

one repressive law or another. The brutality of the South African police was well known; all recalled FRELIMO (Frente de Libertação de Moçambique) Day in 1974, when they had unleashed their dogs on people during a peaceful rally.

74. The Day of Solidarity was a time when the good wishes of the international community went out to the thousands of political prisoners in South Africa to pledge solidarity with them, their cause and their objectives. The international community should continue its efforts to help the oppressed people of South Africa and his delegation pledged its full support to their cause. It stood solidly by the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal

Declaration of Human Rights. It asked for the release of all political prisoners in South Africa. Though the heroes of South Africa might be held in prison today, the cause for which they were fighting would go forward to victory.

75. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, since a number of delegations still wished to speak, the Committee might wish to devote a third meeting on Monday, 13 October 1975, to concluding the commemoration of the Day of Solidarity with South African Political Prisoners.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.

955th meeting

Monday, 13 October 1975, at 3.25 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Roberto MARTINEZ ORDOÑEZ (Honduras).

A/SPC/SR.955

AGENDA ITEM 53

Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa
(continued) (A/10050-S/11638, A/10052-S/11641, A/10103-S/11708, A/SPC/174):

- (a) Report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* (A/10022);
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General (A/10281)

DAY OF SOLIDARITY WITH SOUTH AFRICAN POLITICAL PRISONERS (concluded)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to continue its observance of the Day of Solidarity with South African Political Prisoners.

2. Mr. IPSARIDES (Cyprus) noted that three decades after the establishment of the United Nations, which had emerged from the ashes and ruins of the Second World War, the ruthlessly repressive white minority régime in South Africa continued to plunder the indigenous black majority of that country. His delegation, together with the vast majority of Member States, wished to pay a tribute to those who had been persecuted because of their quest for freedom and equality and because they refused to live as slaves. It was not, however, enough to pay a tribute to those men and women and to express solidarity with them in their courageous and heroic struggle. What was needed was effective action by the international community as a whole. Moreover, racism could only be effectively eradicated if those who practised it were deprived of the means of doing so. Perhaps the only effective answer would be the total isolation of the South African régime and increased support for the oppressed peoples of South Africa and their liberation movements, whose cause was the cause of all mankind.

3. His delegation associated itself with all other delegations in expressing once more its firm solidarity with South

African political prisoners and in calling upon the South African régime to halt forthwith and unconditionally its acts of persecution.

Mr. Hussein (Somalia), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

4. Mr. WOLF (Austria) said that his delegation wished to join the many other delegations which had condemned time and again the inhuman policies of *apartheid*. On numerous occasions, in the United Nations and elsewhere, the Austrian Federal Government had unequivocally stated its position in favour of political liberty throughout the world. It noted with regret, however, that the efforts of the international community to put an end to the oppressive policies of the Government of South Africa seemed to have been in vain, although an undeniable wind of change in the southern part of Africa provided grounds for some measure of optimism for the immediate future. Convinced that the forces of repression in South Africa would not triumph, his delegation wished to declare its solidarity with South African political prisoners and to join in the appeal for their immediate release.

5. Mr. K.B. SINGH (Nepal) recalled that General Assembly resolution 1881 (XVIII) had been highly significant because, with the single exception of South Africa, all Member States had voted in favour of it. However, the police régime in Pretoria had ignored that resolution and continued its reign of terror in flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The purpose of the Day of Solidarity was not merely to draw the attention of world public opinion to such violations but also to reaffirm that there could be no peaceful solution in South Africa unless all persons imprisoned or restricted for their opposition to *apartheid* were released unconditionally and allowed to participate in genuine negotiations, on a basis of equality, with a view to working out the destiny of South Africa. With the liberation of the former Portuguese

colonies, the racist régime in Pretoria had seemed to have read the warning signs, but it had apparently chosen to resort to the strategy of creating divisions among the indigenous people by establishing so-called "homelands" and by camouflaging the severe repression against those in opposition under the cover of so-called détente and dialogue. Its diversionary tactics merely concealed a determination to push ahead with *apartheid* and to consolidate and perpetuate white domination, while agreeing to relax some of the more glaring manifestations of racism in order to pacify public opinion. The continued trials, bannings and other forms of persecution reflected the vengefulness of the régime and the increasing resistance to *apartheid*. The brutal treatment and torture of prisoners continued to be a matter of grave concern. No fewer than 70 persons were under detention, most of them under the Terrorism Act of 1967, and some had been held incommunicado in prison for long periods, without access to family or counsel.

