



Chairman: Mr. Cornelius C. CREMIN (Ireland).

AGENDA ITEMS 37 AND 12

The policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa (*continued*) (A/8403, A/8422 and Corr.1, A/8467, A/8468, A/SPC/145, A/SPC/L.206, A/SPC/L.207):

- (a) Report of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* (A/8422 and Corr.1);
- (b) Reports of the Secretary-General (A/8467, A/8468);
- (c) Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter XVII (section C)) (A/8403)

1. Mr. NDAYIRAGIJE (Burundi) said that, although the United Nations had adopted many resolutions on *apartheid* the South African racists continued to ignore them, and were being assisted in doing so by certain Powers whose actions belied their words. The reports of the Secretary-General (A/8467 A/8468) and the Special Committee on *Apartheid* (A/8422 and Corr.1) should be considered carefully if effective assistance was to be given to the South Africans fighting for their freedom. The policies of *apartheid* were a challenge to Africa and the entire modern world; they had been further intensified in recent years, and the rise in the number of criminal convictions paralleled the increase in the military budget. The purpose of all those measures was to reduce the non-white peoples to mere economic tools and condemn them to a life of eternal slavery in the Bantustans, where 70 per cent of the population of South Africa would be settled on 12 per cent of the national territory and would be expected to provide for all its needs.

2. The racist white minority would like to extend that policy to the entire continent and turn every African country into a Bantustan, as could be seen in Southern Rhodesia, Namibia and the Territories under Portuguese administration. Pursuing its imperialistic designs, that minority had committed aggression against the Republic of Zambia, an aggression which was in fact aimed at all the States of the region.

3. The African countries had denounced those actions. The Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Lusaka in September 1970, the Seventh Summit Conference of the East and Central African States, held at Mogadiscio in October 1971, and the seventeenth ordinary session of the Council of Ministers of the OAU, held at Addis Ababa in June 1971, had all condemned the policies of *apartheid*, the assistance given those policies by certain imperialist Powers and the position taken up by those African countries which supported "dialogue" and betrayed the cause of African liberation.

4. His Government fully supported the OAU in its efforts to root out all forms of colonialism and discrimination from the African continent and believed that dialogue should first be established between the South African authorities and the liberation movements representing the non-white peoples of South Africa. He believed that the General Assembly should not hesitate to denounce once more, and to condemn, the support given to South Africa by certain NATO countries and that the United Nations should not only adopt resolutions on the subject but also endeavour to take effective steps to ensure their implementation. In the Declaration of Mogadiscio the leaders of the East and Central African States had asserted that there was no way left to liberate southern Africa other than by armed struggle. His delegation shared that view.

5. Mr. MOUSSA (Tunisia) said that since the South African whites had begun practising *apartheid*, all men of conscience had condemned that abject policy of enslavement of man by man. At the United Nations, for the past several years, the international community had almost unanimously censured the South African Government severely and called upon it to renounce its inhuman policies. Yet the phenomenon of *apartheid* persisted and was in fact gaining ground. It was interesting in that connexion to read in the study on racial discrimination undertaken by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities¹ first the report dealing with the historical background and the economic and social consequences of racial discrimination (paras. 552-560) and then the pages on the reaction of the international community to the policy of *apartheid* (paras. 758-810).

6. A study of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly showed that that reaction had gone through three stages: first, the period from the seventh to fourteenth sessions, secondly, from the fifteenth to seventeenth sessions, and thirdly, from the eighteenth session and on. The international community, although timid at first, had condemned the policies of *apartheid* more and more severely, had invited States to take steps to induce South Africa to abandon those policies and had now gone so far as to deplore the co-operation of certain States with the South African Government, namely, the same States which the Security Council had called upon to end their arms deliveries to South Africa at once. Lastly, other decisions had been taken by the Economic and Social Council, the Commission on Human Rights, the specialized agencies and individually by the majority of States Members of the United Nations. But nothing had produced the slightest

¹ *Special Study on Racial Discrimination in the Political, Economic, Social and Cultural Spheres* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.71.XIV.2).

effect on the recalcitrant and defiant attitude of the Pretoria Government, which had further intensified its policies, extending its repression to anyone who dared, even in the name of religion, to oppose it and going so far as to confine an entire people to “reservations”, as though they were a herd of cattle.

