

GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 817th  
MEETINGThursday, 19 October 1972,  
at 10.55 a.m.

NEW YORK

Chairman: Mr. Hady TOURÉ (Guinea).

## AGENDA ITEM 38

The policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa (*continued*) (A/8666 and Corr.1, A/8670, A/8689, A/8703, paras. 501-519):

- (a) Reports of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* (A/8722 and Add.1, A/8770);
- (b) Reports of the Secretary-General (A/8822)

GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

1. Mr. HARKETT (Morocco) noted that the balance sheet for the action undertaken by the United Nations to put an end to the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa was discouraging: the racist Pretoria Government had responded to the Organization's many appeals and resolutions by further increasing its brutal repression of the Africans and by flatly refusing to enter into a dialogue with the authentic representatives of the African population, and there was no indication that there would be the slightest change in that policy. On the contrary, the South African Government had actually dared to threaten the security and territorial integrity of neighbouring African States and was providing Portugal and Ian Smith's rebel régime with military assistance, thus enabling them to intensify their repression of the peoples of Guinea (Bissau), Mozambique, Angola and Zimbabwe.

2. The Pretoria Government was able thus to defy the United Nations and the entire world because of the complicity of certain profit-hungry international corporations and the deplorable passivity of certain great Powers, which was attributable to base material motives and unfounded strategic considerations. In that connexion, the King of Morocco, H. M. Hassan II, current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, had stated, at a press conference following the ninth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government held at Rabat in June 1972, that it was completely contradictory to state one's opposition to colonialism, *apartheid* and racial segregation in the United Nations while continuing to encourage the very people who practised *apartheid* and colonialism.

3. It was probably in order to have a clear conscience that certain economically developed Powers had voted for resolutions condemning the policies of *apartheid* and providing for measures to force the racist Pretoria

Government to practise a policy that was consistent with the legitimate claims of the majority of the South African population; those Powers were nevertheless continuing to strengthen the Pretoria régime by supplying it with capital and weapons.

4. The argument that the non-white Africans benefited from South Africa's growing prosperity was totally without foundation. His delegation wished to point out, moreover, that its oppressed South African brothers were fighting, first and foremost, to recover their dignity and freedom. With regard to the sale of weapons and spare parts to the racist minority Government, it could not accept the distinction made between weapons intended for external defence—which, in fact, constituted a threat to the neighbouring African States—and those used for police operations. As for the excuse—put forward by the Powers that sold weapons to South Africa—that the embargo imposed by the United Nations was not observed by everyone, that specious argument was merely a cover-up for the base material competition between arms manufacturers. The African countries appealed to the Powers which had joined them in condemning the ignoble racist South African régime to be consistent and halt all co-operation with that régime.

5. His delegation paid a tribute to the countries that were making a substantial contribution to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa. It would be desirable for the great Powers to show real interest in the Fund, in accordance with paragraph 6 of Security Council resolution 311 (1972). His delegation also hoped that the great Powers would end their boycott of the Special Committee on *Apartheid*, thanks to whose efforts world public opinion was beginning to awaken to the problem of *apartheid*. In that connexion, the non-governmental international organizations and the religious organizations should be thanked for and encouraged to continue their assistance to the victims of *apartheid* and their courageous denunciations of Pretoria's infamous policy.

6. His delegation had noted with satisfaction the decision to hold an international conference of trade unions on *apartheid* in 1973, which would surely result in concrete and effective action. It was convinced that the United Nations would be able to adopt measures, under Chapter VII of the Charter, to guarantee full implementation of global sanctions against the Pretoria régime. The fight might be long and hard, but Africa was more determined than ever to rid itself of colonialism and racism. At the ninth session of the OAU Assembly the heads of State and Government had solemnly

pledged to make a substantial increase in their assistance to the African movements fighting colonialism and racism. As King Hassan had said, "Colonial occupation and racial presence are nothing but a foreign body; some day, the process of rejection will take place".

