



Wednesday, 28 October 1970,  
at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

Chairman: Mr. Abdul Samad GHAUS  
(Afghanistan).

**AGENDA ITEM 34**

**The policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa: report of the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued) (A/8022 and Add.1, A/8109, A/8117, A/SPC/L.181, A/SPC/L.183-186)**

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that Ethiopia and Madagascar had joined the sponsors of draft resolutions A/SPC/L.183 to A/SPC/L.186, the Philippines the sponsors of draft resolutions A/SPC/L.183, A/SPC/L.185 and A/SPC/L.186, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo the sponsors of draft resolutions A/SPC/L.183 to A/SPC/L.185.

2. Miss HLASS (Jordan) said that the information available on the policy and practice of *apartheid* and on the economic and military assistance rendered to South Africa by certain Powers left no room for doubts or misgivings. The Organization had condemned *apartheid* in numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and had taken a clear political and legal decision in recognizing the legitimacy of the struggle of the national liberation movement and the requests to provide the movement with material, moral and political assistance.

3. Commending the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa for its excellent report (A/8022 and Add.1), which contained a wealth of valuable and ably-presented information, she said that the conclusions and recommendations clearly indicated the measures which the United Nations should take in its quest for peace, prosperity and justice in South Africa.

4. The Secretary-General, in addressing the African Heads of State two years previously, had said that the destiny of the world would be influenced greatly if not decisively by the future development of events in Africa; peace and progress throughout the world depended on peace and progress in developing Africa.

5. Explaining the position of her Government on the question of *apartheid* she would say, firstly, that the system of *apartheid* was alien to her country's religion and culture and was an affront to its concept of freedom under the law and its faith in human equality and dignity; second, as a member of the Lusaka conference of non-aligned countries in September 1970, her country was proud of the 1969

Manifesto on Southern Africa,<sup>1</sup> a statesmanlike document which represented a commitment to human dignity, to freedom, justice and the equality of man; and third, Jordan supported the African people in its armed struggle for freedom and hoped that the international community would continue to render them material assistance.

6. Speaking as a Palestinian, she said that *apartheid* found a parallel concept in zionism. Previous speakers had skilfully and adequately presented the similarities between those two concepts of genocide. Since *apartheid* in South Africa was characterized by visible discrimination, it evoked instant condemnation, for, when the victims were visible, mankind's conscience was shaken; in Israel, however, since it took the form of invisible discrimination against Palestinians, who had been deprived of their homeland, mankind's conscience was numb. In fact, Member States would soon be able to draw the parallel for themselves when the report of the three-member Special Committee<sup>2</sup> appointed to investigate the violations by Israel of the human rights of the Palestinian people become available.

7. Her delegation agreed with the suggestion of the representative of Mexico (693rd and 701st meetings) regarding the proposed suspension of South Africa under Article 5 of the United Nations Charter. The applicability of that Article was unquestionable, since both preventive and enforcement action had been taken by the Security Council. Although suspension was the exclusive function of the Security Council, the General Assembly had the power to initiate the process of suspension by making a recommendation to the Security Council, such recommending functions being provided under Articles 10 and 11. Her delegation urged the adoption of a draft resolution which would have the General Assembly make such a recommendation.

8. The debate had shown which Members were in favour of effective measures to support the aspirations of the oppressed peoples of South Africa; it had shown which States were sincere when they called for law and order and which put first the investments and profits derived from the oppression of the peoples of South Africa.

9. Finally, she wished to quote from the statement to the General Assembly (1845th plenary meeting) by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kenya who had said:

"It is ironic to condemn *apartheid* in seemingly strong terms and at the same time to sustain and strengthen it by

<sup>1</sup> Adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its sixth ordinary session; for the text, see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

<sup>2</sup> Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, established by the General Assembly (resolution 2443 (XXIII)).

the back door; it is contradictory to support self-determination in southern Africa and at the same time to stifle it by arming the supremacist régime to the hilt; it is idle to pretend concern for the welfare of Africans while the oppressive racist régime is being given aid and comfort; it is incompatible to love and hate the minority racist régime at the same time. Very soon, a choice must be made between support for freedom and slavery; between short-term economic lucre and long-term political and economic accommodation with Africa; between the retrogressive forces of *apartheid* and the progressive forces of racial harmony. It is evident that no country can be friendly to both these diametrically opposed elements."

