

863rd meeting

Friday, 12 October 1973, at 3.25 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Károly SZARKA (Hungary).

A/SPC/SR.863

AGENDA ITEM 42

Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa (continued) (A/9160, A/9188, A/SPC/160, A/SPC/161, A/SPC/L.264):

- (a) Reports of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* (A/9022, A/9169, A/9180);
- (b) Reports of the Secretary-General (A/9165)

DAY OF SOLIDARITY WITH POLITICAL PRISONERS IN SOUTH AFRICA (concluded)

1. Mr. ROSE (German Democratic Republic) said it was obvious that the ruling circles of South Africa were not willing to implement the decisions of the United Nations and end their rule of terror against the people of South Africa. His delegation noted that the methods employed against the staunch patriots in South Africa who upheld human rights and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations were those which had been used by German fascism. It therefore shared the view of other delegations that the Government of Pretoria was a fascist régime and considered that there was a need for concerted international action to eliminate *apartheid*, in the interests of peace and human rights.

2. The people of the German Democratic Republic had destroyed the roots of fascism and racism and had constructed a socialist State, which had made support for the fight against colonialism, fascism and racism an integral part of its foreign policy. His delegation had learned with repugnance of the methods of fascism employed in Chile where a reactionary military junta had overthrown the constitutionally elected Government and where thousands of patriots were being detained in prisons and camps and the life of Senator Corvalán was in danger. His country supported the peoples of both Chile and South Africa in their struggle for freedom and self-determination, and would support any action to end the imprisonment and ill-treatment of the opponents of colonialism and racism in South Africa.

3. His delegation was fully aware that the policy of *apartheid* served to maintain the political power of the white minority in South Africa and to secure the exploitation of the majority of the population and noted that the unholy alliance of the Pretoria Government with foreign monopolies was expanding and gathering strength. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic, like other socialist countries, called for the release of South African political prisoners and detainees, and complied with the terms of United Nations resolutions in maintaining no diplomatic, economic or other relations with the Pretoria régime. If all States took similar action, it would be possible, in co-operation with the forces of the national liberation movement, to force the South African Government to abandon its policy of *apartheid* and end its methods of fascist suppression.

4. In conclusion, his delegation felt that the pledge to respect human rights and observe the principles of the

Charter must be translated into practical action. Humanity must not end where the profit interests of national and international monopolies began.

5. Mr. ALI (Pakistan) said that the organized system of racial discrimination practised in South Africa had long aroused the indignation of the world community. It was in the very nature of *apartheid* to employ repression for its survival, and such Draconian laws as the Sabotage Act and the Terrorism Act had turned the law into a tool of oppression in South Africa.

6. The Special Committee on *Apartheid* had first expressed concern over the treatment meted out to political prisoners in South Africa in 1963 and since that time, almost every organized body within the United Nations system concerned with the protection of human rights and personal freedoms had expressed abhorrence at the inhuman manner in which South Africa treated all who opposed the odious system of *apartheid*. South Africa's reaction to the appeals of the General Assembly had been one of brazen defiance, complete disregard and insensitivity to all norms of civilized behaviour. It had stepped up its reign of intimidation and terror and, as *The Times* of London had noted in an editorial on 2 November 1970, had become a State with a commitment to repression.

7. To distort the truth and hide its hideous practices from the world, the Government of South Africa had undertaken an extensive propaganda campaign and the number of representatives of the South African Department of Information abroad had been tripled. It was therefore essential for the world community to take action in order to frustrate South Africa's attempt to deceive the world. Measures like the observance of the Day of Solidarity with Political Prisoners in South Africa not only provided the moral support so important in such matters, but also helped to expose South Africa's iniquitous policies of *apartheid*. The international community should also concentrate on providing legal assistance to the political prisoners and detainees and relief to their families. The good work being done by the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, on whose Committee of Trustees Pakistan served, should be further expanded and his delegation hoped that contributions to that noble cause would be increased.

8. With regard to draft resolution A/SPC/L.264, he said that, while his delegation was fully aware of the noble intentions which had guided its sponsors, it did not feel that it sufficiently reflected the revulsion and indignation of the world community over the persecution of political prisoners in South Africa. However, in the interest of maintaining unanimity and in the hope that the Government of South Africa would appreciate its implications, his delegation was prepared to support the draft resolution.

9. In conclusion, his delegation wished to reiterate its solidarity with those who were enduring torture and suffering in South African gaols and pledged itself to do

all it could to uproot the evil system which had been established in South Africa.

10. Mr. SIYOLWE (Zambia) said that the supporters and defenders of the iniquitous policy of *apartheid* had attempted to bluff the peace-loving nations of the world by creating separate and so-called independent "States", eight for Africans and one for whites, in which each ethnic group was to develop along its own lines.

