

## 968th meeting

Wednesday, 29 October 1975, at 3.15 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Roberto MARTINEZ ORDOÑEZ (Honduras).

A/SPC/SR.968

### AGENDA ITEM 53

**Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa (continued)** (A/10050-S/11638, A/10052-S/11641, A/10103-S/11708, A/SPC/174, A/SPC/L.327, A/SPC/L.328):

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

### GENERAL DEBATE (concluded)

1. Mr. WOLF (Austria) said that as a sponsor of the two draft resolutions on the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa (A/SPC/L.324 and A/SPC/L.325), which had been adopted by consensus at the 960th meeting, his delegation welcomed the fact that condemnation of *apartheid* in all its forms was now world-wide. It also was pleased that the activities of the United Nations had, in one form or another, had an effect on world public opinion and had thus played an important role in overcoming that policy. The importance of that process should be seen in the context of the significant developments which had occurred recently on the African continent, developments which would undoubtedly have a positive influence on the situation prevailing in South Africa and Namibia. He hoped therefore that the Government of South Africa would adopt policies conducive to peaceful change. Furthermore, the new situation would be an encouragement to those who were directly involved in the struggle for political freedom and equality and to the Special Committee against *Apartheid* in its commendable work.
2. In 1975, Austria's contribution to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa had been increased by more than 100 per cent in comparison with its 1974 contribution. His Government would also increase its 1976 contribution by 5 per cent and would continue to support the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa.
3. His delegation shared the view that the struggle for political freedom in South Africa was not the concern of Governments alone. The public at large, non-governmental organizations and especially trade unions must also play a substantial role in efforts to influence Government policies directly. His Government had always firmly and unequivocally rejected any policy based on human inequality. No one could fail to recognize that human dignity was indivisible and must be defended by all. He therefore appealed to the South African authorities to put an end to their sinister policy of *apartheid* before it was too late. The granting of amnesty to political prisoners would be a first step in that direction.
4. Mr. SERUP (Denmark) said that the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* (A/10022) was wider in scope than in previous years and demonstrated more clearly than ever the world-wide activities of the Committee in its struggle against the system of *apartheid*. The Special Committee had concluded that Vorster was continuing his attempts to perpetuate the white-minority rule in disregard of United Nations resolutions. Nevertheless, the events of the preceding year provided some grounds for hope, however remote, that the situation would improve. In that connexion, his delegation welcomed the advance of decolonization in southern Africa. The attainment of independence by Mozambique, Cape Verde, and Sao Tome and Principe, and also by Papua New Guinea—whose delegations he welcomed to the Committee—would undoubtedly stimulate the struggle against *apartheid* in South Africa. He expressed the hope that Angola would soon take its place among the independent nations of Africa.
5. As a result of those developments, South Africa now found itself at a cross-roads and had to choose between abandoning or pursuing its policy of *apartheid*. If it chose to do the latter, it ran the risk of creating a situation that would have consequences too terrible to contemplate.
6. The United Nations, for its part, must exert pressure on South Africa in accordance with the Charter. Denmark had repeatedly asserted that universally applied sanctions imposed by the Security Council were the most effective means of achieving a peaceful solution. It was of overriding importance therefore that all Member States should, as Denmark itself did, strictly comply with the arms embargo against South Africa.
7. In addition to political action, the international community must intensify its efforts in the humanitarian field, for repression was increasing. Denmark and the other Nordic countries were among the largest contributors to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa. In 1975, Denmark had contributed approximately \$284,000 and it hoped that all Member States would make generous contributions. Similarly, it trusted that the resolutions concerning *apartheid* would receive the widest possible support.
8. Mr. TOWO-ATANGANA (United Republic of Cameroon) said that the problem of *apartheid* was a matter of deep concern to his country, not only because of the intolerable suffering endured by millions of people in Azania but also because the international community seemed incapable of wiping out a doctrine identical with that which had caused such misfortune to mankind some 30 years ago. *Apartheid* was a successor to Hitler's nazism, and its authors did not even take the trouble to deny it. Consequently, the international community had con-

demned *apartheid* and proclaimed that it was a crime against humanity. However, one might wonder what had been the result of that condemnation. The Special Committee against *Apartheid* provided extremely valuable data in its report.