6. His delegation wished to stress once again that the international community had a responsibility to all the prisoners detained for their opposition to *apartheid*, who had been subjected to all kinds of ill-treatment and torture for upholding the principles, aspirations and rights embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and it wished to reiterate its support for the aims of the Day of Solidarity.

7. Mr. KAPLLANI (Albania) said that his delegation wished to reaffirm its whole-hearted support for the just struggle of the South African people against the Fascist régime in Pretoria. The situation of the political prisoners in South Africa was but one manifestation of the inhuman conditions under which the indigenous population of that country was compelled to live. It was a direct consequence of the Fascist policies of *apartheid* pursued by the Vorster clique, which had virtually turned South Africa into a prison state. That situation had evoked world-wide indignation on the part of progressive mankind as a whole.

8. The United Nations in general and the Special Political Committee in particular had for years condemned the policies of *apartheid* of the Pretoria régime, but the bitter truth was that United Nations resolutions had not changed in the slightest the inhuman conditions of life of millions of people in South Africa. The Vorster clique was able to maintain its régime and continue the hated policies of *apartheid* because it had enjoyed and continued to enjoy the support of the imperialist Powers, mainly the United States of America, which had made the Pretoria régime a bastion of imperialism and colonialism against the independent and progressive African countries.

9. His delegation was in full agreement with those who had stated that they harboured no illusions about the alleged "goodwill" and "kind intentions" of the Vorster clique. It wished to state its contempt for and rejection of the view expressed during the Committee's deliberations that the so-called spirit of détente was helping to bring nearer the day of liberation for the peoples of Africa. Evidence of the falseness of that idea was afforded by the existence of political prisoners in South Africa and the plight of the indigenous population of that country.

10. The armed struggle of the Azanian and Namibian peoples, which was an inseparable part of the struggle of

the African continent and the liberation struggle of the peoples of the world, would surely lead them to freedom and independence. Their path of struggle had made it possible for the representatives of Mozambique, Sao Tome and Principe, and Cape Verde to take their rightful places in the United Nations. His delegation had always believed, and it was now convinced, that the day would come when the valiant people of Azania would, by force of arms, settle accounts with the racist Pretoria régime.

11. Mr. AL-SABAH (Kuwait), speaking as Chairman of the Asian group for the month of October 1975, noted that *apartheid* was not only a threat to international security but also a crime, since it permitted the majority to be exploited by the minority. In addition to offering moral support to those who were subjected to *apartheid*, the international community needed to consider what action it could take to end the sufferings of the majority in South Africa. In spite of the embargo imposed upon it by Security Council resolution 181 (1963), South Africa was armed to the teeth as a result of the military aid supplied by certain Western countries. It was clear that any sanctions imposed on South Africa had to be mandatory and should include the severing of diplomatic relations, an economic embargo and the exclusion of South Africa from international organizations. The problems created by racial discrimination and *apartheid* concerned all mankind and there could be no security as long as some peoples were deprived of basic rights and freedoms. The Asian peoples had been among the first to press for the inclusion of the question of racial segregation in the agenda of the United Nations, and it was incumbent upon the great Asian nations to come to the assistance of the oppressed. They therefore expressed their solidarity with political prisoners in South Africa and asked for measures to be undertaken to eradicate racial discrimination everywhere in the world.