7. Mr. MANGAL (Afghanistan) said that the continuation of the policy of *apartheid* by the racist white minority régime in South Africa was an example of deliberate defiance by a Member State of the United Nations resolutions and the principles of the Charter. Although the problem of *apartheid* had been on the agenda of various United Nations bodies for more than 20 years, South Africa had continued to implement a policy of segregation unprecedented in the history of the modern world. A situation in which a minority of whites determined, at will, the living conditions of a majority of non-whites was an anachronism at a time when the peoples still under alien domination struggled for the realization of their legitimate rights in the wake of a dying colonialism. Decolonization was an irreversible process which the General Assembly had further accelerated by adopting the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Yet, South Africa, its example followed by Portugal and the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia, believed it could reverse the course of history and, in that undertaking, had endangered international peace and security and infringed the fundamental rights of mankind. The world could no longer ignore or tolerate a policy of repression abhorrent to the human mind and a system in which law, custom and religion were used as tools of a policy of repression which, as the report of the Special Committee (A/8772 and Add.1) indicated, had been further intensified in the past year despite the concern it had aroused in the international community and in South Africa itself. Every day, more and more South Africans were being herded into veritable ghettos, the so-called Bantustans, where they were to pursue so-called "separate development". All who opposed the policy of *apartheid* were subjected to the maltreatment and torture described in the special report prepared by the Special Committee (A/8770), which had collected much evidence on the subject. South Africa had in fact become a selective police state.

8. His delegation strongly opposed a policy which had quite rightly aroused world indignation. When a State Member of the United Nations applied a system of social and political coercion that was contrary to the principles set out in the Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it was the duty of all other Member States to give the United Nations every assistance in any action it took in accordance with the Charter and to refrain from giving assistance to any State against which the United Nations was taking preventive or enforcement action. Those provisions, contained in Article 2, paragraph 5, of the Charter, had inspired the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, and, in particular, Security Council resolution 282 (1970) concerning the effective implementation of the arms embargo. However, as was pointed out in the report of the Special Committee (A/8722 and Add.1), the adoption of those resolutions

had not prevented South Africa from increasing its military build-up, *inter alia*, by manufacturing its own weapons with the assistance and co-operation of certain Governments which supported United Nations decisions but whose actions belied their words. In the view of his delegation, that gap, which was brought about by the contradiction between the expressions of support of certain countries for the resolutions of the United Nations and the actions of those countries, was one of the reasons for the failure thus imposed on the Organization to eradicate the inhuman policy of *apartheid*. Those Governments had not hesitated to increase their trade with South Africa and, in so doing, were not only giving economic assistance but encouraging it to disregard the Organization's resolutions and enabling it to ignore both the economic sanctions and the moral pressure of world public opinion. His delegation urged the United Nations to search for new ways and means to eliminate the policy of *apartheid* wherever it existed, so that the existing intolerable situation could be brought to an end.

9. Mr. SLIWKA (Poland) observed that the problem of *apartheid*, far from losing its urgency, was becoming increasingly serious. It was clear from the documents under consideration, particularly the reports of the Special Committee, that the Pretoria régime was applying its odious policy with increased intransigence and was intensifying its repressive actions, disregarding the many resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council and the declared opposition of world public opinion, which condemned *apartheid* on moral grounds and regarded it as a threat to international security.

10. His delegation had regularly condemned the policy of *apartheid* in the General Assembly, pointing to its inherent dangers and expressing the hope that, by concerted and effective efforts, practical measures might be found to give effect to the provisions of the resolutions that had been adopted. His delegation regretted the fact that Members of the Organization were continuing to support the racist South African régime both materially—by expanding trade with it and investing capital in South Africa from which they received a substantial return through the exploitation of the non-white population—and politically providing the Pretoria régime not only with modern weapons but with equipment and licences which enabled it to produce its own weapons and, by increasing its military potential, to intensify repression in its territory and support the Portuguese colonial troops and the illegal Southern Rhodesian régime. Those States which, in violation of the resolutions of the Organization to which they belonged, were acquiescing in the perpetuation of an inhuman policy because it served their interests had rightly drawn severe criticism from world public opinion.

11. The opposition to the policies of *apartheid* and racist repression within South Africa and the régime's increased isolation in international life were, nevertheless, encouraging elements and indicated that the struggle that had been undertaken had not been in

vain and should be pursued until all forms of *apartheid* were eliminated.

