

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 480th
MEETING



Tuesday, 7 December 1965,
at 11.5 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 36:

*The policies of apartheid of the Government
of the Republic of South Africa (continued):*

(a) *Reports of the Special Committee on the
Policies of apartheid of the Government
of the Republic of South Africa;*

(b) *Reports of the Secretary-General. 1*

Chairman: Mr. Carlet R. AUGUSTE (Haiti).

AGENDA ITEM 36

The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued) (A/SPC/107 and Corr.1, A/SPC/L.118 and Add.1, A/SPC/L.119 and Add.1, A/SPC/L.120):

(a) Reports of the Special Committee on the Policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (A/5692, A/5707, A/5825 and Add.1, A/5932, A/5957);

(b) Reports of the Secretary-General (A/5850 and Add.1, A/6025 and Add.1)

1. Mr. HILMY (United Arab Republic) said that in discussing the report of the Special Committee on the Policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (A/5957) the Special Political Committee was dealing with one of the greatest tragedies of the age and one of the most serious problems facing the United Nations, for apartheid was a system which, in addition to denying the majority of a country's population the enjoyment of its most elementary human rights, constituted a violation of the rules governing international relations. The Governments and peoples of the world with their differing interests, cultures, religions, races and inclinations were more united in condemning apartheid than they had been with regard to any other issue. That fact was reflected in the statement by the Anglican Archbishop of Cape Town on the conviction of Nelson Mandela and seven others, published in London in The Times on 31 July 1964. The Archbishop had said that world opinion condemned the South African Government's attempts to enforce a racial policy which was in itself immoral and that the world outcry showed that it was the South African nation and not the condemned men who had been convicted. The issue should be viewed not in isolation but rather in the context of the policies of racial oppression and white supremacy which were being pursued in Southern Rhodesia and the Portuguese colonies as well as in South Africa and South West Africa. Only the Governments of South Africa

and Portugal were offering assistance to the Smith régime, in defiance of world public opinion and of every principle of the Charter of the United Nations.

2. The documents submitted by the Special Committee all presented the same picture of tyranny, inhumanity and nazism in South Africa. The situation was summed up in the report of commission III of the International Conference on Economic Sanctions against South Africa held in London in April 1964, which stated, inter alia, that the South African Government was able to draw support from its main trading partners and that the prospect was that violence and bloodshed would increase (see A/5707, annex II, para. 29). The survival of the régime in the face of world-wide condemnation could be attributed without hesitation to those who benefited materially from the oppression and exploitation of the African inhabitants of South Africa, namely those same Powers which were obstructing effective action by the United Nations. There could be no doubt as to the close relationship between the unusually high profits on foreign investments in South Africa and the continuing practice of the policies of apartheid. The United Arab Republic had faithfully implemented all the United Nations resolutions on the subject. He noted in that connexion that the African leaders had condemned the policies of apartheid at their conferences in 1963, 1964 and 1965 and that the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held at Cairo in 1964 had adopted a recommendation inviting all States to boycott South African goods and ban exports to South Africa.

3. The report of the Special Committee demonstrated that the great economic progress made by South Africa in recent years was due to its economic relations with a number of industrialized countries, including the United Kingdom and the United States. The increase in the volume of investments by international corporations since the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 1761 (XVII) was particularly striking. He drew attention in that connexion to a statement by the South African Minister of Economic Affairs (A/5932, para. 108) to the effect that one of the features of 1965 would be the amount of foreign capital pouring into the country and that there was a new awakening among foreign investors to the industrial and economic potential of South Africa. Those countries which were increasing their investments in South Africa and expanding their economic relations with it were helping the régime to develop the self-sufficiency and military power which would enable it to withstand the effects of the economic sanctions applied at great sacrifice by a number of countries. His delegation fully shared the view expressed by the Special Committee that primary responsibility

for the failure of the efforts of the United Nations rested on South Africa's major trading partners. A letter published in The New York Times in July 1964 had called for disengagement from assistance to the present rulers of South Africa as the only possible means of overcoming the intolerable evil of apartheid. The writer had gone on to state that every American individual or institution that was an investor in one or more of the American firms having branches in South Africa or was a depositor in any of the major American banks or investment houses with offices in that country was a partner in the South African régime's policies of apartheid and that the time had come for such American investors to insist upon the disengagement of the business enterprises representing them from that partnership.