11. Under the system of *apartheid*, the value of a human being was determined solely by an accident of birth; race was the final and ultimate gauge. The system had wasted the talents and skills of 82 per cent of the population of South Africa in order to secure cheap, controlled, but unorganized black labour and high profits for the white minority. The system of *apartheid* was maintained and institutionalized by a complex structure of oppressive legislation backed up by the wealth produced by exploitation and the military strength of a misguided and selfish minority.

At the invitation of the Chairman, who referred to the relevant decision taken by the Committee at its 859th meeting, Mr. J. Ennals, Secretary-General of Amnesty International, took a seat at the Committee table.

12. Mr. ENNALS (Secretary-General of Amnesty International) said that South Africa's legal system represented the total corruption of any rule of law. It protected a minority against the overwhelming majority and repressed the majority in the interests of the minority. Under that system of law, families were divided and people were isolated, tortured and driven to suicide. When prisoners were released at the end of their sentence, they were banished or prevented from finding employment. The 12 African workers killed at Carletonville had merely been seeking to exercise human rights denied to them by the laws of South Africa, which banned trade unions and denied workers their right to negotiate for a living wage or express legitimate grievances.

13. As the organizer of the first movement to boycott South African goods in the United Kingdom, he wished to remind the Committee of the direct link between the South African Government's maintenance of *apartheid* and the goods and products of South Africa which were available in the stores of many countries. As long as South Africa continued to sell its produce to other countries, the South African Government would, with impunity, continue to imprison and ill-treat the opponents of *apartheid* and flout the human rights of the majority of the population.

Mr. Ennals withdrew.

14. Mr. CREMIN (Ireland) said that his delegation wished to associate itself with the initiative to observe the Day of Solidarity with Political Prisoners in South Africa. It was fitting that the international community should pay tribute to the men and women who had been imprisoned for their opposition to the *apartheid* policies of the South African Government and that it should seek to restore their liberty and remove the fundamental cause of their imprisonment.

15. It was lamentable that, 28 years after the signing of the United Nations Charter and 25 years after the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, discrimination on grounds of race or colour should be practised by a founder Member of the United Nations.

Although such discrimination was explicitly outlawed by Article 1, paragraph 3, of the Charter and by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it had been embodied in South Africa's legal system. By statutes such as the so-called 90-day law,¹ the Suppression of Communism Act, the Sabotage Act² and the Terrorism Act of 1967, South Africa had institutionalized and sought to preserve the legacy of racial discrimination and had cut off all legal avenues for social and political change. Under those laws, many leaders of the black people and numerous white opponents of *apartheid* had been restricted, gaoled, banished or forced into exile. Thousands of people had been held in detention, without access to the courts, their families and their lawyers, for many months at a time. Not only had they been subjected to the psychological torture of indefinite detention, but there had been overwhelming evidence in the last decade of torture against many detainees.

16. The evidence given to the Special Committee on *Apartheid* regarding the treatment of prisoners was a matter of urgent and serious concern to all nations and peoples which considered the principle of human dignity and respect for human rights as part of their commitments under the United Nations Charter. The repressive measures adopted by the Government of South Africa to maintain the policy of *apartheid* in operation were proof of its fallacious nature. There was a real danger that by eliminating almost all possibility of peaceful change, the Government might drive the non-white inhabitants of South Africa in despair to violent means of redressing their legitimate grievances.

17. His Government had on numerous occasions declared its complete rejection and abhorrence of the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa. Speaking before the General Assembly on 24 September 1973 (2125th plenary meeting), the Foreign Minister of Ireland had noted that no consideration of personal achievement, level of education or even loyalty to the régime influenced the treatment meted out to those whose colour was different from that of the ruling minority and he had reaffirmed his Government's condemnation of that policy and its belief that the intrinsically evil character of *apartheid* made it ultimately unworkable.

18. In the view of his delegation, an unequivocal and forceful condemnation of the treatment of political prisoners in South Africa would serve as an affirmation of solidarity and an encouragement to those white and non-white citizens who were suffering so that might would not triumph over right. His delegation was pleased that his country was a sponsor of draft resolution A/SPC/L.264 and hoped that it would meet with unanimous approval.

19. Practical assistance could also be given to ease the effects of the policy of *apartheid* on those who suffered under it, and his delegation urged all countries, particularly those which were not doing so, to contribute generously to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and to the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa.

20. In conclusion, his delegation urgently appealed once again to the Government of South Africa to abandon its potentially disastrous course. The voices of the

¹ The General Law Amendment Act of 1963, sect. 17.

