

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records

**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 539th
MEETING**

Friday, 9 December 1966,
at 8.50 p.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 34:</i>	
<i>The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa: report of the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued)</i>	239

Chairman: Mr. Max JAKOBSON (Finland).

AGENDA ITEM 34

The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa: report of the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued) (A/6356, A/6412, A/6486, A/6494, A/SPC/L.135, A/SPC/L.136)

1. Mr. KILU (Kenya) said that his Government was not disheartened by the failure of the United Nations to persuade the South Africa régime to renounce its monstrous policies, and would continue to press for ways and means of eliminating apartheid. The situation resulting from its application to the African majority in South Africa was steadily deteriorating; racial segregation was being extended to all aspects of life. Under new legislation introduced by the régime, for example, universities were being threatened with a loss of government grants if they discriminated in any way against student organizations advocating racial separation on the campus, and segregation was being enforced in charitable organizations such as the National Council for the Blind. The main trading partners of South Africa were guilty of perpetuating apartheid by continuing to do business with South Africa, by blocking Security Council action through the exercise of the veto, and by refusing to participate in the work of the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa.

2. Kenya had taken drastic measures against the racist régime in South Africa. It had banned all trade to and from South Africa and Portugal at a loss of some \$6 million to its economy; it had closed the South African Consulate in Nairobi and had expelled the South African Consul General; it had withdrawn landing and flying rights from South African Airways; it had ordered all Kenya merchants to dispose of South African and Portuguese goods in their possession and to cease all dealings with those two countries; and it had taken a firm position against apartheid at the various international conferences held on that subject.

3. Still another resolution condemning apartheid would be futile, since it would be flouted by certain States bent on increasing their trade with South Africa. Ultimately, the question of apartheid would have to be solved by force of arms, with all nations of goodwill joining together to defeat the forces of oppression.

4. Mr. OUATTARA (Upper Volta), emphasizing the gravity of the problem as reflected in the two reports of the Special Committee (A/6356 and A/6486), expressed his delegation's bitter disappointment concerning the failure of the United Nations to take effective action against the South African régime and the bad faith shown by certain countries in refusing to respond to appeals for such action. The latter, while recognizing the potentially explosive nature of the situation created by the policies and practices of apartheid, maintained that there was as yet no threat to international peace and therefore refused to apply the sanctions provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter. Their position was inherently illogical and indicated a total absence of moral scruples. Moreover, those who held that a solution should be sought by encouraging the people of South Africa to apply the methods of consultation and conciliation disregarded the evidence. Obviously, consultation and conciliation could only be carried out between two parties which were willing to enter into that process. But the South African régime had not only refused the repeated advice of the United Nations to do so; it would not even consider a dialogue with the African majority which it despised and oppressed. Surely if it had ever offered to sit down and talk with the representatives of that majority, the petitioners who had been heard in the United Nations would have reported such overtures. Consequently, the South African white minority was the only party to be encouraged to resort to conciliation, for it was that minority, supported by military resources and foreign interests, which was jeopardizing peace in southern Africa. To illustrate the point, he quoted at length from an article published in *Le Monde* of 3 November 1966 showing that the system of racial segregation was so firmly established that not only were the Whites in full command, but normal human contacts with the black Africans had been totally eliminated and the latter had become "invisible" to the white South Africans living in their insulated "European" world. However, the day was not far off when those white South Africans might be forced to atone for their inhumanity.

5. The report of the Special Committee on the implementation of paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 2054 A (XX) (A/6356) indicated that not all Member States were complying with the terms of that resolution and emphasized the special responsibilities of South Africa's major trading partners.

His delegation had reason to fear that, despite assurances by many Governments that they were enforcing an arms embargo against South Africa, the United Nations decision to that effect was also being flouted. For instance, while the General Assembly had been discussing the question of South West Africa, war matériel was being shipped to Portugal. Such hypocritical conduct could only lead to disaster. Upper Volta would support any draft resolution aimed at eliminating all forms of racial discrimination and restoring the dignity of the Africans of South Africa.

