



EX LIBRIS
D. BAGWANDEEN

1982 -05- 30

*D. Bagwarden
Durban*



It is after a long time that I avail myself of these columns. The experience that I have gathered in my travels to the concourse of the United Nations in America and to other parts of the world have convinced me that, whilst adhering to basic principles and sustaining them by every means at ones disposal, moderation of expression and objectivity should guide one. The Editor has asked me what happened at UN and my views on the reactions of European South Africa on the resolution passed on the treatment of Indians in this country.

Nothing extraordinary happened at UN. The resolution passed was the least that UN could do if it was to justify its existence. The resolution is a plain and honest recognition of the factual position existing in South Africa. It accepts that there is racial discrimination in the treatment of Indians in South Africa; that it is not in accord with the Charter of the United Nations or with the Treaty obligations existing between India and South Africa; that as a result the relations between the two countries had been impaired and were likely to become further impaired and lastly it called upon the two countries to compose their differences and report at the next meeting of the Assembly.

The pain and anger and at times defiance shown by the South African Parliament and press must cause sorrow to all who desire racial harmony and goodwill. For the first time South Africa has had pointed out to it by an international body that membership of the Nations carries with it definite responsibilities.

It is an unreasonable and unsustainable contention that there are no treaty or agreement obligations existing between the two countries. The introduction of Indians was

on a government basis when equality and fair treatment were promised. This has been accepted by no less a person than Mr. Balfour as well as other members of the Union Government and by Dr. Malan when he concluded the Capetown Agreement in 1948. Nor could it be denied that the treatment of Indians culminating in the grievous wrong of passing the Asiatic Act, last year which took away the elementary right of purchasing and occupying property on racial grounds, is a breach of the United Nations Charter. The two Memoranda submitted by the Union Government did not deny racial discrimination but endeavoured to justify it as necessary for the preservation of Western Standards of life and Christian civilization. It was conveniently forgotten that the Capetown Agreement was also to preserve Western Standards of life and the situation which arose in Durban to which exception was taken was as a result of the Indians' endeavour to comply with these Western Standards of life. This was ably pointed out by the First Brown Commission.

The issues could not be fogged at Lake Success by such cries as that Durban would become another Bombay. The members know that an equal number of Europeans and Indians lived in the City of Durban and the Indian possessed only 14% of the rateable value of the City. Nor were they duped by the statement of Mr. Hester Nicholls that the Indian, type for type, was better off in South Africa than his fellow in India. They knew that for that matter the British, the Dutchman and others had benefitted by their emigration to South Africa and were better off than their fellows in their mother countries. No member of UN was unaware of the fact that the Indian as much as the white man had contributed to the prosperity of the land and that if the Indian was considered an intruder and worthy of repatriation, the white man was as much so, and the 8,000,000 Africans were the only ones rightfully entitled to cry "Quit South Africa".

In any case the UN resolution does not interfere in the domestic affairs of the Union. It has merely stated the position and called for its correction by inviting the two countries to compose their differences and report whatever agreement is reached by them to the next Assembly. If this is to be defied the UN authority, its very existence is challenged and it may be that from this may arise the position that brought the League of Nations to its unhappy end. It is inconceivable that the country of which Field Marshal Janas is the chief of state could be responsible for such a tragedy.

UN is the hope of mankind, which is composed mainly of people of colour. These peoples are awakening everywhere. The days of supremacy, arrogance and exploitation are over; the denial of human rights and justice to peoples on grounds of colour or religion are also over; the tide is flowing for the dignity of the human personality for equality of opportunity and progress for happiness for freedom from want and fear and to endeavour to stem it is to call for another catastrophe.

I and General Janas will not permit this. His achievements in the field of international affairs and his great station as a humanist are guarantees that when the transient resentment of European South Africa is overcome and a grasp of the fact is achieved the way will be open for adherence to the UN resolution by way of joint discussions between the two governments, in order to bring the treatments of Indians in South Africa into conformity with the world Charter.