² The General Law Amendment Act of 1962, sect. 21.

ever-increasing number of opponents of *apartheid* would not be silenced. The policy of *apartheid* was not only degrading for South Africa, but also carried within it the seeds of destruction for those who practised it.

21. Mr. DUMA (Romania) said that his country strongly condemned the policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination pursued by the minority racist régime in South Africa and called for the immediate release of all political prisoners in South Africa. Its sympathy and support were extended to all who fought to end the régime, in order to ensure equal rights for all citizens of South Africa and equal participation in the activities of the country. It noted that the Government of Pretoria had totally ignored the resolutions hitherto adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council and felt that in order to make United Nations action against *apartheid* more effective, all States Members of the United Nations should comply fully with the principles and provisions of its resolutions.

22. At the same time, his delegation considered that international recognition should be granted to the South African national liberation movements. Their leaders should be acknowledged as the true representatives of the people of South Africa and permitted to defend and promote their rights in the United Nations and other international forums.

23. In Romania 11 October 1973 had been observed as the Day of Solidarity with Political Prisoners in South Africa. Meetings had taken place in the main cities under the auspices of the Romanian League for Friendship with the Peoples of Africa and Asia, and had expressed the profound solidarity of the Romanian people with the struggle of the South African people against the policy of *apartheid*.

24. In conclusion, his delegation wished to reaffirm the support of the Romanian people for all those who struggled against foreign oppression and against the criminal policies of *apartheid* and racial discrimination of the Government of South Africa.

25. Mr. BIRIDO (Sudan) said that the fate of those South Africans who had been imprisoned and banned for their opposition to *apartheid* had been a source of constant concern to his delegation. As the Foreign Minister of his country had stated before the General Assembly on 5 October 1973 (2142nd plenary meeting), the international community must take up seriously the matter of those men and women whose sole guilt was standing up for their inalienable rights to independence and freedom to determine their future. On the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the first call for international action by the General Assembly (resolution 1881 (XVIII)) and the Security Council (resolution 181 (1963)), his delegation reiterated its unreserved condemnation of the arbitrary laws which had confined decent human beings and deprived them of their basic human rights. Thousands of South Africans were either in gaol or banned because their political activities had brought them into violent conflict with the inhuman and arbitrary *apartheid* laws. Hundreds of suspects were being held without trial in solitary confinement and subjected to the most cruel tortures.

26. He referred to the distinguished citizens of South Africa, including Nelson Mandela, Robert M. Sobukwe, Walter Sisulu, Ahmed Kathrada and the late Chief Albert Luthuli, the Nobel Peace Prize winner,

who had been detained by the South African Government, and said that it was clear, that those who upheld and actively promoted the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in South Africa were liable to imprisonment or banishment. The United Nations should exert itself on behalf of the political prisoners in South Africa. The Government of that country was waging war against the majority of South Africans by incarcerating national leaders and intellectuals who inspired them to struggle for their dignity, and thereby endeavouring to deprive the majority of any national consciousness or sense of purpose. While his delegation had no doubt about the undaunted spirit of resistance in South Africa, it felt that the contribution of the international community to that resistance was significant.

27. It was against that background that his delegation had considered draft resolution A/SPC/L.264 introduced by the Swedish delegation (861st meeting). Although it would have preferred a stronger text, including an endorsement of the statement on political prisoners in South Africa adopted by the Special Committee on *Apartheid* on 17 August 1973 (A/SPC/160, annex), his delegation intended to support it in view of the importance which it attached to the universal condemnation of *apartheid*.

28. Mr. SEIGNORET (Trinidad and Tobago) said that many people of all races were being subjected to indefinite detention or long periods of confinement under harsh conditions because they aspired to, or defended, the most elementary of human rights. The Committee was only doing its duty in holding a special meeting to express the solidarity of the international community with political prisoners in South Africa; it must ensure that they were not forgotten.

29. Ten years earlier the General Assembly had been moved to call for the release of political prisoners in South Africa (resolution 1881 (XVIII)) because of the arrest of 11 men, including some distinguished South African leaders, at Rivonia.³ Since then, those and other black leaders had been held on Robben Island, a place which would remain a symbol of inhuman treatment long after *apartheid* was destroyed. Only the South African Government knew precisely how many prisoners were being detained and how many were serving sentences in such centres as Robben Island. At the 861st meeting, the representative of the African National Congress had said that there were 391 political prisoners in maximum security prisons in South Africa, of which 383 were on Robben Island. The Committee must endeavour to make such facts widely known. The Government of South Africa recognized that even some of its best friends felt revulsion at the situation and it therefore sought to keep information about it secret.

