

961st meeting

Tuesday, 21 October 1975, at 10.45 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Roberto MARTINEZ ORDOÑEZ (Honduras).

A/SPC/SR.961

AGENDA ITEM 53

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

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

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. BENUZZI (Italy) reaffirmed his delegation's total condemnation of *apartheid* both in theory and in practice.

2. Despite South Africa's promises to the United Nations to carry out reforms in the *apartheid* system, the unjust pattern of life in that country remained unchanged and a wave of harsh repression had been unleashed on the non-white population and white liberals alike. After the régime's positive action with regard to the problem of Southern Rhodesia, such repression had come as a surprise and a disappointment.

3. Italy's position regarding *apartheid* was determined by its commitment to constitutional and democratic principles as well as to the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly. The imprisonment of thousands of human beings in South Africa for their political beliefs ranked among the tragedies of the contemporary era. His delegation sympathized with all political prisoners in South Africa and elsewhere.

4. His delegation noted with pleasure that the Special Committee against *Apartheid* had confined itself in its report (A/10022) to a consideration of facts and had refrained from imprecise allegations. However, while the report did mention the cancellation of sports events in Italy in which South African teams had been scheduled to participate, his delegation regretted that the report did not contain any mention of the recent closing of the immigration offices of the South African Government in Rome and Milan at the official request of the Italian Government. That important step reflected the decision of his Government to discourage emigration from Italy to South Africa. As a result of that decision, emigration had come to a halt except in isolated cases involving family reunions.

5. His delegation was also pleased to note the co-operation of Governments and non-governmental organizations with the Special Committee against *Apartheid* in the preceding year. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the European Economic Community in particular had co-operated with the Special Committee by providing it with information and clarifications on the occasion of the visit of its Chairman to Brussels in February 1975.

6. His Government complied fully with the voluntary arms embargo imposed against South Africa by the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. It hoped that the pressure brought to bear on the Government of South Africa by the international community would soon produce tangible results. The white population of South Africa must come to realize that it was in their own interests to abandon the practice of *apartheid*.

7. Baron VON WECHMAR (Federal Republic of Germany) said that there were three separate facets to the question of South Africa, namely, South Africa's relationship with Rhodesia, its continued illegal presence in Namibia and its policy of racial segregation.

8. Since the attainment of independence by the former Portuguese colonies, there had been some change in South Africa's attitude towards Rhodesia. It had been, for example, at the insistence of Prime Minister Vorster that talks had been initiated between Ian Smith and the African National Council. His Government regretted the temporary breakdown of those negotiations and had encouraged South Africa to use its influence, including compliance with economic sanctions, to persuade the Smith régime to resume negotiations.

9. Although there had been some change in the situation in Namibia during 1975, his Government did not consider the constitutional conference proposed by South Africa to be an appropriate way of bringing about Namibia's independence.

10. Within South Africa itself, there had been little if any progress. Despite the apparent willingness of Pretoria to eliminate the worst aspects of so-called "petty" *apartheid*, it had not moved one inch on the key issue of granting its black population the right to participate in political decisions. Instead, it adhered to its "bantustan" policy, which offered no real solution to the problem. His country's Foreign Minister had taken advantage of the recent visit to Bonn of his South African counterpart to point out that delaying tactics would not lead to the gradual acceptance of *apartheid* but to the radicalization of the black population and the growing isolation of South Africa from the rest of the world.

11. Those who urged the use of force as the answer to South Africa's intransigence were counselling a course which was not only dangerous and contrary to the Charter of the United Nations but also futile, given the existing balance of power in South Africa. Nor was a complete economic embargo the appropriate way to bring about internal change in South Africa. An economic boycott would adversely affect the black population by forcing the white minority into an attitude of defiance. The international community should instead seek to encourage the

economic development of the black population and strengthen its share in population and strengthen its share in political decision-making. Continuous contact, not isolation, was the way to promote the realization in Pretoria that harmonious coexistence with its African neighbours and genuine détente were possible only if South Africa abandoned its policy of racial segregation. The attempts of African statesmen to overcome the barrier of distrust had therefore won the respect and admiration of his delegation.