12. His delegation wished to point out that the Polish Government and people vigorously condemned *apartheid* as a crime against humanity and participated actively in international efforts to combat it. That position had been set out by his Government in a memorandum<sup>1</sup> prepared in application of the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2784 (XXVI); the memorandum said, *inter alia*, that Poland regarded it as its international duty to contribute to the efforts undertaken by the United Nations aimed at the speedy eradication of racism and to condemn in all international forums the policy of *apartheid*, a flagrant violation of human rights which was similar to nazi policies. Indeed, Poland, complying with the Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, did not maintain diplomatic, economic, cultural or other relations with the Pretoria régime or with the illegal racist régime in Southern Rhodesia. Taking a position of solidarity with the oppressed peoples, the Polish people had celebrated the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination with programmes of activities that included special lectures, meetings and discussions on *apartheid*, racial discrimination and colonial domination. Co-operation by the information media had made it possible to extend those activities beyond the large centres and to inform public opinion throughout the country. He also wished to point out that the competent authorities had decided to include in civic education programmes at the secondary level special courses dealing with the origins of *apartheid*, racism and racial discrimination and with ways and means of combating them and giving extensive information about the United Nations special committees that were responsible for those particular problems. Human Rights Day, which had been celebrated in Poland the previous December, had given the Polish people an opportunity to express its solidarity with those South Africans who opposed *apartheid* and with all people struggling for independence.

13. His country had always supported and was determined to continue to support any action aimed at the preparation of effective international instruments relating to crimes against humanity, particularly those which resulted from the policies of *apartheid*. It had ratified the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, and its initiative had led to the adoption of the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity, under which "inhuman acts resulting from the policy of *apartheid*" were classified as crimes against humanity. It unreservedly supported the draft convention on the suppression and punishment of the crime of *apartheid* submitted at the twenty-sixth session (see A/8768, annex I) by Guinea and the Soviet Union, considering that the adoption of such an instrument would make it possible to apply more effectively the provisions of the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration

of Human Rights and the two Conventions just referred to and would facilitate the implementation of the resolutions adopted by the United Nations against the policy of *apartheid*.

14. Mr. ZENKYAVICHUS (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stressed the importance of the question under consideration, the documentation on which had been supplemented by several representatives of African States in their statements. The policy of *apartheid*, which the world rejected and which the United Nations classified as a crime against humanity, was not only a racist policy but also a policy of exploitation of the non-whites of Africa, a manifestation of colonialism and imperialism directed against the national liberation movements of the African peoples and against the independent African States.

15. In its resolutions the United Nations had repeatedly stressed the fact that the situation in South Africa was a serious threat to international peace and security. There was nothing standing in the way of the Pretoria régime in its efforts, together with the Portuguese colonialists and the Southern Rhodesian racists, to dominate the non-white population and oppose the movements of independent African countries. Numerous acts of aggression had been committed by South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Portugal against Senegal, Guinea, the Congo, Zaire, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia. The colonialists were waging a war of extermination against the Africans of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). South Africa was continuing its illegal occupation of Namibia, which it had divided into a white area and black reservations, whose wealth it was plundering and in which it was building military installations, particularly in the north, with a view to conducting operations against Zambia and the United Republic of Tanzania.

16. The Pretoria régime was a threat directed against the African countries. During the past 10 years, South Africa's military budget had increased eightfold and its military equipment represented an expenditure of almost \$3,000 million. South Africa was acquiring missiles, had just completed an underground control centre for guided missiles in the northern part of the country and was trying to have nuclear weapons made available to it. Military blackmail and acts of aggression were accompanied by acts of economic war against Botswana, Swaziland and Lesotho.

17. The reason the South African Government disregarded United Nations resolutions was that it was secure in the moral, economic and military support that certain NATO countries, particularly the United Kingdom and the United States of America, were giving it because of their economic and strategic interests. The report of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* and the publications of the Unit on *Apartheid* showed how those countries, by participating in the economic life of South Africa, were promoting *apartheid*. The General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on economic sanctions and the arms embargo had been violated, and South Africa's trade had increased.

<sup>1</sup> See document E/CN.4/1093/Add.5 (mimeographed).

In April 1972 the Defence Minister of South Africa had even boasted that that country's requests for arms were being more favourably received by the Western countries. Imperialism was trying to hold on to its last bastion in Africa. The racist régime in South Africa was defying the independent African States and attempting to thwart the national liberation movements of the African peoples both by direct action and by diversionary manoeuvres which, by hinting at the possibility of a plebiscite, liberalization of racist measures and a dialogue, had the effect of lulling the vigilance of the peoples and dividing the anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist effort.