7. Why was the international community still powerless to put an end to a policy which it almost unanimously condemned? As almost every speaker had pointed out, the reason was that certain States, influential Members of the United Nations, were reluctant to put pressure on the Pretoria Government to make it renounce its policy, while they loudly proclaimed their indignation at that policy. The United Nations had decided that isolation was its most effective weapon against *apartheid*, thus giving a definite form to the self-imposed moral isolation of the South African Government. But that Government, which displayed utter contempt for the texts and decisions of the United Nations, could not feel truly isolated so long as it maintained prosperous trade relations with countries which were among the most highly industrialized and which lived under a democratic system. However, it was not completely insensitive to the attacks made upon it and was now talking of dialogue and of an outward-looking policy. That was merely a stratagem, of course, and there could be no dialogue except with the authentic representatives of the South African people.

8. There was a people in South Africa that was held captive in its own country and was being driven to the point of desperation. Throughout southern Africa an intolerable situation existed which could not go on indefinitely. The least that could be said about an attitude of closing one's eyes and standing with folded arms in the face of a dangerously deteriorating situation was that it was not a wise attitude.

9. Mr. DE SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil) said that it was discouraging that in 25 years the United Nations had not been able to provide any appreciable assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa in their struggle for human dignity. During that same period, the South African Government had endeavoured to strengthen and refine the application of its policies of *apartheid* in every field of human activity. On the pretext of preserving the separate identity of each ethnic group, the South African Government had sought to institute a system ensuring the predominance of the white minority in the country's social and political life. All its laws were drafted with that goal in mind.

10. The most astonishing fact, however, was that anyone might still consider it possible for such a régime to endure. *Apartheid* was doomed, for it could not survive the pressure of world public opinion. The task of the United Nations was to hasten the disappearance of *apartheid* by ensuring the peaceful establishment of a harmonious multiracial society. Since all the ethnic groups living in South Africa must learn to live together in a spirit of equality, Brazil was opposed to encouraging the use of force or the adoption of measures which would tend to perpetuate hatred and reaction.

11. His delegation believed that the United Nations had the capacity to reverse the present trend of *apartheid*, and

his Government attached the greatest importance to the work of the Special Committee on *Apartheid*, particularly in the dissemination of the information concerning *apartheid*. The United Nations must strive to awaken world public opinion to the evils of *apartheid* and to the urgent needs for exerting pressure on the South African Government and the white population that supported it. His delegation would fully support any constructive measures aimed at eliminating *apartheid*. Any steps adopted should be directed towards that goal and to the development of circumstances favourable to the peaceful economic development and social well-being of all the inhabitants of South Africa.

12. The Brazilian Government supported, and was complying fully with Security Council resolution 282 (1970) of 23 July 1970 and it hoped that other Governments would follow its example. It also hoped that any policy of dialogue of the Government of South Africa, which had been much discussed recently, would include debate between the different ethnic communities in that country, and that conversations that might take place with other States would of necessity comprise contacts between officials of those States and members of all interested internal groups in South Africa. The Brazilian Government, which had been unswerving in its formal rejection of racial discrimination, hoped that a healthy and vigorous society based on the harmonious coexistence of races would be established in South Africa.

13. His delegation would support the draft resolution adopted at the 766th meeting (A/SPC/146) when it was considered by the General Assembly.

14. Mr. TREKI (Libyan Arab Republic) noted that the question of *apartheid* had been on the agenda of the General Assembly and the Security Council for a number of years and said that the time had come for the United Nations to take effective action to oblige racist States to renounce racial discrimination. In its report, the Special Committee on *Apartheid* (A/8422 and Corr.1) had stressed the need to consider the problem of *apartheid* in a broader context. The United Nations must combat racism wherever it existed and in particular in Palestine. Israeli Zionism, like South African *apartheid*, imposed on indigenous populations a system which, based on racial discrimination and hatred, reduced Palestinian Arabs to the status of third-class citizens. Like the South African racists, the Israeli racists imposed collective punishment, tortured detainees, deported whole populations, destroyed dwellings and confiscated property. The links uniting Israel and the South African Government were well known. Since 1960 Israeli exports to South Africa had increased tenfold and had made that country Israel's chief trading partner in Africa. South African Zionists sent millions of dollars to Israel every year, and the South African racists did not conceal their support for Israel. According to the *Rand Daily Mail* of Johannesburg, Verwoerd had said that the Zionists had taken Israel from the Arabs after they had lived there for a thousand years, and that he agreed with them that Israel, like South Africa, was an *apartheid* State. Furthermore, the daily *Die Transvaler*, also of Johannesburg, had wondered if there was any real difference between the way the people of Israel were trying to maintain themselves amid non-Jewish peoples and the way the Afrikaner was trying to

remain what he was. The newspaper had gone on to say that the people of Israel based themselves upon the Old Testament to explain why they did not wish to mix with other people, and that the Afrikaner did that too.