10. Mr. SOLOMON (Ethiopia) welcomed the Special Committee's comprehensive report. Though all efforts by the United Nations to eradicate the obnoxious policies of *apartheid* had thus far proved fruitless, the Organization had succeeded in exposing those evil practices. In numerous resolutions, it had requested the disengagement of States maintaining diplomatic, consular, political, military and economic relations with South Africa. His delegation believed that the consistent implementation of the relevant resolutions would have provided an adequate framework for international action aimed at bringing the apostles of *apartheid* to their knees. Unfortunately, no progress had been made because a number of States with vested interests in South Africa had not implemented those resolutions; owing to the dishonest ingenuity of South Africa's trading partners, Pretoria was growing increasingly defiant. The 15 million restless victims of *apartheid* were growing angry and bitter against their oppressors, who were tightening their chains in order to maintain their supplies of cheap labour. The policy of *apartheid* was the very antithesis of peace, justice and progress.

11. The Lusaka Manifesto<sup>1</sup> had symbolized the good faith of the African peoples in seeking, if possible, a peaceful solution to the problem. In paragraph 8, it had stated that:

"Our stand towards southern Africa thus involves a rejection of racialism, not a reversal of the existing racial domination. We believe that all the peoples who have made their homes in the countries of southern Africa are Africans, regardless of the colour of their skins; and we would oppose a racist majority government which adopted a philosophy of deliberate and permanent discrimination . . . ; we are demanding an opportunity for all the people of these States, working together as equal individual citizens, to work out for themselves the institutions and the system of government under which they will, by general consent, live together and work together to build a harmonious society."

Yet, because it had been addressed to a sick and morally bankrupt society, obsessed by the obsolete myth of white supremacy, the Lusaka Manifesto had been repeatedly rejected.

12. His delegation did not advocate force as an instrument of national policy. Since however, all peaceful means seemed to have failed, force, the only language which the die-hard racists in South Africa understood, would have to be used. If the alternatives were either to use force or to

abandon the cause of freedom and justice, then force must be resorted to as the lesser of two evils. His country therefore pledged itself to assist the liberation movements in their legitimate struggle.

13. The Emperor of Ethiopia, in his address before the General Assembly on 23 October 1970 (1882nd plenary meeting), during its commemorative session, had said:

"If the United Nations is to survive as an institution worthy of the respect of peoples throughout the world, it must redouble its efforts to free the colonial peoples from subjugation. I strongly believe that this commemorative session cannot do less than rekindle the flame of liberty in these oppressed peoples by adopting a declaration of war against their oppressors. I believe the United Nations should do even more! I believe that it should extend material assistance to them just as the Organization of African Unity does, until the colonial and racial systems in South Africa are brought to an end. We must not fear that such action would break the United Nations, for the *entente* in southern Africa is an alliance of minorities. On the contrary, as the overwhelming majority of the family of nations represented here is against this unholy alliance, the States concerned cannot in any way affect our Organization."

14. Mr. OGBU (Nigeria) expressed his delegation's appreciation to the great world statesmen, the Secretary-General, the heads of delegations and other distinguished representatives who, by their unequivocal denunciation of the Fascist policies of South Africa, had reaffirmed the commitment of the United Nations to the total and early elimination of racial discrimination in that country. He welcomed the Special Committee's report which would go down in the history of the United Nations as one of the most important political documents of the present time.

15. The murderous acts of the *apartheid* régime against the peaceful African population had been clearly revealed in the report and in the statements of many delegations. The shameful collusion of certain Western Powers—including permanent members of the Security Council—in the diplomatic, economic, commercial and military fields had been exposed to the full glare of international opinion.

16. He paid a warm tribute to the Soviet Union which, as a permanent member of the Security Council, had adhered faithfully to the letter and spirit of the Charter and of the various resolutions on *apartheid* adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly. To appreciate that country's highly commendable and courageous attitude, it was only necessary to imagine what the situation would have been if it had joined the other three permanent members of the Security Council in contravening the Charter and flouting the Organization. The stand of the Soviet Union on *apartheid* was a major contribution to peace and stability in Africa and the world.

17. There was a mass of incontrovertible evidence that the Western Powers bore a grave responsibility for the frustration of the efforts of the United Nations to achieve equality and justice for non-white South Africans. Those same Powers, by their "unholy alliance" with South Africa, had enabled that régime to consolidate its position in Namibia

and had brought aid and comfort to the racist régime in Zimbabwe and the Fascist dictatorship in Lisbon.

18. The criminal Gestapo methods of oppression, torture and murder employed by the South African régime were directed not only against the 15 million Africans in South Africa but against all persons of African descent throughout the world. *Apartheid* was a crime against humanity and posed a serious threat to international peace and security. His delegation was therefore very disappointed that the United States of America had shown no appreciable concern, had given no leadership and had made no concrete efforts to join other countries in working for the early elimination of *apartheid*. The declared domestic policy of the United States on racial matters in recent years had shown a conscious determination to secure equality and justice for all her citizens. His delegation commended that policy and hoped that the enlightened attitude of the United States would be reflected in greater understanding of the dangers inherent in the "philosophy" of *apartheid*.