6. Mr. TAKAHASHI (Japan) deplored South Africa's continued defiance of United Nations decisions. His Government had repeatedly appealed to the South African Government to renounce its apartheid policies in the interest of all the peoples of South Africa, including those of European origin. It had also demonstrated its sympathy with the victims of apartheid and had now decided to contribute \$20,000 to the United Nations educational and training programme for South Africans.

7. Apartheid, the most virulent form of racial discrimination in the modern world, was a matter of concern to all States, and South Africa's argument that United Nations action was precluded under Article 2, paragraph 7 was wholly untenable. Moreover, the South African régime could not hope to reverse the tide of history by maintaining its oppressive policies. His delegation therefore appealed once again to the South African Government to realize the futility of its course and to work towards the harmonious coexistence of all racial groups in the interests of peace.

8. While Japan sympathized with the impatience of the African nations to bring about an end to apartheid through the application of universal economic sanctions against South Africa, it warned them that such sanctions could only be successful if they were really applied effectively by all States. Since several States found it difficult to apply sanctions in present circumstances, it was unrealistic to assume that they could be universal. However, Japan was prepared to co-operate fully if and when lawful and effective economic sanctions against South Africa were voted by the Security Council. Japan had complied with past decisions of the Council: it had given no military or economic assistance to South Africa; it maintained an arms embargo against that country; it had voluntarily refrained from entering into diplomatic relations with the South African Government; and there was no Japanese capital invested in South Africa; it did not contemplate any change in that basic position. Japan would continue to co-operate to the fullest possible extent with other States for the earliest elimination of apartheid.

9. Mr. KIKHIA (Libya) briefly reviewed the efforts of the United Nations to persuade the Government of the Republic of South Africa to desist from its racist policy, which was in effect a form of neo-nazism enjoying sufficient support to defy the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and to threaten peace and security not only in Africa but throughout the world. The danger of racial conflict in Africa had become imminent, and it was time for the United Nations to take further measures

to bring the Pretoria régime to reason. Since persuasion and other peaceful means had failed to induce it to alter its course, the only peaceful alternative left to the United Nations was the application of economic and other sanctions, particularly by South Africa's main trading partners. Pressure should be brought against the latter to withdraw their economic and financial aid from the white minority in South Africa, thus discouraging any further repression of the African population.

10. The repeated manifestations of the powerlessness of the United Nations to prevail upon South Africa to abandon its racist policies had intensified that country's profound contempt for the Organization. As reported in *Le Figaro* after the vote on the resolution concerning South West Africa (2145 (XXI)), a South African representative had dismissed the event with the comment that life would go on as usual. The failure of the United Nations to impose its decisions on Member States undermined its prestige and jeopardized its survival.

11. The South African Government was preparing for the worst by building a formidable war machine which would enable it to suppress any internal uprising and to intimidate the independent neighbouring States of southern Africa. At the same time, it was consolidating its aggressive alliance with the Portuguese colonialists and with the rebel régime of Ian Smith in Rhodesia. At a military parade held on 31 May 1966, the late Prime Minister Verwoerd had described South Africa as the white man's domain and had sworn that the white South Africans would not sacrifice their way of life and would defend themselves with all their might. Twenty per cent of South Africa's 1966-67 budget had been allocated for military purposes, a 12 per cent increase over the previous year.

12. Economically South Africa was enjoying great prosperity, but it was based on ruthless exploitation of the labour provided by the African majority, encouraged by certain Western Powers which were opposed to the application of sanctions because they did not want to see their investments threatened. Those major trading partners of South Africa were the only Powers in a position to exert sufficient pressure on the South African authorities to persuade them to revise their racial policies, but they refused to do so, basing their refusal on respect for the principle of sovereignty embodied in the United Nations Charter. That, however, was obviously a false pretext; those same Powers had not respected the principle of sovereignty in certain other cases. Moreover, the principle could not be interpreted in such a way as to prevent the implementation of other provisions of the Charter, such as those of the Preamble concerning fundamental human rights and the dignity and worth of the human person, and those of Article 55 concerning the self-determination of peoples. The idea of sovereignty was thus indissolubly linked with the ideals of peace, justice, social progress and human rights. Colonialist exploitation, racist oppression and the violation of human rights could in no case be compatible with membership in the United Nations.