15. *Apartheid* in South Africa constituted a threat to international peace and security. That situation would justify the exclusion of South Africa from the United Nations. The Libyan delegation supported the view expressed by the Special Committee on *Apartheid* that the embargo on arms supplies to South Africa must be reinforced, and called for similar action to be taken in the case of Israel. The Libyan Arab Republic condemned discrimination wherever it existed and its Government supported by deeds the armed struggle waged by the liberation movements in South Africa and occupied Palestine. In the OAU it had adopted a clear position on the question of *apartheid*. It opposed any dialogue with the South African Government, or indeed with Israel. The South African Government must renounce its racist policy and grant the non-white population the right to self-determination.

16. His delegation wished to congratulate the Special Committee on *Apartheid* and its Chairman, the representative of Somalia, on the quality of the report submitted to the Special Political Committee. It whole-heartedly supported the recommendations set forth in the report.

17. Mr. KARAMAGI (Uganda) said that the policy of *apartheid* pursued by the South African Government was a system of slavery based on the myth of racial inequality. In the introduction (A/8401/Add.1 and Corr.1) to his report on the work of the Organization the Secretary-General had drawn attention to the grave situation in South Africa, where ruthless measures of repression were pursued against the opponents of *apartheid*. Furthermore, reference was made in paragraph 68 of the report of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* (A/8422 and Corr.1) to the ruthless measures applied by the South African Government to intensify the repression practised against the opponents of *apartheid*. The very Reverend G. A. French-Beytagh, the Anglican Dean of Johannesburg, was regarded as a subversive element for having said that the doctrine of *apartheid* was abhorrent to Christianity, but also for having provided, through funds placed at his disposal, food, medicines and school books to needy families, including those of political prisoners. The South African Government was hounding religious authorities and was expelling foreign missionaries, because they had become effective witnesses of the inhumanity of *apartheid*. The Ugandan delegation regarded the Reverend French-Beytagh, who had been sentenced to five years' imprisonment, as a true martyr to the cause of justice.

18. The death of Mr. Ahmed Timol, the Indian teacher who had fallen from the tenth floor of the Police Headquarters building in Johannesburg three days after his arrest, was another example of the persecution of the opponents of *apartheid*. The Pretoria régime had stated that Mr. Timol had committed suicide, but newspapers had pointed out that he had been the sixteenth political prisoner to die in mysterious circumstances. The South African Government had refused permission for a judicial

inquiry to be held to determine whether the police were torturing suspects, as they were accused of doing.

19. The report of the Special Committee listed the crimes against humanity committed by the Pretoria régime: acquitted prisoners were immediately served with banning orders and an indeterminate number of people were being subjected to physical and psychological torture. Caught in a web of fear created by its own violence, the Pretoria régime had undertaken a purge of the Church and had even begun to persecute whites.

20. The Ugandan delegation whole-heartedly supported the conclusions and recommendations of the Special Committee and paid a tribute to its Chairman and its Rapporteur. The films recently shown in the Dag Hammarskjöld auditorium bore witness to the crimes outlined in the report of the Special Committee.

21. His delegation saw no justification for the maintenance of diplomatic, military, economic or social relations with the fascist régime in Pretoria. It was time for the major trading partners of South Africa to take stock of the implications of the assistance and support that they extended to the neo-Nazi régime which flouted all norms of international morality. He thought that by the terms of Article 103 of the United Nations Charter, there was ample justification for the assertion that any arms supplied to South Africa or the granting of any licences to manufacture such equipment in South Africa constituted a violation of Security Council resolutions 181 (1963), 182 (1963) and 282 (1970), in which no distinction was drawn between arms for internal use and arms for external defence. His delegation therefore appealed to those countries which maintained friendly relations with the Pretoria régime to give up the economic benefits they derived from their trade with South Africa and from their investments in that country, in order to fulfil in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the Charter. To those who claimed that the Africans in South Africa would benefit from trade with, and investments in, South Africa, his delegation would reply that the oppressed Africans of South Africa preferred poverty in freedom to riches in slavery.