19. Turning to South Africa's policy of subversion of independent African States, he said that the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Nigeria—both of which had been in the vanguard of the struggle against *apartheid* and Portuguese colonialism—had been the targets of subversion by South Africa and Portugal during the past ten years. He was proud that the evil machinations of the South African racists to weaken the forces of freedom, independence, sovereignty and unity had been decisively checked in both countries. Nevertheless, the high priests of racial bigotry had not yet recovered from the reverses suffered, and might try their hands elsewhere on the continent. He wished to assure them that they would fail again.

20. His delegation whole-heartedly supported the Special Committee's recommendation to break diplomatic, consular, economic and commercial relations with South Africa. As to the failure of certain States to observe fully the arms embargo against South Africa, he said that some of that country's trading partners had argued that their economic and commercial interests in the Republic were vital to their economy, or had drawn a sharp distinction between politics and economic relations. He expressed surprise that those States refused to see the immense advantages that would result from a democratically stable South Africa. Their economic and commercial wealth in the Republic was being erected over a huge explosive device which would go off in the fulness of time. Co-operation with a democratically elected government of Azania would therefore be in their own interest.

21. His country was unequivocally opposed to the supply to South Africa of any arms whatsoever or to the assistance rendered to that régime to manufacture arms inside the Republic. Such weapons would serve only to enhance the ability of the régime to pursue and intensify its racial oppression. The suggestion that an imaginary threat to the Cape route by the USSR Navy was the main reason for a resumption of arms supplies had been thoroughly discredited. In any event, Africa could not be defended without the co-operation of Africans. Consequently, the only reason for the arms deals was that the business was very lucrative indeed. For South Africa's trading partners and military collaborators, the end seemed to justify the

means. Those States were clearly accomplices in the crimes against humanity; the money which they earned was derived from the blood of the innocent victims of Sharpeville and the other valiant opponents of *apartheid*.

22. In time, the wicked régime in South Africa would crumble and *apartheid* would surely be destroyed. He pledged the total support of the Nigerian Government and people in the different struggle ahead.

23. Mr. S. TRAORE (Mali) said that if, by some miracle, the millions of men who had fallen on the battlefields of the Second World War were to return to life, they would be stricken with grief upon finding that the racism against which they had fought had taken more pernicious and brutal forms, opposed only in the form of resolutions, which seemed to be intended more for the archives than for action. The celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations brought to mind the spirit in which the authors of the Charter, having just emerged from the horrors of six years of war with their dreams of world peace and harmony among men, have striven to make the principles of tolerance and peaceful relations a reality, in the realization that a world without respect for fundamental human rights was a precarious one indeed and that those rights were essential to human existence. But now, twenty-five years after the signing of the Charter, one saw only the bitter reality of entire peoples deprived of their freedom and their rights, driven from their lands and brutally humiliated in the name of the new political philosophy of *apartheid*.

24. Both within and outside the United Nations, voices had been raised against the practice of *apartheid*. Pope Paul VI had spoken out against racism as a threat to peace, and a group of experts meeting under the auspices of UNESCO in Paris in September 1967 had condemned racism as an obstacle to development, a divisive influence among nations and a force which aggravated international conflict and threatened world peace. The report of the Special Committee provided ample confirmation of those truths.

25. The policy of *apartheid* deprived millions of non-whites of the exercise of their physical, intellectual and moral faculties, as was only natural when, in the name of so-called separate development, a minority which had sufficiently demonstrated its own intellectual and moral backwardness took upon itself the right to administer a people whom it felt it could rob of anything, even hope. The report of the Special Committee bristled with examples of legislative and administrative measures clearly designed to perpetrate a crime against an entire people. Thus, non-white South Africans, who made up 68 per cent of the population, were confined on 13 per cent of the land, and very barren land at that. The schools and so-called training centres were actually intended merely to supply willing labour for the economic appetites of the white minority. The basic civic rights granted to all by the United Nations Charter and by the constitutions of all Member States were denied to non-white South Africans. The benefits of science and technology served only the whites in South Africa. Indeed, all of non-white South Africa was an enormous concentration camp where even the family unit was under attack and wives were separated from their husbands and children. The racist minority in South Africa did not belong

to the civilized world, for it was distressingly reminiscent of those responsible for the ghettos, ovens and concentration camps of thirty years before; moreover, it did not even attempt to hide that resemblance. Indeed, it had challenged the world with its policies. Mankind must take up that challenge.