12. Referring to the frequent criticism of his country in the United Nations for its economic relations with South Africa, he pointed out that trade was essential not only to his own country, which had limited resources in raw materials, but also to the very survival of the ever-growing world population. Maximum growth could be achieved only through unrestricted trade, which should be separated from politics. In that connexion, he noted that a large number of African countries also maintained trade relations with South Africa. His Government was therefore not sacrificing the interests of the black population in South Africa to its own economic interests but, on the contrary, had constantly attempted to strike an equitable balance between the two so as to translate into practice its disapproval of *apartheid*. Thus, his Government had refrained from encouraging investments in South Africa by expressly excluding that country from all investment promotion schemes. It had repeatedly urged its companies operating in South Africa to set an example by paying equal wages to black and white workers. It had also discouraged sporting contacts with South African teams which had not been formed in accordance with the Olympic principle of non-intervention.

13. It was the firm and established policy of the Federal Republic not to supply any arms to South Africa. Even before its entry into the United Nations, the Federal Republic had, pursuant to resolutions of the Security Council, placed an embargo on the export of military materiel to South Africa and had refrained from all military co-operation with that country. His Government regulated the export of arms and military equipment more strictly than any other highly industrialized country with an arms industry of its own.

14. Despite his Government's good record with respect to regulating military exports to South Africa, certain publications of dubious origin, such as the pamphlet entitled *The Nuclear Conspiracy*, had recently given currency to distortions and misrepresentations regarding collaboration between the Federal Republic of Germany and South Africa in the fields of nuclear energy and uranium enrichment. In that connexion, he emphasized that his country had renounced the production of nuclear weapons and in 1975 had ratified the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Moreover, it made approval for the supply of nuclear power plants to foreign countries contingent upon satisfaction of IAEA safeguards ensuring that such plants would not be used for military purposes. He emphasized that there was no co-operation between the Federal Republic and South Africa in the field of uranium enrichment. While it was true that the West German company STEAG and the South African company UCOR had conducted a comparative study of the South African and West German uranium enrichment processes in order to evaluate their respective technical and economic advan-

tages, the South African company had concluded that its own process was more suitable. The West German process for uranium enrichment was not classified and was readily accessible in technical journals, which in itself proved that the process had no relevance for military applications.

15. As to other allegations, he emphasized that the object of the international tender in which a West German company was participating was the supply of a normal nuclear power plant of the type already in operation in 15 countries. Furthermore, no applications for an export permit had been filed yet with the authorities of the Federal Republic by the firm in question.

16. The struggle against *apartheid* was a matter of concern to all, not only to Africans. Confrontation between African and Western European countries would therefore only serve the purposes of the Pretoria Government and should be avoided. His delegation welcomed the fact that the Committee had already adopted by consensus resolutions on the South African political prisoners and on the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, to which his Government made a significant contribution.

17. Mr. KAPLLANI (Albania) said that the Committee's current debate on the policies of *apartheid* was taking place at a time when the struggle of the African peoples against colonialism was entering a decisive stage, as was demonstrated by the recent attainment of independence by the former Portuguese colonies. The peoples of Africa were strengthening their solidarity in the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination.

18. *Apartheid* was the ugliest and most shameful manifestation of racial discrimination and imperialist slavery. Racial discrimination was unfortunately not simply a phenomenon confined to past centuries when white colonizers, a sword in one hand and a cross in the other, had occupied the lands of America and Africa to establish their "civilized" rule over coloured populations; it lived on in the form of *apartheid* in southern Africa. The Fascist régimes in Pretoria and Salisbury were forcing the indigenous populations of Azania, Namibia and Zimbabwe to live under concentration camp conditions that were reminiscent of Hitler's rule.

19. The peoples of the world had condemned racism and *apartheid* and the United Nations had imposed economic and political sanctions against the Vorster and Smith régimes. The General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session had rejected the credentials of the South African delegation (resolution 3206 (XXIX)). Such steps demonstrated the universal condemnation of the Fascist Pretoria régime and its policies of *apartheid*.

20. The Vorster régime nevertheless continued to flout such measures and world public opinion. It was encouraged to behave in that manner by the economic, military and political support it received from the United States of America and other countries of the aggressive NATO bloc. Those countries had substantial economic, political and military interests in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, where they exploited both the abundant natural resources and the cheap labour of the indigenous population. They

regarded South Africa as an important strategic base from which to threaten the independence and freedom of African countries, as could be seen from the repeated provocations of the Pretoria racists against Zambia, the United Republic of Tanzania and other independent African countries.

21. It was not by chance that the United States imperialists who enforced discrimination against Negroes in their own country, were intensifying their collaboration with the racists of South Africa, nor did the close ties between the Israeli Zionists and the racists of South Africa come as any surprise.