13. The people and Government of Libya, a country which had also experienced racial segregation in the past, supported the South African people in

their struggle. Libya had applied all the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, had broken off trade relations with South Africa and was ready to apply any measures called for by the United Nations to combat the policies of the Pretoria régime.

14. There were certain aspects of the problem which in the view of his delegation warranted special attention. One was the nazi character of the régime: in recent years Pretoria had become the world centre of neo-nazism. Yet the Western Powers were not likely to go to war against that régime, since it was based on international finance, any more than they had taken action against the Nazis before their own vital interests were threatened. History likewise recorded their sacrifice of the people of Ethiopia, the sufferings inflicted on the people of Palestine, and the imperialist attack on Egypt aimed at protecting the Suez financial interests.

15. In its efforts to enslave the indigenous population of South Africa the Pretoria régime was using not only military force, police pressure and economic exploitation but also an anachronistic system of education based on outmoded tribalism, designed to teach the African that he was inferior and destined to serve the white man. What was even more revolting, however, was that the spirit of a religion which preached tolerance and brotherhood was being profaned by the Afrikaner minority, one of whose spokesmen had gone so far as to proclaim that South African racism reflected the will of God.

16. His delegation wished to pay a tribute to the members of the Special Committee and the participants in the seminar on apartheid held at Brasilia in August and September 1966. It would fully support the conclusions and recommendations of the Special Committee (see A/6486, chaps. IV and V) and the seminar (see A/6412, sect. III).

17. He then drew attention to a newly published book compiled by Ania Fracos in which various persons living in South Africa—including racist Whites, liberal Whites and Africans—expressed the view that it was already too late for a peaceful solution and that when the breaking-point was reached South Africa would be plunged in a blood-bath which might oblige the United Nations to intervene. His delegation hoped it would take effective action before that point was reached.

18. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) said that his country, faithful to the ideals and principles of the Charter, could not but oppose a social philosophy like apartheid—a challenge to the very *raison d'être* of the United Nations, which had been created not only to maintain peace and security but also to safeguard human rights and fundamental freedoms. The report of the Special Committee (A/6486) showed that a year after the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2054 (XX) the Pretoria régime was continuing to pursue the inhuman policies it had been called upon to abandon, and seemed more determined than ever to defy its moral and legal obligations and the appeals of the international community. According to the report, persons who opposed the white ruling class were tried under arbitrary laws that violated every canon of justice, or were subjected to harsh punishments by virtue of administrative actions alone. The report

went on to say that the South African Government had made the power of the courts largely ineffective by reasons of massive repressive legislation which denied them any jurisdiction, while not hesitating to use that power to implement legislation which was to its liking. It was high time that the United Nations, which year after year adopted resolutions re-affirming high principles, took action to bring about the attainment of the goals envisaged in those resolutions.

19. His delegation agreed that the policies of apartheid constituted a crime against humanity. If the Pretoria régime showed no sign of a change of heart, the Security Council would have to seek in the Charter ways and means of imposing such a change. Cyprus also attached significance to the warning uttered by Mr. Ngcobo the representative of the Pan-Africanist Congress (South Africa) (533rd meeting), that the oppressed people of South Africa were ready not only to die for their rights but also to kill for them, and to the Guinean representative's warning of the possibility of a confrontation that would involve more countries than South Africa alone (537th meeting). If it was agreed that those warnings should be taken seriously, it followed that the policies of the Pretoria régime must be regarded as a threat to international peace and security. The threat was compounded by the régime's collaboration with the white supremacists in Rhodesia and the Portuguese colonialists. In that connexion his delegation fully endorsed the idea of convening a conference under United Nations auspices to consider the problems of apartheid, racial discrimination and colonialism in the whole of southern Africa.