12. Mr. VALDERRAMA (Philippines) said that the General Assembly, the Security Council, other organs of the United Nations, and the international community as a whole had condemned *apartheid* as a crime against humanity. They had reaffirmed the legitimacy of the struggle of the people of South Africa against *apartheid* and racial discrimination. They had called upon the South African régime to release all persons imprisoned or restricted for their opposition to *apartheid* and had expressed their unqualified solidarity with those brave men and women in South Africa who had devoted their lives and efforts to the struggle for the liberation of the South African people from the degrading practices and manifestations of the *apartheid* régime. The Day of Solidarity assumed special significance because of the recent wave of repression, during which the South African régime had arrested many black youths, students and cultural leaders. The régime stood condemned for its policies of repression and had brought upon itself universal obloquy in the international community.

13. The just cause of the people of South Africa would triumph in the end, since history showed that a people could not subjugate another people for ever. Just as the peoples of Mozambique, Sao Tome and Principe, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau and Papua New Guinea had regained their freedom, so would the oppressed people of South Africa.

14. His delegation saluted the political prisoners of South Africa, black and white, as they waged their struggle for a cause that was right and just. It saluted the liberation movements, which epitomized the long struggle for liberation from the yoke of the *apartheid* régime and for the realization of the noble aspirations of the people of South Africa. The people of the Philippines, having experienced humiliation and indignity as a subject people for hundreds of years, today rose in solidarity with the political prisoners of South Africa and would continue to support them until the oppressed people of South Africa enjoyed the blessings of self-determination and independence on the basis of equality and justice.

15. Mr. BANGO BANGO (Zaire) said that during the commemoration of the Day of Solidarity with South African Political Prisoners, his delegation wished to reaffirm its total support for the liberation movements of Azania, the first victims of the racist régime in South Africa. It wished to stress that, as the President of the Republic of Zaire had pointed out in his address to the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session (2140th plenary meeting), Zaire as a whole was mobilized to fight against all the racists and colonialists in southern Africa, and it would spare no efforts to aid the liberation movements which were struggling to liberate Azania. His delegation would like the Special Political Committee to adopt a forceful resolution assuring the suffering people of South Africa and their imprisoned leaders of the total support of the international community for their noble cause. In the view of his delegation, such a resolution would be the best way of assuring the liberation movements of the international community's solidarity with their aspirations and would be a source of hope for political prisoners in South Africa.

16. Mr. TSIYREGZEN (Mongolia) expressed his delegation's appreciation to the Special Committee against *Apartheid* for the idea of organizing the Day of Solidarity. The Pretoria régime's pursuit of its policy of *apartheid*, thereby flouting the many resolutions adopted by the United Nations and also world public opinion, constituted a serious threat to peace and security. His delegation was deeply concerned at the new wave of repression against the opponents of that policy and the daily increase in the number of detainees. The Government and people of the Mongolian People's Republic had always condemned the policy of *apartheid* practised in South Africa and wished to join with all progressive forces in the world to demand that the Vorster régime immediately and unconditionally free all political prisoners in South Africa.

17. Mr. NDOUME AZABOUDE (United Republic of Cameroon) said that the odious system of *apartheid* was a crime against all humanity because it was based on the daily humiliation and oppression of the black people of South Africa and was a serious threat to international peace and security. Despite Vorster's cynical promises at the end of 1974 that there would be changes in the régime within six months, the situation in South Africa had deteriorated with the mass trials of students, the strengthening of the "bantustans" and the continued increase in the military budget with a view to more systematic repression of the liberation movements.

18. The Vorster régime should unconditionally free the hundreds of nationalist leaders languishing in South African

prisons, especially Nelson Mandela. A total embargo on arms, petroleum and other essential products should be imposed and strictly observed. His Government had no relations with South Africa and would always implement any measures taken against that repugnant régime. It strongly condemned the imperialist countries, above all France, the United States of America and the United Kingdom, and all commercial firms which helped to maintain the *apartheid* system. It also condemned the abusive use made by certain Powers of their Security Council veto in order to oppose any action under Articles 41 and 42 of the Charter of the United Nations.