30. The political prisoners would only be released if South Africa's powerful friends combined to bring pressure to bear on the Government. All appeals to South Africa to abandon its racist policies had been ignored. International action had so far lacked the bite it would have if all those States which condemned *apartheid* moved resolutely against it. It was the Committee's responsibility to ensure that everyone, particularly those with significant power, should hear the cry for freedom and be moved to action.

³ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Nineteenth Session, Annexes*, annex No. 12, document A/5692, annex I, para. 19.

31. His delegation had seen a report that the number of political prisoners was declining, but that report also pointed out that, immediately after completion of their sentences, many political prisoners were served with banning and house arrest orders or were deported to the reserves or so-called resettlement camps. Since the people of South Africa could not leave the country freely, it would be true to say that the whole country was a prison for almost all the non-white population and for those whites who challenged *apartheid*. Any detainee would assert that his home had been turned into a prison. In remembering those who were formally held as prisoners, the Committee must not forget those who were under house arrest and other forms of detention.

32. All States were committed to the aim of eradicating *apartheid*. They differed only as to the type and timing of the measures to be used to bring about peaceful change. The Special Committee on *Apartheid* had referred in its report (A/9168) to the important task of persuading South Africa's friends to join in making the measures called for in General Assembly and Security Council resolutions fully effective. Accordingly, his delegation commended the sponsors of the draft resolution. The Chairman of the Special Committee had already made special mention (862nd meeting) of the fact that the Federal Republic of Germany was a sponsor of draft resolution A/SPC/L.264. His delegation noted with satisfaction that two other sponsors were members of the Security Council and that none of the sponsors was a member of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* or belonged to the group of non-aligned countries. All the sponsors were from the cultural group whose civilization and interests South Africa purported to defend.

33. In view of South Africa's past indifference, the renewed call for the release of political prisoners might be doomed in advance to ineffectiveness. However, his delegation shared the conviction that the mere fact that it was those delegations which had taken the initiative in sponsoring the draft resolution would have a great influence on public opinion both in South Africa and in those countries that supported it. His delegation looked forward to the establishment of an effective coalition of all anti-*apartheid* forces and commended the draft resolution to the Committee for unanimous approval. It expressed its solidarity with the political prisoners in South Africa and with all who were fighting to eliminate *apartheid*.

34. Mr. SCHAUFLE (United States of America) said that one of the encouraging trends in the twentieth century had been the elimination of institutionalized racial discrimination. Most people and Governments recognized the principle that all men were equal. His Government could not accept the premise of racial inequality inherent in South Africa's social structure. It had striven to eliminate racial injustice in the United States of America and knew from experience that racial discrimination was burdensome and dehumanizing to people of all races and could promote hatred and violence. His Government genuinely hoped that the South African Government would reverse its policy of *apartheid* with its potential for widespread disorder and bloodshed.

35. By its very nature, *apartheid* challenged those whom it oppressed to demonstrate their opposition to racial discrimination and reassert the equal worth and

humanity of all races. It was sad that such protest and political activity could result in imprisonment or banning. His country took the opportunity of the Day of Solidarity with Political Prisoners in South Africa to express its sympathy with those imprisoned and banned simply because they had dared to oppose an inequitable social system. His Government supported draft resolution A/SPC/L.264, and, if a vote was taken, his delegation would vote in favour of it. The United States hoped that the demands for the recognition of human rights in South Africa would soon be heeded and that the suffering of those who had been gaoled or banned would not be in vain.

36. Mr. OHTAKA (Japan) said that it was appropriate for the Committee to observe the Day of Solidarity with Political Prisoners in South Africa at a time when the United Nations was launching the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. The wide interest shown in the Day by Member States was proof of their concern.

37. Ten years earlier, his delegation had been a sponsor of the historic resolution 1881 (XVIII) of the General Assembly. It was encouraging to learn from the Chairman of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* that the United Nations warnings might have had some effect. Nevertheless many people were still oppressed in South Africa because of their opposition to *apartheid*.

38. His delegation welcomed the initiative of the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.264 and hoped that it would be adopted unanimously. It reiterated its opposition to all forms of racial discrimination and its determination to support international efforts to combat *apartheid* and assist those people who were suffering because of their opposition to it. His country made an annual contribution to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa. He hoped that the day would soon come when the Committee could observe the Day of Solidarity in remembrance of an event of the past.

39. Mr. DAUNT (United Kingdom) said that the number of delegations speaking in the debate bore witness to the importance their Governments attached to the plight of political prisoners in South Africa. His own Government condemned political persecution wherever it occurred and supported all measures which it regarded as proper and practical to combat discrimination and alleviate the condition of those who suffered under it in South Africa. There were no differences over the objective, and his country made a substantial contribution towards its attainment. His delegation would support the draft resolution.