4. It was clear from the course of events in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia that the time had come for the imposition of economic sanctions. In view of the gravity of the threat represented by the situation in South Africa, his delegation considered it urgent that the Assembly should invite South Africa's trading partners to respect the decisions of the United Nations and it hoped that the Security Council would be called upon to take the necessary measures under Chapter VII of the Charter.

5. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) proposed that the statement made by the representative of the United Arab Republic should be issued verbatim.

6. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection he would take it that the Committee was in favour of the Cyprus representative's proposal.

7. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that on reading the report of the Special Committee (A/5957) he had been deeply moved by the account of the suffering and humiliation inflicted upon the non-white population of South Africa by the bigoted white minority, who apparently believed that they were superior beings because of the colour of their skin. The self-righteous racists forgot that the torch of civilization had burned brightly in Africa and Asia when their ancestors were still barbarians; they forgot that all men belonged to the same species, *homo sapiens*; they hypocritically ignored the tenets of their Church, which taught that all men were brothers and enjoined the faithful to love their neighbour. The white South Africans were in fact victims of a collective psychosis, a minority of megalomaniacs who could be regarded with pity or derision and left to their own devices, were it not for the fact that their folly led them to oppress the non-white majority.

8. That folly was contagious, for it had spread to Southern Rhodesia, where the Smith régime had turned a deaf ear to the admonitions of the United Kingdom Government and wantonly disregarded the resolutions adopted by the Security Council. The white racists in Southern Rhodesia and South Africa killed and suppressed all those who opposed racial discrimination, and if they were left free to pursue their perverted policies nothing would prevent them from forming a formidable axis in southern Africa. If the United Nations did not take effective action to solve the problem, the African and Asian States would eventually be obliged to do so, for they remembered

the exploitation and humiliation of the colonial era and could not allow the arrogant white racists to offend human dignity with impunity.

9. The situation in southern Africa was thus fraught with danger, and could have catastrophic world-wide consequences if the powerful States failed to take drastic preventive measures. So far the Western Powers had piously condemned the racists, but had been unwilling to take effective action against Southern Rhodesia or South Africa, contending that blockades and boycotts were not feasible. Denmark, however, had set a good example by announcing its willingness to support economic sanctions against South Africa. It was true that such sanctions would harm the economies of certain Western countries, but those countries themselves had been unable to suggest any acceptable alternative course of action. Patience, persuasion and conciliation had proved ineffective, and half-hearted action would give the racists yet more time to consolidate their position. Prompt and positive action was therefore necessary, for the decisions taken recently by the African States showed that the situation in southern Africa might otherwise deteriorate rapidly.

10. The United Kingdom Government was admittedly in a particularly unenviable position; it seemed to be motivated by a sincere desire to act, yet the imposition of sanctions would seriously affect its business community. It could escape from that dilemma by transferring the onus of responsibility to the United Nations, as it had done in the case of Palestine.

11. Mr. BARROMI (Israel), speaking on a point of order, observed that the question of Palestine was irrelevant to the agenda item before the Committee.

12. The CHAIRMAN invited the representative of Saudi Arabia to confine his remarks to the subject under discussion.

13. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that he had mentioned Palestine parenthetically, by way of illustration. The United Kingdom was on good terms with both the United States and the Soviet Union, the two major permanent members of the Security Council, who were the guardians of world peace. Those Powers had reacted in a similar manner at the time of the Suez crisis, and could resolve the issue in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia by immediately addressing a serious ultimatum to the white rulers of those countries. If the latter still refused to change their ways, the two Powers would be justified in using force.