26. It was no longer necessary to state that the practice of *apartheid* was a crime against humanity. The real question was whether, by accepting it, the international community was not making itself an accomplice to that crime. Yet the United Nations continued to adopt resolutions and recommendations which, if genuinely implemented, would obviate the need for recourse to violence in order to eliminate that blot on the conscience of mankind. Unfortunately, experience had shown that some of those whose peoples had suffered the most from racial intolerance offered economic and military protection to the practice of *apartheid*. Their arguments were varied but uniformly unconvincing. Reference had been made, for example, to the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter in support of the argument that *apartheid* fell within the domestic jurisdiction of the South African Government. But Article 2 was not a unique provision to be interpreted outside the general context of the Charter itself, which rested upon the basic principles of the maintenance of international peace and security and the defence of the inalienable rights of men without distinction as to race, colour or religion. The Charter was completely binding upon its signatories, and any practice which was contrary to it must be opposed. Indeed, what was the United Nations doing each day if not dealing with questions which normally fell under the sovereignty of its Members? Development, for instance, was first and foremost an internal matter. The people of Korea had the sovereign right to live under the régime of their choosing. The forms of government and administration in China were the internal problem of China alone. And yet the United Nations carried out military operations in Korea and claimed the right to dictate China's international behaviour. It could not say that racism and intolerance, which had caused mankind untold suffering, were not within its competence.

27. It had also been said that solutions to the problem of *apartheid* must be sought only through non-violent means. Again, the Charter must be viewed as a whole. While Chapter VI provided for the pacific settlement of disputes, Chapter VII left no doubt as to the forceful measures which must be taken for the maintenance of international peace and security. The offensive attitude of the leaders in Pretoria placed them outside the protection of Chapter VI. In the view of his delegation, the case of the South African régime fell under Article 6 of the Charter, which provided for the expulsion of any State that had persistently violated the principles of the Charter. His delegation also held out the hope that those Member States which had considered that international peace was threatened in Korea in 1950 would take action to apply the pertinent provisions of Chapter VII to the South African régime. Action must be taken before it was too late, and the report of the Committee made it clear that time was short.

28. The Fascists and racists of Pretoria were consolidating themselves militarily and economically, thanks to the

support of certain States which, no doubt, were themselves not untouched by the virus of racism and racial discrimination. The sum of \$2,800 million which had been allocated for armaments, rather than for the development of the people of South Africa as a whole, would have left the South African economy in a sorry state if it had not been supported by other external resources. At the 1872nd plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 19 October 1970, President Kaunda of Zambia had made clear the use to which those armaments would be put. For the leaders in Pretoria, South Africa's external defence meant above all the annihilation of the opponents of its *apartheid* policy. The memory of Sharpeville should leave no doubt as to that fact, unless the armaments supplied to the South African régime had the magical quality of being harmless to non-whites and effective only against imaginary enemies from imaginary communist countries. The security of southern Africa could not be guaranteed by the Pretoria régime alone; on the contrary, his delegation considered that the supply of arms to South Africa was essentially aimed at keeping that region, and consequently all of Africa, in a state of permanent insecurity. The allies of South Africa must come to understand that basic fact.

29. Thus provided with military assistance, South Africa received economic advantages denied to other developing nations which devoted most of their income to the development of their citizens. That much was evident from a reading of the relevant passages (A/AC.115/L.276)<sup>3</sup> of the study by Mr. Sean Gervasi which showed that the large and ever-increasing volume of trade between South Africa and the developed countries of the "free world" was actually in no way crucial to economic activity in any of the latter countries, while economic assistance from the great Powers for the rest of Africa was increasingly difficult to obtain and extremely costly. In view of the foregoing, it was no surprise that resolutions on *apartheid* went unimplemented and that South African mercenaries could with impunity fly to the assistance of Southern Rhodesia and Portugal. *Apartheid* had been declared a crime on the conscience of mankind; it was for the United Nations to see that that conscience was respected.

30. Miss DINCER (Turkey) said that it was extremely painful, on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations and the tenth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, to have to refer to the question of *apartheid* in the knowledge that the numerous resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly on that policy remained unimplemented. In the context of the policies of colonialism, racial discrimination and racial prejudice which continued to be practised by the South African régime in the political, social, economic and cultural fields, the United Nations had made a great contribution to the protection of basic rights and freedoms through the adoption of resolutions concerning *apartheid*, which had not only been recognized by a large majority of Member States as constituting a threat to international peace and security, but had also been declared a potential threat to international peace and security by the Security

<sup>3</sup> Mimeographed; the full text of the study, entitled *Industrialization, foreign capital and forced labour in South Africa*, has been issued as United Nations publication, Sales No.: F.70 II.K.8.