22. The struggle of the peoples of Azania, Namibia and Zimbabwe was part and parcel of the struggle of all African peoples for national liberation against colonialism and neo-colonialism, racism and imperialist hegemony. Despite their diabolical tactics of "détente" and "dialogue", the white colonialists would succeed in deceiving only the naive. The imperialists, colonialists and neo-colonialists and their lackeys in southern Africa were doomed to failure because of the irresistible force of the African peoples' struggle. His Government supported and would continue to support that struggle for national liberation and independence and for the eradication of *apartheid* and racial discrimination.

23. Mr. KASINA (Kenya) said that the racist régime in South Africa had continued to treat United Nations appeals with contempt and had even intensified the brutality with which it enforced *apartheid*. The African in South Africa was subjected to all forms of oppression and degradation and was denied the most basic rights. Arrests and detentions of opponents of *apartheid* were continuing under the so-called "Sabotage Act" and the Terrorism Act.

24. The collapse of Portuguese colonialism had, however, brought profound political change to southern Africa. The racist régime had responded to that change by intensifying political repression and pursuing its tactic of establishing friendly relations with African countries so as to divert world attention from problems inside South Africa itself. His delegation, for its part, had consistently rejected the notion of dialogue with the Pretoria régime, since it would harm the struggle of the African people for self-determination and give the seal of recognition to the racist régime and vicious policies of *apartheid*. That régime should instead initiate a dialogue with the black majority population within its borders.

25. "Separate development" was another of the régime's slogans aimed at concealing its real intentions. The so-called "homelands" could not conceivably flourish as independent countries, since they were mere enclaves of unwanted land. Moreover, half of the African population did not live in the "homelands".

26. The racist régime had ignored more than 150 United Nations resolutions, since it was secure in the knowledge that it had commercial, military, diplomatic and cultural relations with many Member States. His delegation had noted that certain NATO countries were involved in the construction of a highly advanced military communications system known as Project *Advokaat*, which was to have its

headquarters in South Africa. His delegation strongly appealed to those countries to comply with the trade and military embargoes imposed by the United Nations against South Africa.

27. In view of the persistent refusal of the South African régime to comply with United Nations resolutions, the Organization had no alternative but to maintain and strengthen military, economic, political, cultural and sporting boycotts against that régime. The Security Council should, as recommended by the General Assembly in resolution 3224 B (XXIX), take action under Chapter VII of the Charter to ensure strict compliance by all States with the arms embargo. His delegation endorsed the recommendation of the Special Committee, in paragraph 210 of its report, that the trade embargo should be extended to cover petroleum and other raw materials. Finally, the international community should provide all necessary support to the liberation movements of South Africa in their legitimate struggle against oppression.

28. Mrs. BERMUDEZ (Cuba) said that the thirtieth anniversary of the United Nations was a fitting occasion to think about *apartheid*, one of the most persistent problems in the Organization's history. The *apartheid* policy of the racist Government of South Africa represented not only a system of racial discrimination but also a form of colonialism based on the Fascist oppression of blacks by a white minority which denied them their basic human, political, economic and social rights. It was an attempt by the whites to change the ethnic composition of the native population and destroy its territorial integrity and cultural heritage. It prevented the native population from exploiting its own natural resources. It legalized the unequal distribution of land and provided a cheap African labour force for the country's white economy. It meant permanent exclusion of the black majority from any political activity in the country. In pursuit of the same goals, the Pretoria régime was also accelerating the process of "bantustanization" in an effort to Balkanize the country and concentrate the largest and richest portion of it in the hands of the white minority. Resistance to such policies by the overwhelming majority of the South African people has been met by renewed and intensified repressive measures, including murder, imprisonment and torture.

29. Pretoria also had imperialist ambitions to extend its Fascist régime to Namibia, which it had been occupying illegally for decades. Its military aid to the illegal racist régime in Southern Rhodesia was in keeping with the same policy. That policy was receiving economic, financial, military and diplomatic support from the United States of America and other Western Powers in defiance of many United Nations resolutions. Increasing capital investment in South Africa and Namibia by the transnational corporations of those countries was adding to the economic potential for repression and aggression by the Vorster régime. The United States of America, the United Kingdom, France and other NATO members should be especially singled out for their contributions to South Africa's modern military establishment.