18. The statements made by the representatives of African States who had already spoken in the General Assembly or the Committee showed how concerned the African countries were at the situation created by South Africa's policy of *apartheid* and reflected their determination to put an end to colonialism and *apartheid*. For its part, the Soviet Union strongly condemned the racist and colonialist régimes of Africa and those who gave them assistance. It had always pursued a policy aimed at the complete elimination of colonialism, racism and *apartheid*, a policy based on Leninism and the principles of freedom and equality of peoples. Since its founding, it had shown the spiritual unity that could exist among dozens of nations and nationalities if there was confidence, equality and fidelity to the principle of international brotherhood. It had deep sympathy for peoples struggling for independence. It supported the African countries which were demanding effective action to eliminate the consequences of colonialism and racism as well as *apartheid*. It called for the unconditional implementation of the Security Council and General Assembly resolutions designed to put an end to *apartheid* and the occupation of Namibia. Action under the provisions of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter would surely be an effective means of proceeding against South Africa, Portugal and Southern Rhodesia.

19. Finally, he recalled that at the twenty-sixth session his country had, together with Guinea, submitted a draft convention on the punishment of the crime of *apartheid* (*ibid.*) which had been considered in the Third Committee and subsequently in the Commission on Human Rights and the Economic and Social Council. If, once its text was finalized, that draft convention could be adopted at the current session, it would undoubtedly serve the legitimate cause of the peoples of southern Africa, who were suffering under the racist yoke and struggling against *apartheid* to win their freedom.

20. Mr. BABAA (Libyan Arab Republic) expressed regret at the fact that, despite the efforts made by the United Nations to put an end to South Africa's policy of *apartheid*, the situation was continuing to deteriorate. It was distressing that 16 million human beings should be subjected to the most humiliating treatment because of the colour of their skin. Having failed both to induce the Pretoria régime to change its policy and to take

effective measures, the United Nations was running the risk of becoming a mere debating society.

21. *Apartheid*, which had been recognized by the international community as a crime against humanity, had been extended to Namibia and Southern Rhodesia. *Apartheid* was not merely a matter of human rights; its other aspects—colonial, political, economic and humanitarian—could not be dissociated from it, and in order to combat *apartheid* it was necessary to tackle the situation as a whole. The colonial system in southern Africa was unique in that there the colonialists wished to settle permanently on lands which were not theirs by adopting measures which they considered necessary to guarantee their survival and which were more brutal than those employed by traditional colonialism.

22. The reason that South Africa and Southern Rhodesia applied the same discriminatory practices as were adopted in Palestine was that in those two cases such practices were the manifestation of the same settler colonialism. There were striking similarities between *apartheid* and the racist policy of the Zionists in Palestine. There were the same racial policies, the same herding of the indigenous populations into reservations, the same dependence on assistance from the industrialized States, the same refusal to abide by United Nations resolutions, the same disregard of the aspirations of the indigenous populations and the same attempt to expand their influence in the developing countries through neo-colonialist policies.

23. The commercial and military links between Zionists in Palestine and South Africa had increased considerably. Tel Aviv's exports to South Africa had multiplied tenfold since 1960. In exchange for tanks, Israel exported to South Africa machine-guns, missiles, turbo-jet engines and aircraft designed for anti-guerilla operations.

24. The rights of non-whites in South Africa and of Palestinians in Palestine were sacrificed to the interests of a dominant settler group. The South African policy had been oriented towards forcing Africans off the land and forcing them into the labour market as fuel for South Africa's economic growth. *The New York Times* had described that situation in an article on 15 January 1971.

25. The massacres at Deir Yassim in 1948 and at Sharpeville in 1960 had convinced the indigenous populations of South Africa and Palestine that only by waging a total war could they restore their inalienable rights.

26. His delegation thanked Mr. Farah for his dedicated service as Chairman of the Special Committee on *Apartheid*. It supported the recommendation that a joint meeting should be held by the Special Committee on *Apartheid*, the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the United Nations



Council for Namibia to consider the application of the Bantustan policy in Namibia. It also agreed with the Special Committee on *Apartheid* on the necessity of studying the strategic and other links between certain Powers and South Africa. Lastly, it supported the idea of convening an international conference of non-governmental organizations on action to eliminate *apartheid*. However, his delegation did not agree with Mr. Farah that it was feasible to replace the existing bodies by a single committee on southern Africa. It would be preferable to increase co-ordination and co-operation between those bodies.

27. In order to inform the Committee of the measures adopted by the OAU Council of Foreign Ministers, meeting at Rabat in June 1972, he read out the operative paragraphs of the relevant resolution adopted by the Council (see A/8722, para. 159).

28. The Libyan Arab Republic condemned *apartheid* and had no relations whatsoever with South Africa. It gave moral and material support to the national liberation movements in southern Africa which were fighting for self-determination, freedom and equality. Unless Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter was applied, the Organization's resolutions would remain dead letters. The Libyan Arab Republic had learnt from experience that only through armed struggle could usurped rights be restored.