22. His delegation expressed gratitude to the members of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and stated that Uganda was offering 10 scholarships to South African students and 5 scholarships to Namibian students who wished to study at educational institutions in Uganda.

23. His delegation asked that Uganda be included among the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.206.

24. The CHAIRMAN announced that Ceylon had also asked to be included among the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.206.

25. Mr. CAHANA (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the consideration of the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa was obviously being used as a pretext for levelling accusations against Israel. The members of the Committee had at the current meeting witnessed a flagrant manifestation of the hypocrisy of the Libyan Arab Republic, from which a part of the

non-Arab population had been obliged to flee because of racial and religious fanaticism. He suggested that one of the reasons for the ineffectiveness of the appeals made by the United Nations and of its campaign against *apartheid* was the racist and imperialist policy pursued in Africa itself by an Arab country with the support of many States.

26. Mr. MAHJOUBI (Morocco), speaking on a point of order, observed that the Committee was dealing with the policies of *apartheid* of South Africa and requested that the representative of Israel keep to that question.

27. The CHAIRMAN concurred with the representative of Morocco and said that the comment applied to all delegations. He drew the Committee's attention to the fact that the Special Committee on the Rationalization of the Procedures and Organization of the General Assembly had recommended² to the General Assembly that delegations should use restraint in the exercise of their right of reply and that their statements in exercise of that right should be as brief as possible. He thought it would help the recommendation if all delegations supported it and he urged them to do so.

28. Mr. CAHANA (Israel), speaking on a point of order, protested that the representatives of the Arab countries had no hesitation in attacking Israel one after the other, by referring to questions not before the Committee. He asked that the length of their statements be curtailed accordingly, since, after all, Israel alone had to reply to 17 Arab countries. There was one delegation which made bold to redress the policies of other States while its own régime today practised discrimination.

29. Mr. TREKI (Libyan Arab Republic), speaking on a point of order, said that the facts he had mentioned were quoted in the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories (A/8389 and Corr.1 and A/8389/Add.1 and Corr.1), which also stated that Israel practised a policy of *apartheid*.

30. The CHAIRMAN said that that question was not currently before the Committee and called upon delegations to restrict themselves to the policy of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa.

31. Mr. CAHANA (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, questioned the right of the existing Libyan régime, which was based on racial and religious discrimination, to persist in its accusations against Israel.

32. Mr. MOUSSA (Tunisia), speaking on a point of order, said that Israel was still not talking about South Africa's policy of *apartheid*.

33. Mr. JAISEY (Ghana) observed that the right of reply should relate to the agenda item under discussion.

34. Mr. MAHJOUBI (Morocco) said that the 17 Arab countries were proud, one after the other, to condemn the wrongdoings of *apartheid*. The representative of Israel has spent three minutes on that question but had not condemned the policy. By his silence he probably hoped to gloss over the relations between the two States and keep in with certain important persons in Israel. He had made no mention of the *apartheid* which existed in Israel or of the conditions of the black people living in Israel.

35. Mr. GANDA (Sierra Leone) said that the statements being made in exercise of the right of reply were beside the point. It would benefit both the Chairman and the Committee if delegations would keep to the question under consideration.

36. Mr. TREKI (Libyan Arab Republic) said that it was not beside the point to speak of *apartheid* in Israel. The Committee was considering *apartheid* in South Africa and in all régimes which collaborated with that country, including the racist State of Israel.

37. Mr. CAHANA (Israel) said that he could not allow his country to be described as racist and called upon the Chairman to put an end to such manifestations of hostility.

38. Mr. TREKI (Libyan Arab Republic) asked whether the representative of Israel could state that his country had implemented the arms embargo against South Africa or had broken off diplomatic and trade relations with that country. Libya maintained no relations with South Africa.

39. Mr. JAISEY (Ghana) pointed out that the report of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* did not mention Israel as being one of South Africa's main trading partners.

40. Mr. DIOP (Guinea) said that the representative of Libya had put a question which had not been answered. Instead of making long statements, delegations would do better to specify the measures taken by their Governments against the scandalous policy of *apartheid* in South Africa. The criminals who were arming South Africa were represented on the Committee and should answer for what they were doing.

Organization of the Committee's work

41. The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the previous meeting the Committee had decided to fix a time-limit for its deliberations. The general debate on the question of *apartheid* was to close the following day. He suggested therefore that the Committee take up the next item on its agenda on 15 November.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.40 p.m.

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-Sixth Session, Supplement No. 26, para. 223.*