14. That would, of course, be a last resort, and all other means should be exhausted first. The draft resolution (A/SPC/L.118 and Add.1) should be adopted and fully implemented. He would suggest also that high altitude aircraft should fly over South Africa and Southern Rhodesia daily for six months or a year, dropping leaflets exhorting the population to strike against the authorities until those bigoted tyrants yielded. Powerful radio transmitters should broadcast programmes urging the people to clamour for freedom and the restitution of their rights. All Member States should refuse to grant visas to white South Africans and Southern Rhodesians, thus isolating them in their self-created prisons until they prevailed upon the

racist authorities to change their inhuman policies. If all else failed, then the Charter made it mandatory upon the permanent members of the Security Council to act, and the United States and the Soviet Union should send paratroops to master the racists, in order to avoid a world conflict that would cause mankind untold sorrow.

15. Mr. LICHTVELD (Netherlands) said that the policy of apartheid was rejected in all its aspects by the multiracial Kingdom of the Netherlands. Two of the component parts of that Kingdom, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles, had multiracial societies of their own, made up of people from all continents, including a very small white minority, happily working together for the benefit of their common fatherland. By rejecting racial discrimination in any form they were demonstrating the practicability of racial co-operation and integration and could thus set an example for South Africa, whose doctrine of apartheid was based on the false assumption that a multiracial society was not possible and would inevitably lead to the destruction of the white minority in that country.

16. The Government and people of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considered apartheid to be contrary to their tradition of tolerance and individual freedom, to the basic concepts of democracy, to the principles of the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to the dignity of the non-white races and ultimately even to the long-range interests of the white South Africans themselves. The Kingdom of the Netherlands was dedicated to the principle of equal rights and of government with the consent of the governed. Accordingly, it hoped for the establishment in South Africa of a multiracial society, a development which would require the different sectors of the population to enter into a dialogue on their common future. His Government had given expression to its rejection of apartheid in the United Nations with increasing force and its growing apprehension at the deterioration of conditions in South Africa had been reflected in its attitude toward the debates in the Assembly and the decisions taken there. It was distressing for his country to realize that apartheid was practised by a people who traced their origin in part to the Netherlands, where that line of thinking was rejected as being contrary to the innermost convictions of its people and more important than any ties of kinship.

17. It was understandable that after twenty years in which continuous condemnation of the policies of apartheid had brought about no change in the South African Government's attitude, a feeling of impatience and frustration had taken possession of many African and other nations and they were now urging the adoption of practical measures such as the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations and the application of economic sanctions. It was his delegation's opinion, however, that neither of those steps would be appropriate or lead to the elimination of apartheid. Although the South African delegation was not participating in the Committee's debate, its continued presence in the United Nations would be more effective than its expulsion, for the ultimate influence of world opinion on the South African Government and people was something which should not be underestimated. Pressure on the régime should continue

unabated but that pressure would be most effective if exercised within the framework of the United Nations. His Government believed that only collective peaceful action under the Charter could induce the South African Government to change its course and that nothing could be gained by placing that Government itself in a state of apartheid in relation to the rest of the world. It was difficult to imagine how the United Nations could induce South Africa to show more respect for the principles set forth in the Charter as an outsider than as a Member of the United Nations. As for South Africa's argument that Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter prevented the United Nations from considering the question, his Government held that racial discrimination as practised by the advocates of apartheid was clearly a matter of international concern.

18. The Netherlands had complied with the two resolutions adopted by the Security Council in 1963 calling for an embargo on shipments to South Africa of arms, military equipment and materials for their manufacture, and with the two relevant resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at its eighteenth session. In particular, it had made a substantial contribution for the provision of legal counsel and defence to persons accused of opposing the policy of apartheid. It therefore welcomed the suggestion in the report of the Special Committee concerning the establishment of a trust fund and was glad to know that it had been incorporated into draft resolution A/SPC/L.119 and Add.1. His delegation would vote in favour of that resolution on the understanding that the humanitarian aspect would be the only guide-line, and a consistent one, in the implementation of the ideas contained in that text.