40. Mr. MEHIRI (Tunisia) said that it was appropriate that the Day of Solidarity with Political Prisoners in South Africa should coincide with the tenth anniversary of the adoption of resolution 1881 (XVIII) by the General Assembly. In the past 10 years the United Nations had adopted many other resolutions on the same subject, but the South African régime had only increased its implacable repression of the black people of South Africa, imprisoning many who were fighting for liberty and justice. It was advancing with impunity on a course of genocide. The Committee's duty was not only to condemn *apartheid* but to make all countries aware of the truly pernicious nature of that policy and of their own responsibility for the situation. The political prisoners needed not only condemnation of their oppressors but total and militant solidarity and concerted

international action against the South African régime. It was of little help to the political prisoners that some of the most powerful countries subscribed to the relevant resolutions while supporting the racist régime and ignoring appeals that they should break off all relations with it.

41. Action should be taken not only by African countries and organizations and the non-aligned countries but by the whole international community, and it should be extended to include the liberation of all the oppressed peoples of southern Africa. The last bastions of colonialism were in South Africa. The beast was at bay, and history demanded that it should be brought down. South Africa and its supporters would one day answer for their crimes against humanity.

42. In the north of Africa, other oppressed Africans were fighting the same fight as their brothers in the south against a racist invader. The Zionist régime in Jerusalem and the fascist régime in Pretoria were demonstrating their contempt for international law and United Nations decisions.

43. His delegation supported the draft resolution before the Committee.

44. Mr. AMISSAH (Ghana) said that, while his country shed tears for the oppressed peoples of South Africa, it took consolation from the fact that they had sincere supporters in the Committee. The world was realizing that all human beings must be treated with dignity and decency and that any fraternization with the South African racists helped to destroy human rights and fundamental freedoms for the non-white majority in South Africa and encouraged the racist régime in its oppression.

45. For the first time, a number of Western countries had made more than a token condemnation of *apartheid* by joining the Scandinavian countries in sponsoring the draft resolution before the Committee. It had taken two decades of perseverance to achieve that step. The draft resolution did not go far enough, because it did not specify the sanctions to be applied if South Africa refused to implement it. However, his delegation supported it in the hope that one day the world would act decisively.

46. His delegation was disappointed that the United States of America, the United Kingdom and France were not among the sponsors. Perhaps they needed more time to realize that any situation which denied a people its right to live as human beings was untenable.

47. In proclaiming its solidarity with the political prisoners and all the oppressed peoples of South Africa, his delegation reiterated that there could be no compromise in the quest for freedom and justice for them. There was no place for the double standards that had been applied under colonialism and imperialism. Democracy did not permit minority rule over the majority. Yet, the application of democracy in South Africa had resulted in the ironical situation in which a population of 4 million lorded it over 16 million blacks and many other non-whites. Countries who professed belief in democracy accepted the situation and even took every step to maintain it. Thus the representatives of the 16 million blacks were deemed to represent only themselves and had no right to take part in the debate. People who professed to believe that all men were born equal had applied a double standard to peoples whose

skin was a different colour from their own. The application of that double standard to the majority of the citizens of South Africa had resulted in indignities and brutalities.

48. Little children were being given military training to equip them to fight for freedom and justice in their own fatherland. That was happening in poor African countries while the rich United States was talking about a volunteer army. Some of those children might die in the struggle, but some would live to fight on to victory. The indigenous peoples of Africa did not wish to fight, but they had no choice when faced with Sharpeville, Carletonville and Wiriyaumu. After all, the United States of America had had to fight for its own independence.

49. The opponents of *apartheid* were often charged with emotionalism. They were emotional, but no more so than the practitioners and supporters of *apartheid*. An article in *Newsweek* dated 15 October 1973 reported that the South African Government had produced a film to whip up the emotions of white children against the blacks and the Chinese. The film portrayed the blacks as terrorists led by the Chinese. In fact, the white practitioners of *apartheid* were the terrorists. In spite of such malicious stereotyping and in the face of increasing brutality, the blacks of South Africa had demonstrated that they had no hatred for the white man. They only demanded their legitimate rights.

50. Mr. JOB (Yugoslavia) said that it was with a profound sense of outrage that his delegation participated in the seemingly perennial debates about the fate of political prisoners in South Africa, and it was with the strongest feelings of admiration and respect that it learnt of the indomitable courage and persistence of the people of South Africa in carrying on their struggle in the most inhuman conditions. His delegation hoped—and indeed was certain—that, with whatever support they received from the United Nations, the people of South Africa would prevail in their struggle. It was in that spirit that his delegation participated in the observance of the Day of Solidarity with Political Prisoners in South Africa and supported draft resolution A/SPC/L.264, which it agreed should be adopted unanimously.