19. Mr. MAGONGO (Swaziland) pledged his delegation's solidarity with the South African political prisoners languishing in that country's jails. At the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-aligned Countries, held at Lima from 25 to 30 August 1975, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Swaziland had called upon the Prime Minister of South Africa to release all political prisoners and discuss the liberation of that country with them, as he himself had advocated in the case of political detainees in Southern Rhodesia. The French and Portuguese colonialists' efforts to create black Frenchmen and Portuguese had failed, and that same policy would not succeed in South Africa either. The South Africans' attitude was even more extreme because they regarded white supremacy as created by God. Swaziland would never condone that concept.

20. Miss LOPEZ (Venezuela) said that her delegation wished to express its deep sympathy and solidarity with political prisoners in South Africa and with the liberation movements fighting to regain the dignity of their peoples. The rejection of *apartheid* as a vestige of totalitarianism was natural in Venezuela, whose population resulted from the fusion of Indians, Africans and Europeans and where every type of discrimination was condemned. The Special Committee against *Apartheid* was to be congratulated on suggesting the Day of Solidarity.

21. Mr. KAMANA (Zambia) said that it was fitting that the Committee should hold special meetings to express solidarity with political prisoners in South Africa. His delegation wished to reaffirm the well-known commitment of the Government and people of Zambia to the total eradication of the policies of *apartheid* and racism practised by the minority régime in South Africa and to reaffirm their solidarity with the people of Azania, who, led by their national liberation movements, were struggling for national dignity and their inalienable right to self-determination and independence under majority rule. As the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zambia had said in his address to the General Assembly at the current session (2356th plenary meeting), the South African régime would never command respect and win international acceptance so long as it was committed to those abhorrent policies and fostered so-called "homelands" to perpetuate the exploitation and oppression of the black majority.

22. Zambia had never engaged in any "détente" exercise with South Africa but was committed to the destruction of the *status quo* of minority racist domination in southern Africa. Its contacts with South Africa had been limited to seeking a peaceful settlement in Southern Rhodesia on the basis of majority rule in accordance with the Manifesto on

Southern Africa issued at Lusaka in April 1969¹ and the Dar es Salaam Declaration on Southern Africa issued by the Council of Ministers of OAU at its ninth extraordinary session, held from 7 to 10 April 1975. The success of its efforts to arrange talks on the future of Southern Rhodesia had not in any way affected its general attitude towards South Africa, which was based on the fundamental principles of liberty and justice. Its commitment to the eradication of *apartheid* and racism in South Africa remained firm. It had repeatedly called on South Africa to release all political prisoners and detainees, to permit free political activity, to lift the ban on the nationalist movements, and to recognize as the authentic representatives of the African people of Azania the leaders of the liberation movements rather than the leaders of the so-called "homelands", who were mere puppets. As in the past, it would match its moral support for the liberation movements with material assistance. Although the international community seemed at least verbally unanimous in its opposition to *apartheid* and minority rule in southern Africa, words alone could not free a subjugated people. It was time to move to practical action to change the *status quo*. The liberation movements must be given the means to fight, and those countries, particularly the major Western Powers, which had double standards in their dealings with South Africa must join in a total international boycott of that country, since they clearly had not used their influence to bring about change.

23. Mr. KIDANE MARIAM (Ethiopia) said that the special meetings to express solidarity with South African political prisoners were evidence that the *apartheid* régime was still condemned by most peace-loving peoples in the world. He hoped that the Day of Solidarity would remind all peoples of the need for concerted efforts to eradicate the policies of *apartheid*.

24. Mr. ESCOBAR (Colombia) expressed his delegation's solidarity with the political prisoners suffering persecution in South Africa for their ideals. His country was traditionally opposed to discrimination on the grounds of colour, race or religion, and all its legislation was based on that principle. All segregation must be eliminated, and United Nations resolutions aimed at eradicating the odious system of *apartheid* must be implemented in order that nationalist movements and groups in South Africa should no longer be persecuted for their ideals and for racial reasons.

25. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had concluded its observance of the Day of Solidarity with South African Political Prisoners and would resume the general debate on item 53.

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)*

26. Mr. DE GAAY FORTMAN (Netherlands) said that the South African Prime Minister's recent statement that negotiations in Southern Rhodesia should continue because the alternative was too ghastly to contemplate might show that he was beginning to understand the implications of the

situation in southern Africa, but he should realize that that statement applied to his own country as well. The Netherlands was distressed that the many United Nations resolutions, reports and discussions had had no significant effect on the South African Government. It could not accept the view expressed by the South African representative, speaking in the Security Council during the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly,² that *apartheid* was part of South Africa's internal affairs. The people living in South Africa were not just citizens of that country but part of humanity, and systematic denial of equal rights on the basis of discrimination by colour or race was contrary to fundamental human rights and could not be regarded as a purely internal affair. In his speech, the South African representative had claimed that racial discrimination was not the same as racism and that the latter term should only be used if people had racial feelings of superiority, which did not exist in South Africa. The world could never accept any distinction between those terms, and the only yardstick to be used in judging racial policies was the principle of human equality. The problem of racism was not confined to South Africa but was a global and very explosive problem.

27. It was disappointing that the South African Prime Minister's promise at the end of 1974 that there would be surprising changes in South Africa within six months had not been fulfilled. Like those countries which had adopted the Manifesto on Southern Africa¹ at Lusaka, the Netherlands Government could agree that a political solution for South Africa based on the principle of equality might call for compromise during a transition period, but the South African Government could at least take serious steps towards revoking all discriminatory legislation and enacting new laws banning discrimination. That would eliminate the so-called "petty" *apartheid*, but the so-called "homelands" policy was equally discriminatory. About 70 per cent of the black population in South Africa were not living in the "homelands" but in ghettos within the so-called white areas, which constituted 87 per cent of the Republic's total territory. South Africa should progress towards the granting of full human and political rights and economic opportunity to the non-white population living within those areas. Independence for a so-called "homeland" would mean that all people in the rest of the Republic who were supposed to live in that "homeland" would be regarded as foreigners.

28. *Apartheid* could not survive, and the South African Government must choose between violent confrontation and real dialogue between all its citizens.

29. His country wished to keep its lines of communication with South Africa open and seek to convince white South Africans of the basic immorality and impracticality of their racial policies, because it believed that every opportunity should be used to promote peaceful change within South Africa. Many people understandably doubted whether it was still possible to have contact with those who held racist views. However, in fighting evil policies the power of words should not be underestimated. Even those responsible for such policies had a conscience, and people who supported

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

* Resumed from the 952nd meeting.

² See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-ninth Year, 1800th meeting*.

them were often blinded by fear. It was in the white South Africans' own interest to abolish the hatred-breeding system of *apartheid* and thus destroy the roots of fear. They should be encouraged by the attitude of reconciliation demonstrated by many peoples once oppressed by racists. In the long term, the white South Africans' only chance of survival was to be recognized as Africans. Human contacts should make it possible to convey to the South African population the basic message of the Lusaka Manifesto and the Dar es Salaam Declaration, but the South African Government should listen above all to the voice of non-racialism from within South Africa.

30. The South African Government had accepted the new realities in Mozambique and Angola, and its Prime Minister had urged the Smith régime in Southern Rhodesia to accept the inevitability of majority rule. It would be a tragic illusion for the South African Government to continue to think that such realism in foreign policy was compatible with internal repression and the frustration of every attempt to create a non-racial society within South Africa itself. South Africa had perhaps accepted the new realities purely as a consequence of changing power structures. White South Africans must realize that man was important not because he belonged to a certain race or tribe but because he was human.

Mr. Martínez Ordóñez (Honduras) resumed the Chair.

31. Mr. ABDULDJALIL (Indonesia) said that since its inception the United Nations had been concerned with the problem of *apartheid*, basing its support for the courageous struggle for fundamental human rights in South Africa on the principles contained in its Charter.