19. It was the firm conviction of his Government that the Committee's further deliberations should be guided by respect for the Charter, the use of peaceful means and the realization that a change of policy must come from within and could not be imposed by outsiders. Those considerations should be borne in mind when economic sanctions were discussed. As in the past, his Government considered sanctions an inappropriate means of inducing Members of the United Nations to change their internal policies. It was convinced that they would do nothing to bring about a change of heart in South Africa or to alleviate the sufferings of the non-white inhabitants, and they might hurt the economies of several other countries more than that of South Africa. It therefore seriously doubted the efficiency of any but moral sanctions. In addition to those objections of a practical nature, it was opposed to the application of economic sanctions on the ground that only the Security Council was competent to determine the existence of the conditions under which sanctions could be applied as described in Chapter VII of the Charter, namely a threat to the peace. As the Security Council had not made such a determination, his Government felt that there were no sound grounds on which a call for sanctions could be based.

20. In conclusion, his delegation wished to make a strong appeal to other Members not to isolate South Africa but to continue urging it to change its policies.

21. Mr. DIOP (Senegal) said that the failure of the United Nations to take really effective action on the issue of apartheid was slowly undermining the great confidence of the developing countries in the Organization. The human rights of 13 million Africans were being systematically and progressively violated. Acting with impunity, the Pretoria régime had increased the severity of its measures against the non-white population and had stiffened in its defiant attitude to public opinion. To those who counselled patience and persuasion, he could only ask how it was possible to dissuade someone who refused to enter into a dialogue. A threat to the peace existed; the time had come for action.

22. The situation was daily deteriorating. The aim of apartheid was to enslave all coloured people for the benefit of a "master race". The Senegalese delegation was more interested in finding a way of effectively applying United Nations decisions than in adopting further recommendations that would remain a dead letter. The reason why previous decisions had not been carried out should be sought in the pertinent comments made by the representative of Morocco on the respective roles of the great and small Powers in the United Nations. The Senegalese delegation believed that in an age of universal inter-dependence all peoples, without exception, had an irreplaceable contribution to make to the building of world civilization. The small-mindedness of the allies of Pretoria prevented them from realizing the harmfulness of apartheid for the entire world.

23. Within his own limitations, Mr. Verwoerd was acting effectively. The United Nations, which had decided that the policy of apartheid was criminal, must also take effective action. At the present time, the process of the emancipation of colonial peoples, which had begun after the Second World War, had slowed down. It would appear that an association of former colonial Powers had set about the task not only of holding up the liberation movement, but of restoring colonization in a new guise. Nevertheless, the United Nations could point to certain positive results in the struggle against apartheid. World opinion had been kept well informed of the dangers of apartheid and had supported United Nations work in that field. People of many different countries and races had offered contributions for the relief of non-white and white victims of apartheid. The Senegalese delegation wished to thank all such contributors, the value of whose gifts could not be reckoned in figures alone. The feeling of solidarity thus created between the United Nations and the victims of apartheid helped to strengthen within the Organization the determination to co-operate harmoniously on behalf of all persecuted peoples.

24. In the great task of eliminating apartheid, the report of the Special Committee (A/5957) was particularly valuable, and he wished to congratulate the Chairman and Rapporteur on their excellent work. He fully supported the recommendations contained in the report, and hoped that the draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.118 and Add.1 and A/SPC/L.119 and Add.1), of which Senegal was a sponsor, would not only be adopted by a large majority but would be effectively put into operation.

25. Mr. GOLSALA (Chad) expressed his disappointment at the statement made by the representative of the Netherlands. At a time when the Committee was attempting to take positive action to achieve its aims, some delegations still tried to lead it astray by considering only their own selfish interests. The people of Africa and mankind as a whole could no longer tolerate the policy of apartheid. If the United Nations had failed in its efforts to settle the problem, it was because certain industrialized States Members of the United Nations which were also permanent members of the Security Council, supported the racist Government of South Africa. The avowed aim of the advocates of apartheid was to reconquer the whole of Africa and to restore the system of slavery.

26. The Western Powers had counselled patience and tolerance. They had argued that the situation was not as bad as it seemed and had drawn attention to the contributions made on behalf of the victims. They had also stated that the United Nations was too weak to take effective action. At the same time they had invested in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, and supplied them with arms. But the Africans were not deceived, and were determined to eliminate apartheid within the framework of the Organization of African Unity.