51. While many speakers had expressed the hope that United Nations resolutions would afford moral and political support to the people of South Africa, many others had expressed doubt as to their effectiveness in the face of the unyielding attitude and worsening practices of the South African Government. The United Nations should take heart and draw inspiration from the bravery and dedication of those who were fighting against *apartheid* in their own country. There was evidence, notably in paragraphs 13 and 15 of the Special Committee's review of developments in South Africa since October 1972 (A/AC.115/L.375), that United Nations support was going to people who were ready and able to use it. Progress was agonizingly slow for the freedom fighters, but they persisted and the United Nations must persist in its support: today resolutions, tomorrow direct assistance.

52. His delegation supported the draft resolution, which was a stepping stone to more effective measures. It should be noted that the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, which represented more than two thirds of the world's

population, meeting at Algiers in September 1973, had elaborated a specific programme of effective action.

53. At the 1744th meeting of the Security Council, on 9 October 1973, his delegation had stated that no country should base its policy on the illusion of unalterable military superiority or on massive recourse to State terrorism. The South African Government should recognize the inexorable change which was taking place in international law, in the political behaviour of States and in the attitude of the United Nations with respect to liberation struggles. The starting point was always resolutions and appeals for moral and political support. However, things could move very quickly. Not long ago the representatives of liberation movements had been merely petitioners, then they had become observers in various United Nations bodies, and now there was the independent State of Guinea-Bissau, which had already been recognized by more than 50 countries. The sanctions against Southern Rhodesia were violated, but they were being strengthened. The United Nations had funds for material aid to resistance movements and had instituted special services for them. Above all, the legal and political basis for all those activities was recognition of the right of peoples to fight for their liberation with whatever means were available to them. The United Nations had long ago abandoned the attitude that direct assistance to liberation movements constituted interference in the internal affairs of States.

54. Mr. KEBEDE (Ethiopia) said that it was appropriate for the Committee to observe the Day of Solidarity with Political Prisoners in South Africa. In the 10 years since the adoption of resolution 1881 (XVIII) by the General Assembly, the apostles of *apartheid* had constantly rejected United Nations appeals and the minority régime in Pretoria had escalated the atrocities of *apartheid*. The facts of the deterioration of the situation in South Africa were documented in the excellent report of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* (A/9022) and had been described in detail in the statements of the representatives of the African National Congress and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania. The odious crime at Carletonville was only one example of the atrocities committed in the name of *apartheid* inside prisons and outside by the South African racists.

55. His delegation wished to place on record its satisfaction at the initiative of the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.264 and at the support which it had received from other non-African nations.

56. No human being, except one whose senses had been dulled and dehumanized by the theory of superiority, could fail to respond with indignation to the plight of the political prisoners. The countries of Africa recognized the draft resolution as an expression of moral indignation by human beings capable of compassion for the unjustly oppressed. They recognized the voice of reason, of civilization and of compassion.

57. For many years African countries and other members of the world community had been admonishing the perpetrators of the crime of *apartheid*. History indicated that time was running short for the *apartheid* régime; it could not continue to ignore the warnings of friend and foe. It must abandon its shocking practices or accept the fearful consequences.

58. Mr. HANSEN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that both his Government and his people were

opposed to the policy of *apartheid*. The representatives of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* had had that demonstrated to them during their recent visit to Bonn. His delegation was happy that the Federal Republic of Germany was one of the sponsors of the draft resolution, which he hoped would contribute to a solution of the grave problem of *apartheid*.

59. Mr. DUARTE (Colombia) said that his delegation wished to reaffirm its whole-hearted condemnation of all forms of racial discrimination and to join with others in calling for justice for political prisoners and other victims of *apartheid* in South Africa and it agreed with the statement of the distinguished representative of the United Republic of Tanzania at the 861st meeting. It was not only the torture and inhuman treatment of political prisoners that was to be deplored but also the hopeless situation of the large majority who legitimately aspired to equality in such fields as employment, education, social security and individual freedom.

60. The Government and people of Colombia wished to affirm their solidarity with the political prisoners of South Africa and to express moral support and admiration for their struggle for freedom and the elimination of *apartheid*. He further wished to stress the importance of fully implementing the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on the problem of *apartheid*, in particular resolution 2923 E (XXVII).

61. In conclusion, he wished to reaffirm his country's position with regard to the question of the South African representative's credentials. His delegation had voted against the Syrian amendment to paragraph 14 of the report of the Credentials Committee⁴ because it understood that the sole function of that Committee was to verify the credentials of representatives of Member States. That vote did not imply any softening of Colombia's attitude towards the Government of South Africa. Colombia had always been opposed to any form of racial discrimination and to any violation of human rights, the enjoyment of which was vital to world peace and justice.