9. The report, *inter alia*, confirmed that there were many Governments, non-governmental organizations and trade-union federations which continued to oppose the shameful Pretoria régime. Thanks to their efforts, Vorster's representatives had been expelled from the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth Session despite the misuse of the veto by some major Powers in the Security Council.

10. The South African Government was now almost totally isolated. In Azania itself, the freedom fighters continued to organize, and around Azania the safety belt provided by the Portuguese colonies had disappeared. Faced with that new situation, the Vorster régime was becoming increasingly fierce and, instead of opening negotiations with the liberation movements, was redoubling its manoeuvres. It even claimed to be urging Ian Smith to act with moderation while providing him with all the economic and military means to persist in his obstinacy. In fact, the sole purpose of Vorster's so-called "détente" was to sow confusion and division among the African States.

11. Consequently, the situation in southern Africa had become increasingly explosive in view of the indifference and virtual complicity of those who, under the Charter of the United Nations, had special responsibilities with regard to the maintenance of international peace and security. Perhaps the countries which, a year earlier in the Security Council, had asked that South Africa be given time to modify its policy now realized that all Vorster's promises had been empty. The changes which had been made in the *apartheid* policy were not only very slight but were designed to strengthen white domination. The best example of that was the so-called consultations with the black population.

12. In fact, the black "leaders" with whom the South African régime had announced with much fanfare that it was going to open negotiations had turned out to be the puppet leaders of the "bantustans", appointed by the régime itself. Similarly, the sole purpose of granting autonomy and even independence to a few "bantustans" was to perpetuate the existing situation under which the white minority occupied four fifths of the rich land of Azania.

13. For those reasons, the United Republic of Cameroon had always tried to avoid doing anything that might help to maintain that oppressive system. It had no relations of any kind with the racist régime and had forbidden aircraft flying to or from South Africa to pass over its territory. It had difficulty in understanding how other Governments could take an attitude towards South Africa that was diametrically opposed to the statements they made in international debates. Some even went so far as to cynically justify their collaboration with Pretoria on the grounds of economic necessity. In addition, he rejected the subterfuges of those who justified their own immoralities by citing those of their neighbours. The massive economic and military assistance which the Western Powers gave to the

white minority in Pretoria could not be justified by referring to the maintenance of trade relations with South Africa by some countries, including African countries. It was no accident that South Africa was part of the so-called defence system of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), nor was it a coincidence that those who, in the Security Council, called for an economic embargo against Pretoria came up against a wall of vetoes. He did not wish to condemn anyone but felt that the responsibilities of some Powers were a decisive factor in the persistence of *apartheid* in South Africa. He therefore appealed to the friendly Governments of Japan, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United States of America and the United Kingdom not to continue to ignore the lessons of history. History had shown that the march of peoples towards freedom and dignity was irreversible. The peoples of Azania and Namibia would not be an exception.

14. Mr. BHATIA (India), introducing draft resolution A/SPC/L.328 on *apartheid* in sports, recalled that the General Assembly in its resolution 2775 D (XXVI) had declared its unqualified support of the Olympic principle that no discrimination should be allowed. He was pleased to see that many countries had acted upon that resolution. For example, Mexico had refused to play against the South African team in the Davis Cup tournament, Australia had cancelled its cricket tour of South Africa, New Zealand had reaffirmed its opposition to sports exchanges with South Africa, and other countries such as Canada, Guyana, Malaysia, Pakistan, Trinidad and Tobago and Japan had taken similar action, as described in the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. India, for its part, also had no relations of any kind with South Africa.