Council. Once again, on 24 October 1970, the General Assembly had condemned racism and racial discrimination in the Declaration on the Occasion of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the United Nations (resolution 2627 (XXV)). Yet it was difficult to say that any significant progress had been achieved in rectifying the anachronistic situation which prevailed in South Africa. In fact, the Government of South Africa was actually becoming increasingly strict in its application of the policy of *apartheid*, in open defiance of all the resolutions of the United Nations and the warnings of the international community.

31. On its twenty-fifth anniversary, the United Nations was still confronted with the basic question of how to implement effectively the numerous resolutions which had been adopted on the matter. The policy of her Government on the question was well known, and the Foreign Minister of Turkey, speaking before the General Assembly on 24 September 1970 (1849th plenary meeting), had reiterated the Turkish Government's condemnation of *apartheid*. Indeed, that position reflected her country's historical experience, for all races and creeds had lived together in mutual trust and respect for many centuries under the Ottoman commonwealth.

32. Her delegation had studied carefully the report of the Special Committee, which deserved commendation for its clear presentation and its perceptive analysis of the situation in South Africa. Her delegation was in full agreement with the conclusions and most of the recommendations contained in it. Among the pieces of repressive legislation described in the report, one could cite the Terrorism Act, the Suppression of Communism Act and the so-called Urban Areas Act, which, while allowing African men to remain in white urban areas, in most cases forced their wives and children to retreat to the "homelands", poor and underdeveloped areas set aside by the South African Government for such purposes. The practical effect of that legislation was to split up the family, obliging wives to live in communities made up only of women, children and old people.

33. According to the report, whites, who made up 19 per cent of the total population, held 69 per cent of the national purchasing power, while the non-white majority, which accounted for 68 per cent of the population, had only about 23 per cent of the purchasing power. As the Foreign Minister of South Africa had stated before the General Assembly on 1 October 1970 (1857th plenary meeting), an accelerated programme of industrialization was no doubt under way in South Africa; however, non-white South Africans were apparently drawing few benefits from that industrialization.

34. She noted with regret that, despite all the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, the policy of *apartheid* persisted and had even been extended beyond the borders of that country to Namibia. In that connexion, she wished to state that her delegation fully supported resolution 2624 (XXV), adopted by the General Assembly on 13 October 1970, calling for full implementation of the provisions of Security Council resolution 282 (1970). She wished to point out that her delegation had supported the sixth preambular paragraph of that resolution, regarding the decision on the arms embargo against

South Africa taken at the recent conference of non-aligned countries (see A/SPC/L.181).

35. Her country's disapproval of the policy of *apartheid*, which ran counter to the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the United Nations Charter, had been expressed in various ways. Turkey had voiced its condemnation of that policy on every possible occasion, had voted for all the resolutions submitted on the matter, had never entertained any diplomatic, consular or economic relations with South Africa and did not intend to do so in the future. Her country was an active member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and she therefore wished to take note of one positive development which might help to resolve the question of Namibia. The Security Council had decided (see Council resolution 284 (1970)), on the initiative of the delegation of Finland, to seek the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legal consequences for Member States of South Africa's continued refusal to turn over the administration of Namibia to the Council for Namibia. Her delegation expected that the Court's opinion would provide a sound legal basis for future action by the United Nations and the Council.

36. Turkey had ceased trading with Southern Rhodesia and fully implemented the mandatory economic sanctions imposed by the Security Council. In that connexion, she recalled that the Foreign Minister of Turkey—in his address before the General Assembly to which she had just referred—had suggested that the Security Council should find new ways and means of ensuring the implementation of the sanctions.

37. Her delegation felt compelled to draw certain conclusions regarding prospects for future action with respect to *apartheid*. The international community had demonstrated exceptional unity in condemning that policy, and that condemnation had gradually been transformed into the adoption of concrete measures, such as mandatory economic sanctions and the arms embargo. An international campaign was under way through the dissemination of information on *apartheid*. If that campaign were systematically maintained with the moral and material assistance of all Member States, in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter, it could eventually prove effective in achieving the isolation of South Africa from the international scene. Finally, it was the responsibility of the Member States to support the activities of organizations like the ILO and UNESCO and to provide them with the information they required in their activities against *apartheid*.

38. In conclusion, her delegation welcomed the proclamation of the year 1971 as the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. She expressed the hope that the year 1971 would provide an excellent opportunity to renew and intensify international efforts to eliminate racial discrimination in all its manifestations, including the policy of *apartheid*.

39. Mr. OMRAN (Syria) said that the United Nations had obviously been unsuccessful in dealing with questions of racism and *apartheid* during its twenty-five year history. It was clear from the documents before the Committee that

all the resolutions of the United Nations on the question had been ignored and that the efforts of international organizations had been ineffectual. There could be no doubt that the elimination of the philosophy of *apartheid* constituted the greatest moral challenge of the day. The need for continued United Nations efforts against *apartheid* had never been more urgent.

