

965th meeting

Monday, 27 October 1975, at 11 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Roberto MARTINEZ ORDOÑEZ (Honduras).

A/SPC/SR.965

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) Report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*
(A/10022);

(b) Report of the Secretary-General (A/10281)

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), speaking on a point of order, said that, although he had not been present personally at the 964th meeting of the Committee because of illness, he had learned that the representative of Israel had accused his Government of trading with South Africa. While the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic had replied to the Israeli remarks at that meeting, he wished to exercise his delegation's right of reply at the current meeting.

2. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to grant the request of the representative of Saudi Arabia.

It was so decided.

3. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the policy of his Government with regard to South Africa was quite clear: it did not maintain or permit relations of any kind with the *apartheid* régime. While it was always possible that isolated individuals might occasionally succeed in carrying on relations with South Africa illicitly, his Government's opposition to such relations remained steadfast. By way of example, he pointed out that a number of years earlier his Government had even refused a request by the South African Government for permission to set up an office in Saudi Arabia to handle arrangements for South African Moslems who wished to make the pilgrimage to Mecca. As to allegations that Saudi Arabia was purchasing South African gold, he pointed out that when purchases were made on the open market it was not possible to ascertain the country of origin of the gold acquired.

4. The representative of the United States of America had described the United Nations as being anti-Semitic because of the adoption by the Third Committee at its 2134th meeting of a draft resolution¹ which determined that zionism was a form of racism and racial discrimination. A systematic campaign was being conducted in the United States to castigate the Arabs as anti-Semites and to buy

African votes in the United Nations with the promise of economic assistance. The Arabs could not possibly be anti-Semitic, being Semites themselves. Their quarrel was not with Judaism but with zionism. As a doctrine invented by the descendants of Europeans who had been converted to Judaism, zionism was a foreign element in the body politic of the Middle East. The Zionist colonialists had brought discredit on Judaism by emptying it of its religious content and giving it geographical form. The Oriental Jews were brothers of the Arabs. The European Jews could also be brothers of the Arabs, but never at the expense of the Palestinian people, who were the indigenous inhabitants of the area. If Israel wished to survive in the Middle East, therefore, it must seek to do so with the acceptance of its neighbours and not in defiance of them.

5. Numerous elected officials and representatives of the United States Government were seeking to besmirch the good name of the Semitic Arab nations. They castigated the Arabs as terrorists, while they conveniently forgot the Stern Gang and other Zionist groups. They should be reminded that there was no discrimination in Islam, while, despite being rejected in theory, discrimination was still practised in the United States. The United States was a relative newcomer to civilization and should not presume to lecture the Arabs, without whom there would not have been a Renaissance in Europe, in the ways of civilization.

6. The United States and certain European States were attempting to drive a wedge between Arabs and Africans on the issue of zionism. It should be recalled that he had personally waged a successful campaign in the United Nations to have the principle of self-determination recognized as a full-fledged right, not for the benefit of the Arab States, most of which had already been independent at that time, but for those in Africa and Asia who were still under colonial rule. The representative of the United States had falsely accused the Arabs of seeking to destroy the United Nations by pressing for a resolution which equated zionism with racism. It was however, the Zionists who would destroy the United Nations by forcing the United States into a third world war. The Arab States rejected the notion of racial purity and exclusivity embodied in zionism and had accordingly supported the resolution on zionism in the Third Committee.

7. Finally, he said he had been relieved to learn that the perpetrators of the bombing which had taken place at the United States Mission that morning had identified themselves as Puerto Ricans, since otherwise it would have automatically been assumed that Arabs were responsible for the incident.

8. Mr. ALLISON (Nigeria), introducing draft resolution A/SPC/L.327 on behalf of its sponsors, said that *apartheid*, whether it was termed "separate development" or "separate

¹ Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirtieth Session, Annexes, agenda item 68, document A/10320, para. 27, draft resolution III.

freedom”, was a crime against humanity. That doctrine so permeated South African society that every individual in the country was officially classified according to race. Now, through a deliberate policy of the South African Government, the vast non-white majority were to be relegated to a mere 13 per cent of the land, where they would have to eke out a meagre living. Moreover, the Africans would be required to obtain passes in order to work in the white areas and would be exploited as cheap labour. Thus, they had paradoxically become migrant labourers in the land of their birth, deprived of all political, economic and social rights. Contrary to the contention of the South African Government, therefore, the “bantustans” would mean greater dependence for the African people of South Africa and were the worst manifestation of *apartheid*.