15. Nevertheless, he expressed regret that the Davis Cup Nations Committee, meeting in London in July 1975, had rejected by 24 votes to 22 a motion by Australia to expel South Africa. He hoped that those who continued to permit participation by South African teams in sports events would realize the need for concerted international action on the matter.

16. Meanwhile, the South African authorities were resorting to all kinds of manoeuvres in order to gain acceptance in international sports events and had included a few non-whites in their teams, which they now called "multinational". The non-racial sports federations in South Africa had themselves rejected those manoeuvres. He therefore hoped that the international community would not let itself be deceived.

17. He read out the text of the operative part of the draft resolution and said that the delegations of Chad, the Congo, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Honduras, Ireland, Mauritania, Mauritius, Qatar, Togo, Uganda and the United Republic of Cameroon had joined the sponsors. Finally, he expressed the hope that the draft resolution would win the Committee's approval.

18. The CHAIRMAN announced that Honduras had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.327.

19. Mr. RENS (Belgium), speaking on behalf of his own delegation and those of Luxembourg and the Netherlands, said that, acting upon instructions from their Governments,

they had submitted some amendments<sup>1</sup> to draft resolution A/SPC/L.327, concerning the “bantustans”, which they considered necessary if the draft resolution was to be adopted by consensus.

20. Thus, the third preambular paragraph would be replaced by the following:

“*Reaffirming* the legitimacy of the struggle in South Africa, irrespective of race, colour and creed, for the total eradication of *apartheid* and any form of racial discrimination”.

21. In order to emphasize that the South African régime and it alone was responsible for the situation prevailing in that country, he proposed the addition of an operative paragraph 4 reading as follows:

“*Calls on* the Government of the Republic of South Africa to cease all efforts to establish “bantustans” and to conform to the principles expressed in the Charter of the United Nations”.

22. He hoped that his initiative would be viewed as a constructive act and that it would receive general support. He would like the Committee to wait 24 hours before taking a decision on the amendments.

23. Mr. AMISSAH (Ghana) pointed to the artificiality of the system prevailing in South Africa and added that, however intense the oppression and repression might be, they would never succeed in depriving the non-white majority of its freedom, dignity and human identity.

24. Some of the previous speakers had attempted to explain away certain actions which his Government believed had contributed to the maintenance and perpetuation of *apartheid*. Those attempts had been made by certain trading partners and military allies of South Africa, mostly Western countries, and also Japan. In some of those statements, his delegation had discerned elements of paternalism, hypocrisy and insensitivity. Paternalism, because those countries seemed to be telling the African countries that they must not be too insistent, since they were being given money and other forms of assistance, which, they said, depended largely on their continuing to trade with South Africa. They also pointed out that the situation in South Africa was delicate, that it was essential to proceed with moderation, that changes had taken place and that *apartheid* would disappear one day. They pointed out, in particular, that the use of force would not help to solve the problem. Hypocrisy, because those countries distorted history when they said that recourse to force had never produced results. History provided abundant evidence that the use of force had been inevitable in order to effect positive changes in society and that the much-vaunted Western standards of democracy and freedom had cost many lives. Furthermore, the European colonial régimes had succeeded in establishing themselves in many areas of the world, particularly Asia and Africa, through the use of violent force, but on the pretext of imposing civilization and Christianity. At the Brussels Conference in 1876 and at the Berlin Conference of 1884-1885, King Leopold II

and his henchmen had put a seal on the European partition and exploitation of Africa. King Leopold had become a promoter and an exploiter of forced labour in the Congo region, which had been his possession. At the same time, in other areas of Africa, the European settlers had begun the exploitation of mines and had seized the most fertile and desirable agricultural lands. The Africans, overwhelmed and enslaved by the force of arms, had been compelled to work for miserable wages.