62. Mr. MACRIS (Greece) said that for 28 years Greece had been in the forefront of the struggle to obtain recognition of the right of peoples to self-government, independence and freedom and had striven to eliminate racial discrimination. The Greek Government would continue to contribute to the formulation of rational measures for the total and permanent elimination of racial discrimination. However, although his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.264, it felt it would be preferable if the resolution did not contain any expression of condemnation. Such expressions, which in any event had previously been ineffectual, could prove more harmful to the innocent citizens of all races and colours living within South Africa than to the racists themselves. Furthermore, in the event of a separate vote on each paragraph, his delegation would be obliged to vote against operative paragraph 2, feeling that it was couched in terms incompatible with Article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter.

63. In operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, the words "in keeping with their national laws and with

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 3, documents A/L.700 and A/9179.

the principles, purposes and provisions of the United Nations Charter" should be inserted after the words "more vigorous and concerted action". His motive for proposing that addition was simply to ensure that the resolution was based in all respects on the provisions of the Charter.

64. Mr. TSHERING (Bhutan) said that his Government deplored the policy of *apartheid* pursued by the Government of South Africa, which had continually disregarded the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. His country believed in equal rights and equal treatment for all human beings. Accordingly, his delegation deplored the ill-treatment and torture of political prisoners in South Africa and demanded their release. His delegation would support draft resolution A/SPC/L.264 and hoped that it would serve to convince the South African Government of the opposition of the international community to all forms of torture and other acts of terror against opponents of *apartheid*.

65. Miss WILLIAMS (Sierra Leone) said that, as an African and a Sierra Leonean, she wished to associate herself with those who had already expressed solidarity with the political prisoners in South Africa. In spite of a steady barrage of resolutions by the United Nations, the South African Government persisted in its odious policy of *apartheid*. Acts such as the recent shooting of unarmed miners striking for more pay and better conditions illustrated the ruthlessness and desperation of the South African régime. The leaders of that régime were clearly aware that their days were numbered and were attempting to postpone the day of judgement. The Committee should adopt the strongest and most persuasive resolution possible warning against the dangers of delay and denouncing the inhuman practices of *apartheid*.

66. Her delegation called on the Committee to demand the immediate and unconditional release of the political prisoners in South Africa and urged those nations which had diplomatic and other ties with South Africa to use their influence in the interests of justice and sanity.

67. Mr. TÜZEL (Turkey) said that his Government had consistently supported every effort aimed at eliminating the policy of *apartheid* and would continue to do so in the hope of reaching a solution based on justice, the principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations.

68. The policy of *apartheid* was contrary to all basic human values. The repressive measures implemented by the South African authorities in a desperate effort to silence the opponents of *apartheid* were not only despicable but also tended to make peaceful settlement increasingly difficult. His delegation therefore welcomed draft resolution A/SPC/L.264 and would vote in favour of it.

69. Mr. TALIWAKU (Uganda) said that his delegation wished to associate itself with those who had already expressed solidarity with the political prisoners in South Africa. Ten years before, the hope had been expressed that the system of *apartheid* would soon be destroyed, but that system still survived because of the support provided by international monopoly capital. The Committee should not confine itself to a mere condemnation of *apartheid* but should strive for its final

and total destruction. Uganda felt endangered by the policy of *apartheid*, not simply because of its geographical proximity to South Africa but because the desperation of the South African régime made its actions unpredictable. The whole of Africa was threatened.

70. In the name of the black peoples of South Africa as well as struggling peoples throughout the world, his delegation called upon the Government of South Africa to abandon its policy of *apartheid* and condemned those Members of the United Nations who, because of selfish economic interests, continued to support the minority régime in South Africa.

71. The situation of the black peoples of South Africa was a matter of deep concern to Uganda, and his delegation wished to assert its solidarity with those who were struggling for freedom and independence in South Africa.

72. Mr. NANDAN (Fiji) said that his delegation wished to express its solidarity with all those opponents of *apartheid* who had been imprisoned in South Africa because of their efforts to secure their human rights. He expressed the hope that the opposition of the international community would have an impact on the policies of *apartheid* of the South African régime and said that his delegation would support draft resolution A/SPC/L.264.

73. Mr. THOMPSON-FLÔRES (Brazil) said that his delegation would support draft resolution A/SPC/L.264 because it was profoundly opposed to the idea of racial segregation and believed that the draft resolution provided the basis for a peaceful solution to the problem of *apartheid* in South Africa. The policy of *apartheid* had always been condemned by his Government, which continued to feel that a peaceful solution should be sought in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

74. The CHAIRMAN said it was his understanding that the draft resolution had no financial implications, and, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the resolution.