40. It was stated in paragraph 104 of the report of the Special Committee (A/8022) that, by continuing to apply its repressive legislation designed to suppress demands for social, economic and political changes accepted elsewhere in the world as normal, the South African Government had shown its determination to close all avenues of peaceful change in the country. The increasing number of United Nations resolutions adopted on the subject had been met by an increase in the severity with which measures enforcing racial segregation in South Africa were applied. As the Secretary-General had explained, South Africa was able to continue to challenge the United Nations and to insult the sacred principles of human rights because a number of States which maintained political and economic relations with South Africa, particularly its major trading partners, did not share with the vast majority of Member States the belief that the resolutions adopted on *apartheid* provided an adequate framework for effective international action. It was not unusual that the imperialist Powers supported the racist régime in South Africa. In the global strategy of world capitalism and imperialism, South Africa should be viewed as a large land base of Western imperialism. Its role was to deter the emergence of Africa as a colossal progressive force which could, if left alone, muster enough economic, financial and military power to liquidate the vestiges of colonialism and imperialism. Thus, South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, Portugal, Israel and South Viet-Nam continued to serve as the bastions of permanent aggression against the peoples of Africa, the Middle East and South East Asia.

41. Indeed, South Africa was not without allies, for many influential Member States entertained the warmest of diplomatic, economic, social, military and other relations with that racist régime. Paragraph 113 of the report of the Special Committee showed that the imperialist Powers which were the main trading partners of South Africa, namely the United Kingdom, the United States of America, the Federal Republic of Germany and others, were increasing their volume of trade with South Africa. As indicated in paragraph 114, that trade was not of vital importance to the economies of South Africa's trading partners, but was crucial to the functioning of the South African economy.

42. The phenomenal growth of South Africa's military power, despite the arms embargo instituted by the Security Council, was emphasized in document A/AC.115/L.279.<sup>4</sup> Its military budget had risen from about \$60 million to about \$380 million in the past ten years, thus enabling South Africa to import a large amount of military equipment. Moreover, the number of licences acquired by South Africa had proved sufficient for it to engage in the manufacture of some 140 types of ammunition and bombs. His delegation, like others, rejected the distinction which some attempted to draw between arms for internal repres-

sion or the enforcement of the policies of *apartheid* and arms for external defence, a distinction which existed only in the minds of armaments suppliers. The wars being waged by imperialist régimes in Africa, the Middle East and South-East Asia proved that such arms were used to crush liberation movements. South Africa's threats against neighbouring countries were based upon the actions of a sister racist régime in the Middle East.

43. The existence of co-operation between Israel and South Africa in the economic, political and military fields had been definitely established. Non-stop flights by El Al, the Israeli airline, between Tel Aviv and Johannesburg, as well as many charter flights, carried tourists, businessmen and military missions over the occupied Sinai peninsula. Moreover, South Africa had been granting Israel economic assistance, as was indicated in a statement in the *Jewish Telegraphic Agency Daily News Bulletin* of 17 July 1970 that South Africa had granted Israel a loan of \$15 million. South Africa had also benefited economically from the closure of the Suez Canal in July 1967 as a result of Israeli aggression, as was made clear in paragraph 175 of annex II (A/8022/Add.1) to the report of the Special Committee. Those facts were ample proof of the existence of an unholy alliance between those two sister racist régimes.

44. His delegation believed that the time had come to move from the stage of passing resolutions to the stage of executing them. It supported the suggestions made by the representative of Mexico (693rd and 701st meetings) in the belief that the time had come for the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations and all the specialized agencies. His delegation's support for less firm measures was prompted more by a spirit of solidarity than by conviction. His delegation agreed with the statement by the representative of the Sudan (699th meeting) that the only legal and effective way to eliminate *apartheid* and racism in South Africa and elsewhere was through the armed struggle of the liberation movements. He also supported the proposal made by the representative of Somalia before the General Assembly (1882nd plenary meeting) to the effect that the credentials of the South African delegation, which represented nothing but a racist régime based on oppressive minority rule, should be examined. It considered that the representatives of national liberation movements should be entitled to serve on United Nations bodies rather than the representatives of *apartheid*, colonialism and military occupation.

45. Mr. GHAFFARI (Iran) said that no reports recently published showed any signs that the viciousness of the *apartheid* policy had diminished. Although the question of *apartheid* had been on the agenda of the General Assembly since the inception of the Organization and every effort had been made by the United Nations organs to uphold in South Africa the fundamental human and political rights set forth in the Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, that continuing affront to human dignity had still not been eliminated.