9. He drew attention to the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, which reaffirmed the legitimacy of the struggle of the South African people under the leadership of their national liberation movements. Operative paragraph 2 exposed the “bantustan” policy as an attempt to Balkanize Azania and violate its territorial integrity. Paragraph 3 called on all Governments and organizations not to recognize the bogus independence of the “bantustans” in accordance with the established principle of law whereby it was impossible for a Government to delegate authority which it did not legally possess.

10. The CHAIRMAN announced that Jamaica wished to become a sponsor of the draft resolution. He then pointed out that two corrections were to be made to the Spanish text in order to bring it into line with the English original. The corrections would be circulated as document A/SPC/L.327/Corr.1.

11. Mr. CHAUDHURY (Bangladesh) said that the struggle against *apartheid* had two dimensions—a humanitarian one and a basically political one—which were indivisible. To regard the problem as merely one of human rights was incompatible with the actual situation and served to shore up the frantic diplomatic offensive which the South African régime had belatedly initiated to counter its total isolation. His delegation fully agreed with the repeated emphasis placed by the Special Committee against *Apartheid* on the essentially political nature of the problem. It therefore welcomed the participation by the representatives of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC), the true representatives of the South African people, in the Special Political Committee’s discussion of the item on *apartheid*.

12. The human rights dimension of the problem of *apartheid* was fully documented, and the anguish and unequivocal condemnation of the international community could not be appeased by anything short of the total eradication of that abhorrent policy. It was gratifying to note that the great majority of speakers had not been deceived by South Africa’s attempt to mask its real intent. In a world in which the interdependence of all nations had been repeatedly recognized, the existence and condoning of *apartheid* constituted a serious obstacle to international co-operation and a potent threat to international peace and security. There could be no peace without justice, and peace must be based on the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind.

13. While his delegation welcomed and wholeheartedly supported the intensification of the struggle against *apartheid*, it noted with concern that South Africa’s intransigent attitude was still supported by many of its economic and military partners who were the ones best able to influence its actions. That support remained the major obstacle to the eradication of *apartheid*. The Vorster régime continued to create further obstacles: the doubling of its military budget in 1974/75; the intensification of repressive measures directed against all opponents of *apartheid*, whether white or black; the continued detention of political prisoners; and the tightening of repressive legislation. Perhaps its most heinous move was the rapid implementation of its “bantustan” policy. It seemed incomprehensible that any plan to relocate the majority of the inhabitants to one seventh of a country’s area could be justified as a solution that would end racial discrimination and bring about self-determination.

14. South Africa’s attempts to break out of its isolation by launching a new diplomatic and publicity offensive to explain its policy, offering economic assistance to African States and attempting to solve the Southern Rhodesian problem, bore witness to the success of international pressure and of the persistent and courageous struggle of the oppressed people in South Africa itself. Those attempts must inevitably fail because South Africa was contending against the collective conscience of mankind. There could be no compromise with racism. The international community had clearly indicated the need for unconditional amnesty for all political prisoners and refugees, the repeal of all repressive legislation, and the exercise by the South African people as a whole of their right to self-determination in accordance with principles of the Charter of the United Nations. It was now necessary to consider the means of attaining those objectives.

15. Recent welcome signs of change had set a new stage for the campaign against *apartheid*. Within South Africa, the determination to resist had gained strength despite mass arrests and deportations. Abroad, the decision of the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session (resolution 3206 (XXIX)) to reject the credentials of the South African delegation and its call to the Security Council to take up the issue (resolution 3207 (XXIX)) had been a reminder of the need to safeguard the moral authority of the United Nations. The change of régime in Portugal, leading to the independence of that country’s former colonies, had broken the back of the unholy alliance in southern Africa. The termination of the Simonstown Agreement of 1955 and the French decision of August 1975 to prohibit the sale of arms for continental use were hopeful though hesitant indicators of South Africa’s military isolation.

16. In the year of the thirtieth anniversary of the United Nations, States Members of the Organization must collectively and individually reaffirm and renew their efforts, by all possible means, to end racism and discrimination. His delegation fully endorsed the recommendations contained in Chapter II of the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* (A/10022) and would support them within the limits of its capacity. The President of Bangladesh, in his first address to the nation, had stated that his country would continue its policy of opposing racism, *apartheid*, colonialism and neo-colonialism as laid down in its Consti-

tution. Opposition to oppression was enshrined in the traditions of the Bengali nation, which believed in the supreme status of man and in the inherent equality of all men. The people of Bangladesh were determined to eradicate the most glaring manifestation of oppression in the world today—*apartheid* in South Africa.