30. The condition of the peoples of southern Africa had remained the same for thirty years despite the categorical rejection of South Africa's racism and expansionism by the

great majority of States Members of the United Nations, as expressed in many resolutions. Although implementation of those resolutions had recently been frustrated when the United States of America, the United Kingdom and France had vetoed a Security Council resolution to expel South Africa from the United Nations, it could not be denied that the balance of power in Africa had been changing in a positive direction. The historic successes of the African national liberation movements, which had begun with the universal recognition of the legitimacy of armed struggle, the decision of the United Nations to give their representatives observer status and the liberation of the former Portuguese colonies, were all evidence of that and portended the eventual and inevitable triumph of the liberation forces in South Africa and Namibia. In addition, the Pretoria régime and its imperialist allies were becoming totally isolated as various international bodies and anti-apartheid movements all over the world voiced condemnation of the *apartheid* system as a crime against humanity.

31. She wished to warn, however, that an especially dangerous moment had arrived. The Vorster régime had changed its strategy and initiated an all-out diplomatic offensive marked by apparent concessions which in no way modified its racist doctrine. *Apartheid* was a more serious threat than ever to international peace and security. The international community should therefore not be deceived by diversionary manoeuvres and should not agree to compromises or so-called dialogues with the racist régime. It must instead maintain and strengthen an economic, political, cultural and sports boycott until the South African system was completely destroyed. In her country, whites and blacks had joined in the struggle of oppressed peoples everywhere, whether they be South Africans, Namibians, Palestinians or Puerto Ricans, and it would feel honoured to act as host to one of the forthcoming meetings of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*.

32. Mr. TARCICI (Yemen) said that his delegation regretted the fact that the South African régime was persisting in its policy of *apartheid*; he noted that his Government had consistently supported measures to exert pressure on South Africa, to isolate it and to deprive it of its seat in the United Nations until it could be replaced by a legal and representative Government. His delegation had supported many anti-*apartheid* resolutions, and it condemned all those countries which were still co-operating with the South African régime. It commended the Special Committee against *Apartheid* for its ceaseless efforts to isolate that régime.

33. He noted that there was a resemblance between *apartheid* and Zionism and that the Special Committee had therefore condemned the equally inhuman régimes of South Africa and Israel and denounced co-operation between them. He quoted resolution 77 (XII), adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU at its twelfth ordinary session, held in Kampala from 28 July to 1 August 1975, to the effect that the racist régime in occupied Palestine and the racist régimes in Zimbabwe and South Africa had a common imperialist origin, the same racist structure and a common policy aimed at repression. He noted that the collaboration between those racist régimes had been documented in detail in a report submitted by the Special Committee against *Apartheid*

entitled "Recent developments in the relations between South Africa and Israel".¹ That report referred specifically to the military, diplomatic, economic and cultural co-operation between South Africa and Israel. In view of the importance of the developments outlined in the report, his delegation called upon all those who had not yet done so to join the overwhelming majority of States in implementing the decisions of the international community against *apartheid*.

34. Mr. GHELEV (Bulgaria) said that it was discouraging to note that the problem of racism in South Africa still confronted the United Nations even after 30 years of great progress on other international issues. The situation in South Africa unfortunately continued to threaten peace and security in Africa and throughout the world despite the improvement in the international climate since the days of the cold war, when the forces of imperialism and reaction had found it much easier to defy the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and international law and oppose the aspirations of peoples to self-determination. Despite the victory of revolutionary and democratic forces in Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Angola and Portugal, any serious attempt to usher in lasting peace in Africa was inevitably doomed as long as the racist Government of Pretoria and the illegal minority régime in Salisbury were left to pursue their ruthless policy of racial and colonialist domination. Commendable as they were, United Nations efforts to call public attention to the degrading conditions imposed by the racist régimes on the African population and to condemn them had to be supplemented by practical steps in support of the courageous struggle of that oppressed people.

35. In that connexion, his delegation whole-heartedly supported the recommendations contained in chapter II of the excellent report prepared by the Special Committee against *Apartheid* (A/10022). The Committee had very properly recalled General Assembly resolution 2775 F (XXVI) of 1971, which had stated that the tactics then being employed by the racist Government of South Africa in pursuance of its so-called "outward policy" were designed primarily to obtain acquiescence in its racial policies, to confuse world public opinion and to hinder assistance to the liberation movements by the international community. His delegation fully agreed with the Special Committee that what had been true in 1971 was still true today. South Africa's current propaganda campaign was designed to counteract its isolation by deceiving public opinion with references to so-called reforms; that was a delaying tactic which could deceive no one. It could, nevertheless, still be dangerous to the extent that it blocked international efforts to isolate the Pretoria régime and diverted the United Nations and the international community from the vital need to increase their moral and material support of the national liberation movements. In fact the military, economic and political isolation of the racist régime in South Africa by the international community was the best way to help the South African population in its fight for freedom and should be given the highest priority. For those very reasons it was extremely important to note that certain States and certain economic