46. The South African Government had not only rejected all the resolutions adopted by the United Nations but had also devised new measures and enacted new laws to consolidate its policies of racial discrimination and segregation and ignore all basic human rights. In order to maintain

<sup>4</sup> Mimeographed.

white supremacy in the area, South Africa had also introduced its odious policy into neighbouring countries. It had refused to comply with the Security Council decision (resolution 269 (1969)) demanding its withdrawal from Namibia, had given military support to the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia and had provided it with economic assistance to offset the effects of the Security Council's decision. His delegation therefore fully agreed with the Special Committee's suggestion in paragraph 130 of its report (A/8022) that the question of *apartheid* should be considered in the context of southern Africa as a whole. It was however gratifying to note that the Security Council had finally resumed its consideration of the question.

47. Not content with denying the majority of the population their fundamental and inalienable rights, the *apartheid* system had become active in breaking up family relations in the country. An article in *The New York Times* of 20 October 1970 had described the queues of people seeking advice in private welfare centres because they had been ordered to leave their homes and families. Since black labour was necessary to white industry, African men were allowed to remain in white areas as contract labour without family, but black women and children were being forced to go to the poor undeveloped areas set aside by the Government as black "homelands". The Advice Offices had said that the only solution to the problem was divorce. The article concluded, however, that despite the tragic parade of broken families, the 1970 census had demonstrated the Government's failure to establish racially separate societies. Some eight million blacks were still registered in white areas—over half the black population, three million more than when the Government had begun separate development in 1951 and twice as many as the white population.

48. His country, by culture and tradition, had always opposed any sort of discrimination or segregation and had done everything possible to bring about their elimination. Article 1 of the Teheran Proclamation<sup>5</sup> issued at the end of the International Conference on Human Rights held in 1968 drew attention to the obligations of the international community to promote and encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinctions of any kind, and article 7 had been entirely devoted to the evils of *apartheid* and desire for its eradication. Within its limited means, Iran had contributed to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, because it sincerely believed in that worthy cause.

49. Mr. SINUMVAYAVUGWA (Burundi) drew attention to the general conclusion of the Special Committee's report (A/8022, para. 143), which attributed the lack of progress in the fight against *apartheid* to two main factors: the intransigence of the Government of South Africa and the unco-operative attitude of States which continued to maintain any kind of relations with that country. By ignoring the many United Nations decisions both on its policy of *apartheid* and on its presence in Namibia, the South African Government had clearly demonstrated its refusal to co-operate with the Organization. Burundi did not share the opinion which Western Powers were trying to impose on the General Assembly that a peaceful transfor-

mation of the South African situation could be brought about by a change of heart among white South Africans. As the President of the Republic had said, Burundi felt that the dangerous situation in southern Africa could be changed only by pressure from world public opinion and solidarity with the freedom fighters. The Lusaka Manifesto, adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU in 1969, had condemned racism and assured the freedom-fighters of the support of Heads of State and Government of the independent African States, who would never forget their responsibility for the total liberation of the continent. That solemn undertaking to fight to the death to free that young, dynamic continent with vast natural resources, which was only at the beginning of its glorious history, and to guarantee the security and equality of its inhabitants had unfortunately not been understood by the States most concerned in the matter and had been rejected by the Pretoria authorities.

50. His delegation considered it high time for the United Nations to move out of its welter of resolutions towards decisive action to safeguard peace and restore legality and justice in that region. The whole world should help the oppressed peoples of South Africa to regain their dignity and right to exist. His delegation considered that South Africa, because of its defiance of the fundamental principles of the United Nations, was no longer worthy of being a member of that Organization.

51. Mr. BAHOLLI (Albania) said that, although throughout the twenty-five years existence of the United Nations, there had been countless debates on *apartheid* and countless resolutions had been adopted condemning it, no effective measures had been taken to eliminate that savage form of racial oppression from southern Africa.

52. His delegation strongly condemned the inhuman practices of the racist Government of South Africa and the attitude of the imperialistic countries which showed their indifference to the tragic situation by continuing to support that Government. It had repeatedly been irrefutably proved that in South Africa millions of men were exploited, persecuted, tortured and massacred merely because they were black. It was horrifying to note that in the twentieth century, people in South Africa were engaged in scientific research to discover the most effective methods of combining moral and physical torture, poverty and lack of education and hygiene, in order that millions of the indigenous inhabitants of that country should have to choose between living in slavery or being killed by arms supplied by the imperialistic Powers in Europe and North America.