75. Miss LOPES (Portugal) requested a vote on the draft resolution.

76. Mr. BARAKAT AHMAD (India) said that the resolution should be adopted by acclamation; if the representative of Portugal had any objection, she could explain her position on the resolution.

77. Mr. SIYOLWE (Zambia) supported the proposal of the representative of India.

78. Miss LOPES (Portugal) said that, under the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, a member was entitled to request a vote on any draft resolution. However, if the other members of the Committee objected, she would not insist, on the understanding that she would be permitted to give an explanation of her position.

79. The CHAIRMAN called upon the Committee to adopt draft resolution A/SPC/L.264 by acclamation.

It was so decided.

80. Miss LOPES (Portugal) said it was well known that racial policies had never been practised in Portugal. Her country had always had a multiracial society in which neither the colour of a person's skin nor his

religion had given rise to discrimination. However, if draft resolution A/SPC/L.264 had been put to the vote, her delegation would have abstained because it felt that the question with which the draft resolution dealt was an internal matter in which the United Nations Charter forbade interference.

81. Mr. TALEB (Algeria) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution in spite of the shortcomings and weaknesses which had been pointed out by a number of delegations. His delegation had intended to make a number of amendments to the resolution but had refrained from doing so in the interests of unanimity. He expressed the hope that the spirit of conciliation shown by his delegation would encourage other delegations to make similar concessions with regard to other resolutions on the policy of *apartheid*.

82. Mr. BARAKAT AHMAD (India) said that the text just adopted had many weaknesses. The Special Committee on *Apartheid* had formulated a draft resolution which was stronger and more to the point. However, he wished to praise the initiative of those countries which had sponsored the draft resolution. He had heard with great interest the statement by the representative of the United States of America and was gratified to note that the United States delegation had supported the draft.

83. If such a resolution could not be implemented, other measures would have to be taken.

84. He noted that of the 11 States which had sponsored the resolution, 7 had diplomatic relations with South Africa. It was the responsibility of the delegations of those States to see that the text of the draft resolution reached the proper quarters in their respective countries.

85. Mr. WANG Jun-sheng (China) said that his delegation would like to make a number of observations on the draft resolution just adopted by the Committee. It had supported the resolution because it condemned the failure of the South African authorities to comply with

the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on the release of political prisoners and called for the immediate and unconditional release of those prisoners. However, he had a number of reservations to make. First, the so-called Government of the Republic of South Africa represented only a small racist minority in South Africa and certainly not the broad masses of the Azanian people. Secondly, the root cause of the South African authorities' repression and persecution of those fighting against *apartheid* lay in the colonialist and racist policy pursued by those authorities. If the suffering of the people of South Africa was to be ended, it was imperative to eradicate the colonialist and racist system in South Africa. Thirdly, in view of the intensification of violent repression by the fascist South African authorities, the people of Azania were fully entitled to resort to armed struggle. In the words of the Solemn Declaration on General Policy adopted by the Council of Ministers of OAU, at its twenty-first ordinary session held at Addis Ababa in May 1973: "armed struggle is the main form that efforts to achieve liberation must take".

86. Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania) said that, although his delegation had had some reservations with regard to draft resolution A/SPC/L.264, it had acceded to the Committee's desire to adopt that draft by acclamation in the interests of solidarity with the suffering masses in South Africa and in deference to the 11 sponsors. He proposed that the Committee should call on the Secretariat's Unit on *Apartheid* to give maximum publicity to the observance of the Day of Solidarity with Political Prisoners in South Africa.

87. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the proposal of the Tanzanian representative and would request the Secretariat to give its attention to the matter.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.

864th meeting

Tuesday, 16 October 1973, at 3.20 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Károly SZARKA (Hungary).

A/SPC/SR.864

AGENDA ITEM 42

Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa
(continued) (A/9160, A/9138, A/SPC/160, A/SPC/161):

- (a) Reports of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* (A/9022, A/9168, A/9169, A/9180);
- (b) Reports of the Secretary-General (A/9165)

GENERAL DEBATE

1. Mr. HOUHOU (Algeria) said that the fact that the scourge of *apartheid* continued to exist despite the many resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly showed the helplessness of the United Nations in the face of the problem. That situa-

tion was due primarily to the fact that certain Powers persisted in maintaining close relations with Pretoria and supplying it with weapons and financial assistance.

2. The report of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* (A/9022) had demonstrated clearly that South Africa's economic expansion had been greatly assisted by the ever closer financial, commercial and military relations between South Africa and certain Western countries, that South Africa's military and police forces and its arms industry were stronger now than 10 years earlier, that its repressive, discriminatory laws were being applied with increasing harshness, and that Pretoria was becoming more and more defiant and was helping the illegal racist régime of Ian Smith and the Portuguese Government in their colonial policies.