¹ Document A/AC.115/L.411 of 23 July 1975.

groups were continuing to maintain and in some cases intensify their co-operation with the South African régime. The United Nations could make a most effective contribution in the struggle against *apartheid* by denouncing categorically that deplorable and dangerous policy. For years certain States had condemned *apartheid* in words but continued to co-operate in fact with the régime which practised it. That policy must be strongly denounced. Paragraphs 70 to 77 of the report of the Special Committee deserved special attention because they pointed to the most dangerous kind of co-operation with South Africa, that is, military and nuclear co-operation. The report offered striking proof of the real intentions of the Pretoria régime and the serious danger to peace and security it presented.

36. The South African racists had made it clear that both ideologically and politically they were the successors of Hitler. However, *apartheid* was not merely an ideology and a policy. It was also a system of segregation, oppression and social exploitation based on racial discrimination. It was a modern form of slavery and the foundation of the whole political and economic structure of South Africa. It was therefore essential that the United Nations should focus its attention on the most important aspect of the problem, namely the fact that the criminal policy of the South African régime was based on the political, military, economic and financial support of imperialist forces and transnational corporations.

37. In view of the intransigence with which the Pretoria régime continued to defy the United Nations and world public opinion, it was more necessary than ever that the international community should show determination and energy in supporting the legitimate struggle of the people of South Africa and its liberation movements.

38. Mr. RITTO (Portugal) said that the concept of *apartheid* was abhorrent to all civilized persons and noted that expressions of distaste for that policy grew more vehement every year. Although it might seem difficult, if not impossible, for a régime to ignore world opinion, the South African régime had maintained and even consolidated its policy of *apartheid*.

39. The situation in South Africa had often been cited as proof of the ineffectiveness of the United Nations, but the resolutions of the General Assembly showed that it had not abdicated its role and responsibilities. The report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* described the increasing isolation of the South African régime and the negative repercussions which were starting to be apparent. Had that isolation not been brought about by the United Nations? Mozambique's accession to independence and the forthcoming independence of Angola had been rightly singled out as recent positive developments. The United Nations had helped to lead those countries to sovereignty, and their attainment of independence should have major repercussions in South Africa. In addition to the initiatives taken by the United Nations and the courage and sacrifice of the freedom fighters, it should be noted that a basic factor in the liberation of Mozambique and Angola was the goodwill and enthusiasm shown by the new leaders of Portugal in pursuing a policy of complete decolonization. Those recent developments gave grounds for some hope about the evolution of the situation in South Africa, and his country

believed that it had made a useful contribution to the course of events. Today, it could only associate itself fully in the vehement condemnation of *apartheid*, a policy completely unacceptable to the people of Portugal.

40. Mr. EHSASSI (Iran) said that the determination of the United Nations to bring about a change in South Africa had been matched by South Africa's determination not to relent. In fact, the racist régime in South Africa has continued to enact even more aggressive laws and has denied basic freedoms to millions of people. The dangers inherent in the South African situation were immense, and yet South Africa had ignored them and refused even to accept the prerequisites for a peaceful solution. While talking about a peaceful settlement, it had greatly accelerated the buildup of its military power. Spurning all General Assembly resolutions, the régime had imprisoned thousands of people, hundreds of them under the Terrorism Act. His delegation condemned South Africa's continued policy of repression and fully supported all those who had been imprisoned for calling for an end to a system which excluded the majority of people from the exercise of their right to self-determination.

41. His Government rejected the policy of "bantustans", which was aimed at keeping the oppressed majority of the people perpetually divided and totally dependent economically on Pretoria. The "bantustans" would serve only as a reservoir of cheap labour to sustain the white economy and would not give any real freedom to the black people of South Africa. Only the repeal of such legislation as the Terrorism Act and the granting of self-determination to all the peoples of South Africa would bring peace to that country.

42. International opposition to *apartheid* had strengthened and international activities against *apartheid* had greatly increased during the past year. Even in South Africa itself, many whites were beginning to speak out on the issue. The role of the United Nations in harmonizing and inspiring the struggle had been pivotal, and much credit was due to the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. His delegation believed that the international community had a commitment to eradicate racial discrimination in South Africa, and Iran contributed to various United Nations funds designed to assist the victims of *apartheid*.