29. Mr. GONZALEZ (Chile) said that, true to the principle of liberty and equal rights for all human beings, the revolutionary democratic people's Government of Chile strongly condemned, as it had always done, the criminal practices of *apartheid* and racial discrimination and reiterated its solidarity with the peoples of South Africa and Namibia, whose legitimate right to rebel it recognized, as well as with all peoples fighting to free themselves from colonial exploitation, neo-colonialism and racism. The colonialist and racist régimes, the existence of which was contrary to the principles of the United Nations Charter and of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, must be rapidly and finally eliminated through more effective action by both the General Assembly and the Security Council against the practices of racism and *apartheid*. Chile has always supported all General Assembly and Security Council resolutions designed to put an end to the South African Government's policies of racial discrimination and *apartheid*. In particular, in circular 981 of the Banco Central, dated 6 May 1968, which prohibited trade with South Africa, Chile has implemented the Council's resolutions prohibiting the sale and dispatch of arms and war matériel to South Africa and the General Assembly resolutions calling upon States to desist from investing in South Africa and from granting loans to the South African Government or South African enterprises.

30. In accordance with the resolutions and recommendations of the General Assembly and the anti-colonialist and anti-racist spirit of the Chilean people, the workers' and peasants' organizations, progressive

political parties, trade unions, sporting clubs, community organizations, young people, universities and other social organizations in Chile had launched active campaigns to publicize the crimes of *apartheid* and to promote solidarity with the struggle of the peoples of southern Africa. In its own fight for independence and sovereignty and for complete economic, social and political emancipation, the Chilean people had been inspired by the heroic example of freedom fighters throughout the world, and in particular by the African patriots. That was why Chile considered that both moral and material support must be given to the just struggle of the African peoples for their national freedom and independence. In that connexion, a tribute should be paid to the great contribution made by OAU to the co-ordination and organization of international solidarity and by the socialist community to the fight for emancipation.

31. Chile vehemently protested against the military and economic aid given to South Africa by some Powers which voted against *apartheid*. His country was closely associated with the movement of the non-aligned countries, which constituted a very large proportion of the States Members of the United Nations, and it strongly supported their resolutions, in particular the Manifesto on Southern Africa, signed at Lusaka in 1969,<sup>2</sup> and the Georgetown Declaration of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, signed in August 1972, which made proposals for action within the framework of solidarity with freedom fighters and condemned the Western Powers assisting the colonial and racist régimes. The participants in the Georgetown Conference had agreed to maintain close collaboration during the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly, with a view to achieving the objectives of totally eliminating colonialism and racism and their consequences. They had also resolved to work to strengthen the activities of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Special Committee on *Apartheid* and the United Nations Council for Namibia and to make every endeavour to ensure that all questions relating to the struggle against colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism were retained as priority items on the agenda of the General Assembly, until an end had been put to all their manifestations.

32. The South African Government had gone too far in applying its policies of *apartheid* against the peoples of southern Africa in violation of the Charter and of United Nations resolutions. The report of the Special Committee showed the threat that that policy represented to international peace and security, the constant flouting of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions by the Western Powers which supplied arms to the South African Government and co-operated with it both militarily and economically, the intensification of racist policies through repression and torture

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

and the extension of those Fascist policies to illegally occupied Namibia.

33. In spite of the contacts established between the South African Government and the Secretary-General through his representative, that Government was fragmenting Namibia, confining its inhabitants in Bantustans, imprisoning their leaders, persecuting the strikers who revolted against the exploitation of imperialistic foreign companies and speaking of independence and self-determination as meaning simply the strengthening of the abominable system of *apartheid*.

34. The time had come to take specific measures to bring about the elimination of that scourge once for all. The General Assembly had taken the view that action under Chapter VII of the Charter was essential in order to force South Africa to change its policies. In the view of his delegation, the fact that meagre results had been obtained so far was due not to an abstract United Nations, distinct from the States which composed it, but to the attitude of those Member States themselves. In general, the survival of the Organization depended primarily on the political will of Member States to fight for peace and justice and for the social development of peoples. His delegation therefore condemned the attitude of certain Western Powers and of organizations such as NATO towards the resolutions imposing an arms embargo and it also condemned those who allowed greed of certain enterprises for commercial gain to take priority over the interests of mankind in its struggle for peace, justice and human rights. All Member States had an inescapable duty to observe to the letter, both in theory and in practice, the resolutions of the United Nations.