20. Many of the suggestions made in the reports of the Special Committee and the Brasilia seminar on apartheid had been incorporated in draft resolution A/SPC/L.135, of which his delegation was a sponsor. Their main objectives were the defeat of the concept of white supremacy, the elimination of racial discrimination and the establishment of a democratic society in South Africa based on the concept of "one man, one vote", a concept which the people of Cyprus held dear. The adoption of resolutions, however, was not enough, for it was only their implementation which would produce results. The sponsors regretted that it had been necessary to include in their text a provision appealing to all States to comply fully with the relevant decisions of the Security Council.

21. His own country had been among the first to contribute to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, set up by General Assembly resolution 2054 B (XX) and it had taken administrative and legislative action to compliance with part A of that resolution and the provisions of other relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

22. In conclusion, he would like to pay a tribute to the members of the Special Committee, and particularly to its Chairman and Rapporteur, for their valuable contribution to the study of the problem.

23. Mr. GBEDEY (Togo) expressed his delegation's appreciation of the work done by the Special Committee, which had provided the General Assembly with complete and detailed information on the development of the situation in South Africa. For twenty years the

racist policies of the South African Government had constituted one of the most important items on the General Assembly's agenda. Studies had been made, voluminous reports had been compiled, and resolutions had been adopted, yet the white minority in South Africa had done nothing to relax the repressive measures it applied to its opponents. It was not enough to hold lengthy discussions on the policies of apartheid and adopt resolutions at every session of the General Assembly. What was essential was that all the Members of the United Nations, great and small, should respect the Charter and the decisions of the Organization. Yet it must be recognized that the very foundations of the United Nations had been shaken by the attitude of the great Powers in placing their trade interests above their solemn undertakings to the United Nations, and that the countries of the "third world" were little by little losing their confidence in the Organization. If South Africa had gone on defying world public opinion for twenty years it was because it knew its crimes would go unpunished. It knew that its major trading partners wanted the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council to remain a dead letter and that it could count on their moral, financial and material support. That aspect of the problem was explicitly set forth in the report of the Special Committee, which drew attention in particular to the boycott by many nations of the resolutions of the United Nations, the vast amount of foreign capital invested in South Africa, the increase in trade, the construction of a missile tracking station and assistance to a factory for the manufacture of aircraft, the supplying of training jets, arms and military equipment, and the refusal of certain countries to participate in the work of that Committee. From the report it was easy to conclude that the great Powers, which bore special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, were encouraging South Africa in its defiance of the United Nations resolutions and its continued violations of the provisions of the Charter.

24. In his statement (533rd meeting), the representative of the Pan-Africanist Congress had dwelt on the danger of a violent conflict between the oppressors and the oppressed which would constitute a threat to international peace and security within the meaning of Article 39 of the Charter. South Africa as a signatory of the Charter had undertaken to uphold it and to comply with the decisions of the United Nations. It could not continue indefinitely to flout the will of the Organization with impunity.

25. The time had come to take decisive measures which would put an end to apartheid, and his delegation hoped that the great Powers would now give those measures their support. The people and Government of Togo categorically condemned colonialism in all its forms, firmly rejected racism and considered apartheid contrary to their traditions of tolerance and individual liberty, to the basic principles of democracy, and to the principles of the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Togo had once been a ward of the United Nations; it had made the Organization's ideals of peace and justice its own and would support it in any measures it might take to put an end to apartheid.

26. Mr. HILMY (United Arab Republic) said that over twenty years or so, all the aspects—political, economic and humanitarian—of apartheid had been examined in detail, and it had been condemned by the entire membership of the United Nations and by all international and regional organizations and conferences. It was therefore incumbent on the United Nations, as a reflection of the world conscience, to act firmly and without delay, and its Members should do everything within their power, collectively or individually, to put an end to apartheid.