43. Racism had had no place in Iran's long history; the people of Iran had always condemned racial discrimination and human degradation of any kind, as they condemned the policy of *apartheid* which was today being inflicted upon millions of people.

44. Mr. SENGHOR (Senegal) observed that the enthusiastic welcome given by the United Nations to the four new Member States had not led the Organization to overlook the disquieting situation in the Republic of South Africa. In fact, the Special Political Committee had the benefit of the presence of representatives of the liberation movements who supplemented, with a frankness that did them credit, its information on the odious system of *apartheid*.

45. Senegal was preparing to act as host to a major conference from 5 to 8 January 1976 on Namibia and human rights, which should bring about a better under-

standing of the Namibian problem and make for progress towards a speedy and enduring solution of the Namibian question. In taking that initiative, his country was once again demonstrating its continuing and unreserved support for the South African liberation movements, which could always be assured of its assistance and solidarity.

46. The so-called policy of "détente" proclaimed by South Africa was unacceptable and would continue to be so until the Pretoria racists conceded equal rights to the population as a whole in a declaration to that effect and entered into negotiations with the liberation movements, which unquestionably represented the aspirations of the majority of the population.

47. It was the duty of the United Nations to make known all the crimes of the *apartheid* régime, and his delegation highly appreciated the work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and its objective and excellent report on that subject.

48. His delegation endorsed the Special Committee's condemnation of the manoeuvres of the Pretoria régime, which was preparing to grant a semblance of independence to the Transkei and other "bantustans", hoping in that way to present the international community with a fait accompli. Senegal called upon all States Members of the United Nations to take effective measures to foil those manoeuvres, which deceived only those who were willing to be deceived.

49. The international community must support the struggle of the overwhelming majority of the South African population to exercise its right to self-determination. Senegal attached the utmost importance to the implementation by the international community of effective measures for the isolation of the South African racist régime in the military, economic, political, cultural, sporting and other fields. It endorsed the conclusions contained in the report of the Special Committee; the latter, while noting the progress achieved during the preceding year in the implementation of the arms embargo against South Africa, also noted with regret that the Security Council had failed to take action under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, as requested by the General Assembly in resolution 3324 B (XXIX).

50. Nothing could stand in the way of the will of a people determined to regain its freedom and dignity. His country was convinced that the difficulties of the liberation movements would prove to be only temporary and that *apartheid* would disappear for ever as justice triumphed in that part of the African continent.

51. Mr. ARNELLO (Chile) noted that the item under consideration called for a further condemnation of racial discrimination and racism, as embodied in the policy of *apartheid*. Racial discrimination and racism were alien to Chile's humanistic traditions and its cultural and historical background; it therefore categorically rejected *apartheid* and had consistently supported the struggle against racism and racial discrimination within the United Nations. It wished to congratulate the Special Committee against *Apartheid* on its work, which had the full support of his delegation.

52. His delegation believed that it was important to reaffirm the unity which had been expressed in the Committee regarding its total rejection of racial discrimination and *apartheid*. It would like to associate itself with the comment by one delegation to the effect that it was a mistake to give undue emphasis to differences of opinion within the Committee. To point out differences did not help the cause that the Committee was seeking to promote. A display of solidarity would enable the Committee to defeat the political manoeuvres by certain States which were using the Committee's work as a pretext for making political attacks on other States. For that reason, his delegation did not propose to answer some of the attacks directed at it but wished to point out that, of the 29 countries which maintained diplomatic relations with South Africa, only a few, including Chile, had been singled out. He wished merely to state that Chile had no accredited diplomatic envoy in South Africa and that its relations with that country had not changed for many years. In conclusion, Chile wholeheartedly supported the action taken by the United Nations regarding Namibia and Southern Rhodesia and against racial discrimination and *apartheid*; it had therefore supported the draft resolution A/SPC/L.324 and A/SPC/L.325, which had been adopted at the previous meeting.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.

962nd meeting

Wednesday, 22 October 1975, at 3.10 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Roberto MARTINEZ ORDOÑEZ (Honduras).

A/SPC/SR.962

AGENDA ITEM 53

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

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

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. BRIGHTY (United Kingdom) said that nobody who had listened to the debate on *apartheid* could fail to have been impressed by the way in which the international community had condemned that policy. His delegation had repeatedly expressed its repugnance against that pernicious system and would therefore confine itself to a few specific points.