25. It was clear that those historical facts had not induced Europe to change its attitude towards Africa, since the plunder and pillage were continuing. The system of *apartheid* in South Africa, installed by the white minority with the assistance of the United Kingdom, combined elements of colonialism, slavery and serfdom. The system was being supported and perpetuated by the economic and military links between South Africa and her Western friends and Japan. Some tried to rationalize those relations by asserting that any break in them would aggravate the situation of the black majority; they seemed to overlook the fact that the blacks were only a peripheral force in the economic set-up and that the only real beneficiaries of the system were the whites.

26. The activities of the Western European countries left no room for doubt regarding their true intentions. A book entitled *White Media and Black Britain*, published in London, stated that British capitalist interests in southern Africa were strong and that British newspapers, television and radio were fostering a racist society in the United Kingdom and were prone to accept *apartheid* as less horrifying than nazism because it was directed against blacks. The Deputy Foreign Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany had said that South Africa was far too important a trading partner for his country to break off economic relations with it. He himself was convinced that the maintenance of economic relations with South Africa was dictated by the huge profits accruing mainly as a result of the exploitation of the cheap labour source which the black population constituted and not for altruistic reasons. In recent years, some Western countries, particularly the United States of America, the United Kingdom and France, had adopted a nonchalant attitude towards the problems caused by South Africa's *apartheid* system. It was frustrating to note, that, after years of exploitation, the former colonial Powers—the United Kingdom and France—had turned their backs on their former African colonies. In their use of the veto, in their general voting pattern and in their approach to African problems, they demonstrated that their interests in Africa had ended with the end of the colonial era.

27. The statement by the United States representative at the 963rd meeting had not been sufficiently forceful to exert pressure on the Government of South Africa. The “contacts” which the United States maintained with all members of the South African population were, in his opinion, contacts with persons approved of by the racist régime and not with any leader of the liberation movements or with genuine opponents of the system. The United States, more than any other country, had the capacity, the resources and the influence to promote fundamental and acceptable changes in South Africa. However, its interest in South Africa was primarily economic and military, and it

<sup>1</sup> Subsequently circulated as document A/SPC/L.329.

had refused, on flimsy pretexts, to establish contacts with genuine African leaders, including heads of State. The United States, which was the principal advocate of the principles of freedom and human rights and which, moreover, had a large black population of African descent, should adopt a position in accordance with those principles.

28. He pointed out that another disturbing aspect of the relations between South Africa and its Western allies was the increase in military and other ties which could transform South Africa into a military threat to the rest of Africa. The United States decision to build a naval base in the Indian Ocean, on the island of Diego Garcia, was disturbing because it could lead to an arms race in the area. Project *Advokaat*, under which the NATO defence code had been made available to the Pretoria régime for the codification of the equipment and spares of the project, was also a matter for some concern. He reiterated the dangers inherent in military collaboration between South Africa and NATO, and expressed the hope that the members of the Western military alliance would heed the appeal made to them to reconsider their attitude. Equally disturbing to the African Governments was the fact that South Africa, with the unofficial assistance of the Federal Republic of Germany, had been able to acquire a nuclear capability. He called on the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany and those of the countries of the other foreign companies involved in bidding for the supply of nuclear reactors to South Africa to prevent those companies from participating in the transaction.

29. The attainment of independence and sovereign statehood by Mozambique, Cape Verde, and Sao Tome and Principe could occasion a renewed attempt on the part of the Western alliance to fortify South Africa with the aim of reversing the decolonization process. However, history had shown that a people's desire for freedom and dignity could not be vanquished. The insidious and beguiling nature of Vorster's proposals for "détente" and "dialogue" was quite clear. A number of Western countries had hypocritically accepted that propaganda, but his delegation was more disturbed by the fact that a few African countries, ignoring the sufferings of the black population in South Africa, without regard for their national pride, and against the highest principles of morality, had accepted South Africa's offer of economic and other assistance and, therefore, its friendship. Even the most abject poverty could not justify such behaviour. He therefore appealed to those African countries to return any amount they might have received from South Africa and to sever relations with the racist régime.