32. Despite the imprisonment, torture, and even death inflicted on opponents of *apartheid*, the millions of South Africans who sought elementary justice had not been cowed by the brutality of the régime and were continuing their struggle.

33. The preceding 18 months had seen an important and perhaps decisive change in the international balance of forces confronting the South African Government. As a result of the collapse of the Portuguese empire in southern Africa, South Africa was no longer safely ensconced behind a buffer of colonialist and racist régimes. It had been further isolated by the success of those opposing *apartheid* at the United Nations and in other international forums.

34. Realizing the country's growing isolation, a number of South African Cabinet Ministers had recently made statements to the effect that a modification of the policy of *apartheid* was being considered. The régime's actions had made it clear, however, that no real change was contemplated and that "separate development" would remain the corner-stone of its policy. The white minority would continue to rule, while the African majority would remain powerless in their own homeland.

35. In an attempt to conceal its true aims and to convince others that it had effected a genuine change in its racial policies, the South African Government had intensified contacts with other States and influential foreigners. While that campaign had obtained favourable treatment for the

régime in some segments of the press and mass media, foreign investors, recognizing the potential instability resulting from unjust social and economic policies, were becoming reluctant to invest in a number of South African industrial projects.

36. Thus, in spite of the claims of the régime, the actual situation had shown no improvement. In fact, the conditions of the African population had progressively deteriorated. Political prisoners continued to languish in South African gaols, repressive legislation remained in force and the organizations which represented the majority of the people continued to be proscribed.

37. In disregard of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, the most recent of which was resolution 3324 E (XXIX), the régime was pursuing its plans to establish the "bantustans". The latter were mere enclaves which did not possess any of the characteristics of a viable independent State. A large part of their *de jure* population would reside outside their borders, and they would serve as a continuing source of cheap labour for the South African economy. South Africa's "bantustan" policy was therefore completely inconsistent with the concept of self-determination upheld by the United Nations and constituted an attempt to perpetuate the colonialist and racist domination of the white minority.

38. In its campaign to deceive world public opinion, the régime had also held a number of so-called "consultations with black leaders" while at the same time steadfastly refusing to meet with the representatives of the liberation movement recognized by OAU. Consultations held with the régime's puppets could not be considered a genuine attempt on the part of South Africa to communicate with the majority of the African people, who continued to protest against the policies of the Vorster régime and call for the release of political prisoners. The continuing repression of the opponents of *apartheid*, the build-up of military forces, and the enforcement of *apartheid*, regulations in sports clearly showed that no significant change had taken place in South Africa and that none was contemplated for the future.

39. The question now confronting the international community was how best to maintain and increase pressure on the Vorster régime in order to compel it to abandon its policies of racial discrimination. The régime had refused to accept the prerequisites for a peaceful solution set forth by the General Assembly in resolution 3324 C (XXIX). It was imperative, therefore, that the Members of the United Nations should take additional steps to isolate the régime and support the liberation movements. Attention should be drawn, in particular, to the actions of some Governments which continued to support the régime through trade and other relations; that constituted sustained and effective support of the *apartheid* system and should be exposed as such.

40. Modification of the "bantustan" policy and changes in minor *apartheid* laws would not satisfy the United Nations or the requirements of political, social and economic justice.

41. Since no real progress had been made in the implementation of the arms embargo against South Africa, his

delegation hoped that the Security Council would not fail to take action under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

42. His delegation welcomed the increase in contributions to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa. The Seminar on South Africa, sponsored by the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, had been held in Paris from 28 April to 2 May 1975 and had proved most useful in acquainting a broader segment of the European people with the aims and activities of the Special Committee. It would be most useful to hold seminars in other places, particularly in Latin America. Close co-operation with OAU should be maintained, and consultations between the Special Committee and Governments, especially the main trading partners of South Africa, should be intensified. A stepped-up campaign to disseminate information on *apartheid* should be undertaken by the United Nations and its specialized agencies, and co-operation with non-governmental organizations and the specialized agencies should be pursued.