27. After twenty years of discussion, the situation remained unchanged. The numerous General Assembly and Security Council resolutions had failed to induce South Africa to change its policy. On the contrary, it had intensified its repressive measures and was seeking to extend them elsewhere on the African continent. The arbitrary arrests, torture and brutality continued, and the opponents of apartheid were persecuted in total disregard of the principles of justice and world opinion. There was no indication that the South African Government would change its policy or that those States which had influence with it would co-operate to bring about such a change. It would seem that only outside forces—with economic sanctions as a first step—could be expected to produce results, and it was therefore difficult to take seriously the argument that persuasion was the best approach.

28. The struggle in South Africa was not merely a conflict between Africans and European settlers but a struggle against colonialism in its ugliest form. South Africa's major trading partners bore a grave responsibility for the situation and it was disturbing to note that, despite the repeated appeals by the General Assembly and the Security Council, some States had expanded their commercial ties with South Africa, thereby encouraging it in its policies.

29. His delegation fully supported the conclusions contained in the Special Committee's report, and joined the Special Committee in deploring the attitude of South Africa's major trading partners, particularly those which were permanent members of the Security Council. The refusal to co-operate with the Special Committee was in itself a flagrant violation of the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

30. If peace and stability were to prevail, full economic sanctions would have to be imposed. The explosive situation could not be ended merely by words or wishful thinking. The Security Council's refusal to take positive action had raised serious doubts regarding the Organization's role in maintaining peace and security. The United Nations would be defeating a basic purpose of the Charter if it condoned or remained indifferent to the dangerous situation, which called for action by the Security Council and by freedom-loving States. The African peoples were determined that apartheid must be eradicated. Those States which defended the Pretoria régime must realize that it was in the interests of those whom they supported to seek a peaceful settlement within the framework of the United Nations, before it was too late.

31. His delegation was a sponsor of draft resolution A/SPC/L.135, and it would support any other measure which might help the people of South Africa in their struggle against apartheid.

32. Mr. PEJIC (Yugoslavia) said that after two decades, it had become obvious that, owing to the lack of co-operation by countries which could have exercised their influence with the South African Government, the United Nations had been unable to fulfil the promises it had made, in countless resolutions, to the enslaved people of South Africa. The Special Committee deserved praise for its outstanding report, and the spokesman of the Pan-Africanist Congress had provided useful information.

33. At the present stage, two features of apartheid were most in evidence. First, the intensification of repressive policies was threatening peace in southern Africa and elsewhere, and secondly, the failure of the United Nations to implement its decisions was due primarily to the resistance of South Africa's major economic partners.

34. The Pretoria Government, encouraged by the attitude of the Western countries, continued its policy of persecution and brutality. The victims of those policies were being imprisoned without trial and tortured. New laws, inconceivable in the twentieth century, were being introduced.

35. There was no need to elaborate on the inhumanities committed by the South African Government; they had been fully exposed at the seminar on apartheid at Brasilia, and in the meetings of the Special Committee. A decisive element in the situation was the fact that South Africa had defied the decisions of the United Nations and had intensified its racial discrimination because it considered that it had the backing of certain great Powers which refused to support United Nations decisions and continued to extend assistance to the Pretoria régime, thereby becoming its accomplices.

36. The report of the Special Committee had rightly emphasized that aspect of the question, citing clear evidence of non-compliance with the decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly on the part of the major trading partners of South Africa. Further evidence of the political support of South Africa's policy by certain Western countries, some of them permanent members of the Security Council, could be seen in their opposition to the recommendations of the seminar on apartheid and, more particularly, in their refusal to participate in the work of the Special Committee. The great disparity between the eloquent statements made by the representatives of some countries and the way they acted made it possible for the racists of South Africa to pursue their policies unhindered.

37. South Africa's racist policy, in both its internal and its external manifestations, constituted a serious threat to peace. The intensification of the repressive measures and the growing opposition on the part of the majority population could only result in internal conflict. The South African racists' external actions, in their collusion with Rhodesia, their action in South West Africa and their close co-operation with the Portuguese colonialists were equally dangerous to international peace and security.