30. His delegation deemed it a duty to expose the evils of *apartheid*, but that should not be regarded as preparing the ground for a confrontation between Africa and Western Europe. His delegation also considered it essential to strengthen the capabilities of the United Nations to make it a more effective body, in order to avoid the application of a double standard which clearly suggested insensitivity towards problems involving the black man. The situation in South Africa could explode at any moment. Africa did not need more violence; it needed peace to build itself, and it was essential that all should help to achieve a peaceful solution to the continent's problems.

31. He expressed gratitude to New Zealand, Australia and Canada for their assistance in the rehabilitation of the victims of *apartheid* and expressed the hope that other countries would follow their example. He reiterated his country's support for the imprisoned political leaders and paid a tribute to those who had sacrificed their lives in the struggle against oppression. He reaffirmed his country's commitment to continue the struggle which had been begun so that those sacrifices would not have been in vain.

32. Mr. KIDANE MARIAM (Ethiopia) said that South Africa continued to defy General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and, while endeavouring to convince the world that it was carrying out a process of liberalization, it was increasing its military power, aided and abetted by its generous suppliers, in order to reinforce and perpetuate *apartheid*.

33. As had been said by His Excellency Brigadier-General Teferi Bante at the twelfth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU, which was held at Kampala from 28 July to 1 August 1975, South Africa was the buttress of colonial resistance in southern Africa, and Zimbabwe and Namibia were its outer defences. South Africa's strategy seemed to lie in giving signals that it would be prepared to make concessions regarding Zimbabwe and Namibia if it were allowed to maintain its racist policies in South Africa. Independent Africa should make it clear to South Africa that the inalienable national rights of the South African people could not be bargained away for meaningless concessions in Zimbabwe and Namibia.

34. South Africa was intensifying its propaganda in order to gain its ends, but it would deceive nobody in attempting to present *apartheid* as a humane system designed to enhance the welfare and preserve the culture of the African people. *Apartheid* was none other than a system for the exploitation of the non-white population through the mechanism of discriminatory laws.

35. The United Nations should bring about the total eradication of *apartheid* as soon as possible. The objectives of the Decade for Action To Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination should not remain empty words. The United Nations must go to the assistance of the non-white population of South Africa and enable it to recover its human dignity and fundamental freedoms. To do that, concerted action against *apartheid* must be stepped up. The General Assembly, in its resolution 3324 B (XXIX), had already asked the Security Council to take action under Chapter VII of the Charter, and it was disappointing that the Security Council had failed to apply the numerous resolutions of the Assembly against South Africa.

36. The measures proposed by the Special Committee against *Apartheid* in chapter II of its report and, in particular, the embargo on the supply of petroleum and petroleum products and other raw materials, could be effective in the struggle against *apartheid*.

37. Mr. HOUNGAVU (Dahomey) said that the prime objective of independent Africa, as of all peoples who loved peace and justice, was the complete elimination of *apartheid* and the transfer of political power to the oppressed people of South Africa. There had been universal denun-

ciation of *apartheid*, the racist system and official political doctrine of South Africa, as a grave affront to the non-white citizen, a crime against humanity and a challenge to the United Nations.

38. Although the measures taken by the United Nations had brought about an increasing isolation of the South African régime in the diplomatic field, there had been little actual change in the racist policies. The Pretoria régime had been able to stay in power thanks to the military and financial assistance of international imperialism, led by the United States of America, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany, and France. But that shameful policy was doomed to failure because of the inherent contradictions which would destroy the fabric of *apartheid*. The close co-operation in all spheres between imperialism, zionism and *apartheid* was self-evident. The imperialist transnational corporations, lured by easy profits, continued to invest money in South Africa and to exploit the South African people.