43. Mr. JAMAL (Qatar) said that since the founding of the United Nations the Government of South Africa had consistently disregarded the Charter of the United Nations as well as General Assembly and Security Council resolutions calling for an end to racism and *apartheid*. *Apartheid* was one of the most serious problems of the twentieth century and should be categorically condemned.

44. Racial segregation and *apartheid* as practised by the Government of South Africa were tantamount to genocide. In resolution 2202 A (XXI), the General Assembly had characterized *apartheid* as a grave threat to international peace and security and a crime against humanity.

45. *Apartheid* implied not only racial segregation and the denial of political rights but also social and economic discrimination. The black majority was compelled to perform the most menial tasks, while under the so-called Industrial Provisions of 1956 they were denied the right to organize in trade unions. In the area of education, 70 per cent of the African population of primary school age was not enrolled in school.

46. The situation therefore called for continuing major efforts on the part of the international community and should be kept under constant review.

47. Qatar complied with all United Nations decisions regarding *apartheid* and, accordingly, had no diplomatic or economic relations with South Africa. Nationals of Qatar were also forbidden to have relations of any kind with the Government of South Africa. Qatar had condemned the policy of *apartheid* in numerous international forums.

48. There were obvious similarities between the Israeli aggression against the Palestinian people and the racial discrimination practised by South Africa. The masks were different, but the hideous face behind was the same. Zionist Israel and South Africa considered themselves to be outposts of European civilization in Asia and Africa. They believed that by virtue of race, origin and religion they were entitled to a privileged status. They both used the same

vocabulary to describe the indigenous peoples in their respective territories.

49. Qatar, for its part, was prepared to make every effort to bring an end to the odious policies of racial discrimination and segregation.

50. Mr. OULD SIDI (Mauritania) welcomed the admission to the United Nations of four fraternal countries, Mozambique, Cape Verde, Sao Tome and Principe, and Papua New Guinea, whose independence was the culmination of a long struggle against colonialism. His delegation was also pleased that the legitimate rights of the Cambodian people had been restored and their legitimate representatives seated in the General Assembly.

51. The United Nations had been dealing with the problem of *apartheid* for more than a quarter of a century, and there was still not the faintest hope of improvement in the situation.

52. *Apartheid* constituted a serious threat to international peace and security. Refusing to heed the voice of reason and to make any concessions whatsoever to their black compatriots, the leaders of South Africa continued to defy world public opinion in the most arrogant fashion and to arm the country in order to perpetuate their hateful system. The free peoples represented in the United Nations would not, however, be cowed by Vorster and his clique.

53. The report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* (A/10022) abounded in sordid examples of the régime's conduct. He paid a tribute to Mr. Ogbu, the former Chairman of the Special Committee, for his role in preparing that report, which contributed to a better understanding of the problem of *apartheid*.

54. World public opinion could not remain indifferent to the brutal treatment meted out to the black population of South Africa because of their quest for justice and equality. The policy of *apartheid* was a crime and was contrary to the universally recognized principle of equality among men. It was also contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, which proclaimed the fundamental rights of man and the dignity and worth of the human person. The Government of South Africa was therefore deliberately flouting the principles to which it had subscribed by acceding to the Charter.

55. Racial discrimination was practised with increasing cruelty in South Africa, and the United Nations had responded by adopting innumerable resolutions condemning that country. Yet, those resolutions had had no effect. The Vorster régime had intensified its discrimination while professing to make changes in the system. World public opinion had not been deceived by Vorster's intrigues which were aimed at ending the isolation of his country and thwarting the efforts of the United Nations to promote co-ordinated international action against *apartheid*. Vorster was seeking merely to gain time to build up his arsenal in order to suppress the ever-growing resistance to *apartheid*. It should be noted in that connexion that the Sharpeville massacre of 1960, the "Sabotage Act" of 1962 and numerous other repressive measures were still fresh in the memory of all.