53. His delegation was convinced, however, that *apartheid* would be eliminated by the very people who were suffering from it. It had not become established in South Africa by chance but as a direct consequence of the colonialism of the great imperialist Powers, which were directly or indirectly doing their utmost to perpetuate that barbarous type of colonialism. The common interests of South Africa, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany and other imperialistic countries had joined in an inhuman alliance against the vast majority of the inhabitants of southern Africa. The Government of the United States of America, controlled by monopolies, practised racial discri-

<sup>5</sup> See *Final Act of the International Conference on Human Rights* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.XIV.2), p. 3.



mination even in its own country and was the natural ally of the South African racists. It had been proved that the United States always sought the friendship of oppressors and exploiters to the detriment of the interests and rights of subject people. The North American monopolies, supported by their Government, made profits of \$100 million per year from the blood and toil of the non-white population. The United States of America claimed that the arms supplied to South African racists formed part of past contracts that had to be respected, yet it was willing to break agreements and contracts in many other cases. The United Kingdom, which carried on an extensive and very profitable trade with South Africa, could no longer hide behind empty slogans and had openly expressed its intention to supply arms to the racist régime. Other countries which in any way supported the Government of that country also bore responsibility for the situation. The Soviet "social-imperialists", who had agreed with the United States to divide up the world into spheres of influence, were thus undermining the national liberation movements and helping to prolong the existence of régimes such as that of Pretoria.

54. An explosive situation existed in South Africa, and Albania was certain of the victory of that country's martyred people, who had understood that violence must be met with violence. The gradual development of the political consciousness of the masses and their efforts to organize armed resistance were promising signs of a better future. A people fighting for its liberation could conquer a much stronger enemy. Victory would call for sacrifices, but all sacrifices were bearable in a fight for freedom and human dignity.

55. The Albanian Government had again officially informed the United Nations Secretariat that it had never had any relations with the racist Government in South Africa and would never contemplate such relations. Its people and Government unreservedly supported the just revolutionary fight of the oppressed masses in South Africa and would support any proposals which truly served the cause of the South African peoples fighting to free themselves from the racist colonial yoke.

56. Mr. SHARMA (India), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, assured the representative of Lesotho that the Indian delegation understood the difficult situation faced by that country in view of South Africa's racist policy and repressive measures against freedom fighters. His own statement at the 707th meeting had only referred to the subjects discussed by the Special Committee and should not be interpreted as a reflection on the Government of Lesotho.

57. Mr. HOMEM DE MELO (Portugal), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that several delegations had referred in their statements to his country as if *apartheid* had any connexion with the Portuguese policy in Africa. Some delegations might have an adverse or unjust opinion of his country's policy, but it was obvious that that had nothing to do with racial segregation. It was well known that the Portuguese had always opposed racial segregation

and would continue to do so even when white racism was confronted with other racisms and segregations which could not be considered more acceptable than the one at present being so violently criticized.

58. With regard to the Cabora Bassa dam some delegations had tried to turn that magnificent realization into a diabolical symbol of so-called white supremacy in the Portuguese provinces in southern Africa. At another time and in another context, it would have been hailed as a source of development and wealth for the inhabitants of the Territory. Unfortunately, some Member States appeared unable to appreciate the task being undertaken in the Portuguese Territories, both in Europe and in Africa, because politics did not allow for objective observation of reality. Portugal had, however, not the slightest intention of halting the economic, social and political development of Mozambique, Angola and Portuguese Guinea, which it considered its vital mission.

59. Mr. EILAN (Israel), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that a few days earlier (706th meeting) he had clearly expressed his delegation's view of the Arab countries' endeavours to introduce considerations on the Middle East into a discussion on *apartheid*. He did not think that the introduction of such extraneous matters would serve the cause of those fighting *apartheid*. As the remarks made by the representatives of Jordan and Syria had introduced no new elements, he merely wished to draw attention to his statement made on that occasion in exercise of his right of reply.

60. Mr. OMRAN (Syria), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that his delegation had quoted Israel as an example of one of the Powers which was helping South Africa in defiance of the United Nations resolutions. He wished to remind the Committee of further facts and to quote from Israeli sources concerning co-operation between the two racist régimes. On 20 January 1970 the *Jewish Telegraphic Agency Daily News Bulletin* had reported from London that the South African Government had begun to organize the export to Israel of tanks similar to the new United Kingdom "Chieftan" tank which Israel had been trying to buy from that country.

61. The President of the South-West African Peoples' Organization had stated in the Fourth Committee (1887th meeting) that there was no doubt that co-operation between the Israeli and Pretoria Governments was increasing. South African Jewish Zionists were encouraged to go to Israel to fight, the leaders of Israel's armed forces were helping the South Africans, and the Fascist organizations in South Africa were raising funds for Israel. The implications were obvious and no comment was necessary. For the benefit of the Israeli representative, he quoted paragraph 10 of General Assembly resolution 2547 B (XXIV) which called upon Governments to terminate all types of relations with the South African Government. Reference to Israel's relations with South Africa was therefore a very important part of the discussion on *apartheid*.

*The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.*