35. His delegation agreed with the former Chairman of the Special Committee that the problem of *apartheid* could not be dissociated from the situation existing in Namibia, Southern Rhodesia and the Territories occupied by Portugal. The suggestion of a single commission for southern Africa therefore seemed interesting. Furthermore, co-ordination should be improved between United Nations bodies dealing with the problems of southern Africa, and all necessary measures should be taken to ensure even wider dissemination to the public throughout the world of information relating to those problems. His delegation also supported the proposal for a draft convention on the suppression and punishment of the crime of *apartheid*.

*Mr. Zahawie (Iraq), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

36. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that, by continuing to pursue the policy of *apartheid*, the South African Government was defying the United Nations and world public opinion and threatening international peace and security. Turning a deaf ear to the many resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council since 1946, when India had raised the question of racial discrimination in South Africa, that country was intensifying its repressive measures in order to maintain its privileged position, depriving the indigenous people of South Africa not only of the fruits of

their labour but of their most elementary human rights and, through the implementation of the Bantustan scheme, uprooting millions of South Africans and dispossessing them of their lands. That policy enabled the whites, who accounted for only 19 per cent of the population, to enjoy 74 per cent of the national income while the unemployment figure for non-whites was 1.3 million.

37. South Africa could persist in its defiant attitude only because it was sustained and encouraged by its NATO friends, who had strengthened their economic collaboration with that country by increasing the volume of their trade and the amount of their investments. Not all countries had severed diplomatic and economic relations with South Africa; among those that had not were some of the permanent members of the Security Council, which continued to sell arms to South Africa in contravention of the Council's resolutions on arms embargo. His Government was extremely concerned at the fact that South Africa was purchasing guided missiles and offensive weapons and was manufacturing its own arms. Countries which enabled South Africa to increase its military potential were contributing directly to the perpetuation of *apartheid* in southern Africa. The argument advanced by some of South Africa's trading partners that increased investment in that country weakened *apartheid* was refuted by the fact that the expanding economy of South Africa during the past decade had only widened the gap between whites and non-whites and had in no way lessened the severity of the policies of *apartheid*. It could scarcely be otherwise, since the considerable profits that attracted foreign investors to South Africa were generated precisely by *apartheid*, which was essentially a set of laws and control mechanisms for the maintenance of cheap labour.

38. In the struggle against *apartheid*, there could be neither half measures nor compromises. South Africa's call for dialogue was unacceptable, and both the Heads of State and Government participating in the ninth session of the OAU Assembly at Rabat and the Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned countries attending the Georgetown Conference had affirmed their resolve to give unlimited and unreserved support to the oppressed peoples of southern Africa.

39. His delegation had noted with satisfaction the active role played by non-governmental organizations in the international campaign against *apartheid* and would welcome greater co-operation between those organizations and relevant United Nations bodies. It therefore supported the suggestion of holding a conference of non-governmental organizations to consider a concerted plan of action to combat racism and eradicate *apartheid*. The holding of an international conference of trade unions at Geneva in 1973 under the sponsorship of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* and the ILO to draw up a programme of action against the evil practices of *apartheid* in South Africa was an extremely positive step, that should be carefully prepared. He also wished to recall that OAU was organizing the International Conference of Experts for the

Support of Victims of Colonialism and *Apartheid* in Southern Africa at Oslo in May 1973. It would be well for the Special Committee to establish closer co-operation with OAU in order jointly to promote further campaigns against *apartheid*. In order to counter the increasingly close collaboration between the racist régimes of South Africa, Portugal and Southern Rhodesia, it would be appropriate for the various United Nations organs dealing with the questions of colonialism, racism and *apartheid* in the whole of southern Africa to co-ordinate their activities.

40. His delegation attached the greatest importance to the adoption of an international instrument for the suppression and punishment of the crime of *apartheid*, which would lay the legal basis for the wide international campaign against *apartheid*.

41. He would conclude by quoting from the statement made by Mr. Muller, Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa, on 29 September before the General Assembly (2046th plenary meeting) to the effect that the United Nations must be consistent and could not shirk its duty and discard its Charter in regard to terrorism. But if the Charter meant anything to Mr. Muller, it was he who should be asked to be consistent and abide by the resolutions of the United Nations; his refusal to put an end to the systematic brutal terrorism inflicted on millions of Africans justified the attitude of the international community, which had decided to hold in check the inhumanity and injustice inherent in the system of *apartheid*.

*The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.*