56. The fact that the United Nations resolutions had had no effect could be attributed to the support given to the Government of South Africa by certain Western Powers. Those Powers, although they were founder Members of the United Nations, persisted in violating the decisions taken against a country which was guilty of flagrant violations of the Charter. Their attitude was a deplorable one.

57. The time had come to go beyond mere words and demonstrate to South Africa that the march of history was

irreversible. In compliance with the provisions of the Charter, his delegation proposed that all States should take prompt economic, political and diplomatic action against South Africa to supplement the action already taken by virtually all African countries. The international community had an obligation to assist the 13 million Africans who were being terrorized by a handful of whites.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.

956th meeting

Wednesday, 15 October 1975, at 10.45 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Roberto MARTINEZ ORDOÑEZ (Honduras).

A/SPC/SR.956

AGENDA ITEM 53

Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa
(continued) (A/10050-S/11638, A/10052-S/11641, A/10103-S/11708, A/SPC/174, A/SPC/L.324):

(a) Report of the Special Committee against Apartheid (A/10022);

(b) Report of the Secretary-General (A/10281)

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. HECKSCHER (Sweden), introducing draft resolution A/SPC/L.324, said that at the current session the General Assembly was commemorating the thirtieth anniversary of the United Nations and the tenth anniversary of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, established in pursuance of its resolution 2054 B (XX), which had been adopted on the recommendation of the Special Political Committee, but the need for assistance to persons persecuted in South Africa still remained. The foundation of the Fund was but one expression of international concern to counteract the growth of racial hatred fed by laws that a minority had thought it wise to impose on a majority of the population of South Africa, and the Fund was a common denominator for Member States of the United Nations in their debate over the years on ways of bringing inhuman oppression in South Africa to an end.

2. The Fund, which was intended to meet urgent humanitarian needs, was also commemorating another anniversary. It was just five years since its competence had been extended to Namibia and Southern Rhodesia (General Assembly resolution 2671 E (XXV)). One half of the Member States of the United Nations were contributing to the Fund. The situation in the region was such that much of the Fund's work had to be carried out secretly. The Rhodesian régime, for instance, had recently built up a so-called "defence" system to hinder assistance of all kinds to the victims of its repressive actions.

3. In view of the increasing severity of repression in South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia, the activities of the Fund should be expanded. It was for that reason that his delegation hoped that the draft resolution, of which the

Netherlands and New Zealand had become sponsors, would be adopted unanimously.

4. Mr. FREEMAN-GREENE (New Zealand) said that although the grace period asked for by the Prime Minister of South Africa in November 1974 had expired, the basic structure and tenets of *apartheid* remained untouched. There had been no commitment from the South African Government to abandon its racist policies. Political equality was still ruled out; equal protection under the law was unknown. Racial intermarriage was forbidden, families were split. In the name of separate development, the people were exiled to non-white areas. His Government was unequivocally opposed to the system, which the Prime Minister had recently described as "degrading".

5. He paid tribute to the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and its Chairman for their tireless efforts, which were described in that Committee's report (A/10022).

6. His Government believed it important that effective international pressure be maintained on the South African Government and accordingly supported the recommendations of the Special Political Committee aimed at co-ordinating the international campaign against *apartheid*. In that connexion his Government recognized the importance of the work being done by the Unit on *Apartheid* in disseminating factual information with a view to countering the propaganda of the South African Government. There were many people who still did not fully understand the nature of *apartheid* or the international community's reaction to it. It was for that reason that his Government, which had given \$NZ 5,000 to the Unit on *Apartheid* in 1975, would welcome more information material from the Unit. It would also like to see more countries contributing to the Unit.

7. His delegation also strongly supported the recommendation, made by the Special Committee in paragraph 207 of its report, that the General Assembly should again call for full implementation of the arms embargo against South Africa. New Zealand had scrupulously complied with the voluntary embargo called for by the Security Council over a decade ago in its resolution 181 (1963), and at the