38. For those reasons, his delegation fully supported all the recommendations of the Special Committee, particularly those requesting the Security Council to revive and apply all the actions proposed under Chapter VII of the Charter and to ensure their full implementation by all Member States, especially by those on whose co-operation successful execution mainly depended. The dissatisfaction expressed in the Special Committee's report regarding the fact that for more than two years the Security Council had not re-examined the problem, was fully justified.

39. As his country had in the not too distant past undergone great suffering at the hands of racists, it fully appreciated the sentiments of African States and the majority of the people of South Africa, and it was prepared to do everything within its power to remove the danger inherent in the policies of apartheid.

40. Mr. BANZAR (Mongolia) said that in spite of twenty years of discussion in the General Assembly of the criminal policies of apartheid, the situation in South Africa, far from improving, had further deteriorated and was a serious threat to international peace and security.

41. The South African Government was intensifying its repressive policies and was strengthening its military and police forces in order to crush the opposition of the indigenous inhabitants and the liberation movements in that part of the continent. The introduction of drastic new laws deprived Africans and persons of Asian origin of the most elementary civic rights and freedoms. The racist white minority was striving to perpetuate the division of Africans into separate tribal groups by driving them into the bantustans. Furthermore, it was bent on creating a "balance" between almost 14 million indigenous inhabitants and 3 million Whites by a policy of genocide. In applying that criminal policy, designed to ensure domination of the white minority, the South African Government was violating the basic principles of international law, the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Declaration and International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and other important international instruments.

42. The report of the Special Committee and statements made in the Special Political Committee had shown clearly that apartheid was a form of colonialism and fascism. The racist régime had banned all organizations working for national liberation and ruthlessly persecuted all opponents of apartheid. Furthermore, it was striving to implant its racist ideology in neighbouring territories, such as South West Africa and Southern Rhodesia. The tripartite alliance of South Africa, Rhodesia and the Portuguese colonialists, assisted by such powerful protectors as the United States of America, was engaged in a subversive campaign directed against the freedom of the newly independent African States.

43. Apartheid had long since ceased to be the concern merely of individual countries and peoples; it was a crime against humanity and constituted a serious threat to the freedom of the entire African continent and to international peace and security. His people therefore added its voice to the demands made by the peoples of the world that the cynical disregard

of the resolutions of the United Nations by the imperialist Powers should cease and that effective action should be taken for the eradication of the policies and practices of apartheid.

44. His delegation was convinced that the fascist régime in South Africa would have been liquidated long ago if it had not had the protection of the imperialist Western Powers, for which South Africa was a source of enormous profits. That explained their refusal to apply economic and other sanctions to South Africa. Countries such as the United States, the United Kingdom, France and the Federal Republic of Germany were constantly increasing their investments in South Africa. It was also common knowledge that the United States and other NATO countries were helping South Africa to expand its armed forces. The Federal Republic of Germany, which gave political and economic support to South Africa and Rhodesia, was co-operating with the Pretoria Government in the production of nuclear, chemical and bacteriological weapons and guided missiles.

45. The extensive economic and commercial co-operation of the Western Powers and certain other countries with the South African Government nullified the efforts of the African States which had severed diplomatic and trade relations with that Government, in accordance with the resolutions of the Security

Council and the General Assembly. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development also assisted South Africa by granting loans in disregard of those resolutions. Member States were entitled to demand that the Bank should discontinue operations which were at variance with the decisions of the United Nations, under whose aegis it had been established.

46. It was clear that the Western Powers had always tried to avoid the imposition of sanctions against South Africa, not only because of their commercial interests but because that country was a last stronghold against the national liberation movements of the African peoples. That attitude was particularly reprehensible on the part of those Powers which were permanent members of the Security Council. The General Assembly should condemn them for aiding and abetting the practice of apartheid and should call upon all the Western Powers concerned to cease their economic and other co-operation with South Africa and comply with the United Nations resolutions.

47. His delegation supported the conclusions and recommendations of the Special Committee and would support any measure designed to bring about the speedy eradication of the system of apartheid.

The meeting rose at 10.50 p.m.