government to continue its suicidal course. The Dahoman delegation would support any positive action which would make it possible in the immediate future to exert pressure on the Government of South Africa to make radical changes in its policy. Pressure must be exerted on the white minority to restore freedom to the majority, before it was compelled to choose between extermination or departure from Africa.

22. Mr. LOUW (South Africa), speaking on a point of order, said that the representatives of the United States and Ghana had both stated that the South African delegation's presence at the debate was for the purpose of participating in it. In order to prevent any misunderstanding on that point, he wished to repeat the reasons for his presence. If there was any further misapprehension, he might have to reconsider his decision to attend.

23. He had said, in his initial statement to the Committee (267th meeting), that he had no intention of once more arguing South Africa's case against interference in its domestic affairs. In the general debate in the General Assembly, he had voluntarily given certain information. For the rest, South African policy was a purely South African affair and no concern of the United Nations, the Committee, the sponsors for the inscription of the agenda item (A/4804 and Add.1-5) before the Committee, or any other nation, great or small. Having rejected the constitutional right of the United Nations to discuss the matter, he had stated that the nations which had made such extravagant accusations against South Africa also had no moral right to place the item on the agenda or to discuss it, in view of the racial discrimination and undemocratic practices in their own countries. His only purpose in attending the debate was to deal with the moral aspect and to expose the falsity of the charges made against South Africa. His presence must not be interpreted in any way as admitting the right of the Committee or of the United Nations to interfere with or to discuss what was essentially a domestic affair of the Republic of South Africa.

24. Mr. PLIMPTON (United States of America) was sorry if he had misinterpreted the reason for the presence of the Minister of External Affairs of South Africa. He wished to stress once more, however, that the United States delegation considered his presence, for whatever purpose, a useful and encouraging event, because it hoped that he would take back to his Government a real sense of the attitude of all delegations towards the South African Government's policy. The United States delegation continued to hope that, if

world opinion, as reflected in the discussion, was faithfully and accurately reported to the South African Government, that Government would show some signs of acknowledging its responsibility not only to the Charter but to the opinion of the rest of the world.

25. Mr. AMONOO (Ghana) said that, irrespective of whether the presence of the South African Minister meant that he was participating in the debate or not, the Ghanaian delegation was glad to see him there, listening to the charges against his country and learning at first hand how the African and many other delegations felt about the "apartheid" policy of South Africa.

26. Mr. PERERA (Ceylon), speaking on a point of order, asked whether the representative of South Africa was raising the question of the Committee's competence. If that was his position, the Committee ought to take a decision immediately, under rule 81 of the Committee's rules of procedure. In his view, the Committee was fully competent to discuss and adopt proposals on the item in question.

27. The CHAIRMAN said that there had been no formal proposal regarding the Committee's competence. He felt that the question had been settled by the General Assembly's decision to place the item on the agenda.

28. Mr. HASAN (Pakistan) noted that the item had been discussed by the General Assembly on many occasions, and the General Assembly's decision to place the item on its agenda confirmed the competence of the United Nations to discuss the matter. It was therefore unnecessary to put the matter to the vote.

29. Mr. PERERA (Ceylon) agreed wholeheartedly with the representative of Pakistan. He had raised the issue because of the remarks of the South African representative. If the latter had not raised the question of competence, the Committee could have proceeded on the basis that it was entitled to discuss the matter.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.