39. The imperialist Powers who were helping Vorster should wake up to the new situation in southern Africa and see that Vorster and his racist clique came to their senses before it was too late. Otherwise the South African freedom fighters, supported by independent Africa and by all justice-loving peoples, would be forced to take up arms.

40. The policy of “détente” advocated by Vorster and his allies was a trick to sow confusion among African States and to perpetuate the racist régime in South Africa. The policy of “bantustans” was another farce which would not deceive the international community. United Africa must frustrate those policies by its determination to struggle against *apartheid* until it was completely eliminated.

41. Combat should be engaged against all racist régimes, whether they were called *apartheid* or zionism, if the world was to progress. All friends of Africa who were continuing to maintain any kind of relations with the *apartheid* régime should break off those relations and unreservedly support the African cause as an essential condition for the solidarity of the peoples of the African continent.

42. Those countries and peoples which supported the struggle against *apartheid* must intensify their efforts to fight against Vorster until racism in all its forms had been eliminated.

43. His delegation had faith that the oppressed people of South Africa, united and mobilized for action, would finally triumph over *apartheid*.

44. Mr. DE LATAILLADE (France) said that throughout the many years during which the question of *apartheid* had been discussed, France had repeatedly recorded its total opposition to that doctrine, which went against its concept of humanity. His delegation had never accepted and never would accept the system of *apartheid*, which must be condemned as quite intolerable, and the minor modifications recently made would not change that opinion, which was held by France and by all Frenchmen. He was steadfast in disapproval because he thought that moral condemnation still had an effect and because France had taken part in the drawing up of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In that spirit, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of France, in his statement to the General Assembly

at the current session (2364th plenary meeting), had said that the President of France had placed the strictest limits on the policy of selling armaments to South Africa. On 9 August 1975, in the Republic of Zaire, the Head of the French State had amplified and confirmed the declaration contained in his message of 30 May 1974 to the French Parliament, to which the French delegation had referred in its statement in the Special Political Committee in November 1974 (940th meeting). New restrictions had been placed on the sale of armaments to the authorities in Pretoria. All new sales of land and air weapons to South Africa were prohibited and future arms sales would be limited to naval equipment excluding river craft and landing craft. That could not be seriously regarded as a threat to the countries and peoples of Africa.

45. Mr. VON UTHMANN (Federal Republic of Germany), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, referred to the statement of the representative of Ghana who had spoken of military collaboration between the Federal Republic of Germany and South Africa, particularly in nuclear technology. As the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany had stated in the Special Political Committee, at its 961st meeting, there was no military co-operation between the Federal Republic of Germany and South Africa. In 1963, long before the Federal Republic of Germany had become a Member of the United Nations, the Government had imposed an embargo on the supply of arms, ammunition, military vehicles and so on, and had said that it would not co-operate with South Africa in any way. The position of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany regarding the sale of armaments was much more restrictive than that of any other arms-producing country. The same principles applied to co-operation in nuclear technology. Ever since its formation, the Federal Republic of Germany had eschewed the production of nuclear weapons. It had ratified the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and took its obligations thereunder seriously. Nuclear power stations were being built in conformity with the safeguards of IAEA, which was concerned to see that such installations were not used for military purposes.

46. A company in the Federal Republic of Germany had submitted a bid in response to an international call for tenders for the construction of a nuclear power station in South Africa. Nuclear power stations were gradually replacing the traditional coal-fired or oil-fired power stations and there were 117 of them in 15 countries. They had no military application and, although his Government could understand the doubts of the African countries, the accusations of military co-operation between the Federal Republic of Germany and South Africa were totally without foundation.

#### *Organization of the Committee's work*

47. The CHAIRMAN said that the general debate on the item had thus been concluded and expressed the hope that at the meeting on Friday, 31 October, it would be possible to vote on the draft resolutions submitted by the group of non-aligned countries. The Committee would then begin its consideration of agenda item 50, on the effects of atomic radiation.

*The meeting rose at 5.05 p.m.*