27. To bolster up its régime, the South African Government encouraged immigration from Europe. Gangsters and criminals were being brought into South Africa to exterminate the Africans. The hatred of the racists extended to Latin America and Asia, with the sole exception of Japan. By way of contrast, he wished to remind the Committee of the words of peace addressed to the General Assembly (1347th plenary meeting) by His Holiness, Pope Paul VI.

28. Southern Africa was being colonized once again from Salisbury, Pretoria and the Portuguese territories. The representative of Portugal had said that his Government was ready to co-operate with all its neighbours, including the African countries. A European State could not have common frontiers with an African country. Portugal's African empire would soon be a thing of the past.

29. South Africa's major trading partners opposed the application of sanctions, which was the only way of dealing with the problem. Yet the United Nations Charter authorized their use, and no obstacle should be allowed to stand in their way. He therefore supported the recommendations contained in the report of the Special Committee on apartheid and thanked the Chairman and Rapporteur for their excellent work.

30. He hoped that draft resolutions A/SPC/L.118 and Add.1 and A/SPC/L.119 and Add.1 would be adopted unanimously. The competence of the United Nations had been proved beyond doubt. It must take positive action against the nazi régime in South Africa by agreeing to an oil embargo and a trade, financial and economic blockade.

31. Mr. XYDIS (Greece) said that Greece was opposed to all forms of discrimination and supported the principle of majority rule. His country therefore regarded the policy of apartheid as an evil and dangerous violation of the United Nations Charter and

the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Furthermore, it was a futile policy, doomed to collapse in the long run. Unfortunately, it threatened to destroy not only its advocates, but thousands of innocent victims.

32. Greece had repeatedly attempted to convey its views to the rulers of South Africa, not only through the United Nations but by bilateral channels. Its expressions of concern, however, had met with no response. The South African Government did not want to hear the truth, which explained why its representative was not attending the debate. South Africa's absence could be interpreted only as an admission of guilt.

33. On a matter which concerned the essential dignity of civilized man, no procedural objections based on domestic jurisdiction or national sovereignty could be accepted. Apartheid was a matter of concern to the entire world. It was clear from the evidence that had been submitted to the Committee that the situation in South Africa was deteriorating. The political, spiritual, even the material existence of 13 million Africans was in danger. A definite threat to the peace existed, as the South African Government itself had acknowledged by increasing its defence budget five and a half times in the past seven years. It had purchased—from various countries, some of them regrettably Members of the United Nations—arms and equipment in quantities out of all proportion to any external threat to the country. The time had come for the United Nations to take serious action to avert disaster.

34. Greece had already taken measures to implement the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, and would support further resolutions condemning apartheid and proposing effective measures to preserve the life and dignity of thousands of men, women and children from intolerance and fanaticism. In examining proposed draft resolutions, the Greek delegation would favour those that did not

lay fresh burdens on the people of South Africa, but would tend to mitigate, if not eradicate, the inhuman measures taken by the South African Government. In conclusion, he reserved his right to take part in the discussion of the draft resolutions and to explain his vote either in the Committee or in the General Assembly.

35. Mr. NEKROUF (Morocco), recalling the statement made by the Tunisian representative (478th meeting) when introducing draft resolution A/SPC/L.120, said he wished to make it clear that his delegation did not criticize the South African delegation for being absent but rather for its deliberate refusal to cooperate with the other members of the Committee, whose only desire was to seek a peaceful solution to the problem of apartheid before it was too late.

36. After the Committee had voted on draft resolutions A/SPC/L.118 and Add.1 and A/SPC/L.119 and Add.1, the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.120 would consider whether to press for a vote on that text.

37. Mr. NORTON DE MATOS (Portugal) said that he wished once again categorically to deny the repeated allegation that his Government had entered into what some representatives had described as an "unholy alliance" with Southern Rhodesia and South Africa. Some speakers had gone so far as to cast doubt on the sincerity of his Government's racial policy. The Portuguese way of life showed that the Portuguese Government and nation upheld the principle of the equality of all races and that Portugal's policies were based on that principle.

38. Mr. GOLSALA (Chad) said that he thought members need only recall Portugal's attitude towards the situation in Southern Rhodesia to judge the sincerity of its claim that it adhered to the principle of racial equality.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.