17. Mr. FEZZANI (Tunisia) said that the untiring efforts of the Special Committee had succeeded in informing world public opinion of the horrors of the policies of the racist régime in South Africa. The representatives of the South African liberation movements had shown in their statements that conditions were even more tragic than the Special Committee's report indicated. It was hard to understand how a State which had ignored the many resolutions adopted by the United Nations could still remain a Member. The General Assembly's refusal at its twenty-ninth session to recognize the credentials of the delegation of the *apartheid* régime had reflected the position of an overwhelming majority of Member States and had accentuated South Africa's isolation in the international sphere. In the Security Council, most speakers had denounced *apartheid* as an obnoxious system contrary to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and it was only the vetoes of three permanent members of the Council that had saved South Africa from exclusion from the Organization. The wave of condemnation in 1974 had led the representative of South Africa to make promises and statements to the effect that his Government would do everything in its power to eliminate discrimination based on race and colour. However, a few days later, on 12 November 1974, the South African Minister of the Interior and Information had clearly stated that it was out of the question to expect South Africa to give up its policy of separate development in order to conform to majority rule and ensure integration. On 16 November, the Prime Minister had informed black leaders that the principle of "one man, one vote" would never be applied in South Africa. Consequently, there could be no misunderstanding about the real intentions of the Pretoria régime. His delegation had long been convinced that that régime would not give up its *apartheid* policy out of concern with justice or respect for the international community. The President of the Tunisian Republic had always strongly denounced the *apartheid* policy and drawn attention to the dangerous situation in South Africa, which threatened peace not only in Africa but throughout the world. On the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, he had reaffirmed the active solidarity of the Tunisian Government and people with all peoples that were victims of oppression and racial discrimination, particularly those in South Africa and Palestine, in their heroic fight for freedom and their legitimate rights.

18. *Apartheid* was based on the Nazi doctrine of the hierarchy of races. That anachronistic classification was an attack on the dignity of man which all Africans felt to be an insult to the whole African continent. The Arabs of Africa and Asia, educated in the lofty values of Islam and Christianity, in the spirit of tolerance and the equality of all men, shared the feelings of brother victims of *apartheid* particularly because they, too, had been suffering in Palestine for over 25 years from another, more complex form of racial discrimination based on an identical phi-

losophy, zionism. It was therefore not by chance that relations between Israel and South Africa were becoming stronger. The Special Committee's report described the increasingly close links between the two régimes in violation of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth and twenty-ninth sessions. The Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Lima from 25 to 30 August 1975, had declared its great concern at the increasing military, political, diplomatic, economic and cultural co-operation between those two racist régimes. The policy of the South African régime was hostile to the whole of Africa. Feeling its increasing isolation after the end of Portuguese domination in southern Africa, the régime had increased its military budget from R305 million in 1971/72 to R948 million—3.7 per cent of gross national product—for 1975/76, because it considered itself the guardian of southern Africa. Its increasingly well-equipped army was used inside the country to maintain and consolidate the power of the racist minority, especially to enable it to set up "bantustans". His delegation believed that those artificial entities were being established for the purpose of dividing the Azanian people and threatening the territorial integrity of South Africa. Externally, the South African army was maintaining the illegal occupation of Namibia and supporting the shaky Smith régime in Zimbabwe, and it constituted a permanent threat to the young States of southern Africa especially the former Portuguese colonies. The racist régime had been able to carry out that policy because the sanctions decided on by the United Nations had not been applied by all Members. As the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Tunisia had said at the 2369th plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 1 October 1975, peace-loving and freedom-loving countries must put an end to all activities likely to strengthen the political, military or economic potential of the South African régime and should exercise pressure on it to negotiate with the liberation movements.

19. During the year of the thirtieth anniversary of the United Nations, his delegation hoped that all Member States without exception would fully realize the challenge to the whole of Africa represented by the continuation of *apartheid* and the grave dangers inherent in the intensive arming of the Pretoria régime. Unanimous, unceasing pressure, in accordance with United Nations resolutions, and the heroic struggle of the South African nationalists would cut short the sufferings of the Azanian people and compel the Vorster régime to free political prisoners and to put an end to its policies of *apartheid* and separate development. Dialogue with the leaders of ANC and PAC, the only legitimate representatives of the majority of the population, would lead to the establishment of a South Africa in which all men, irrespective of colour, race or belief, would participate in building a united, democratic, non-racial country.

20. Mr. DAGBA (Togo) said that his Government continued to be concerned at the alarming situation in South Africa, which constituted a permanent threat to peace in that region and to international security. World public opinion, showing a complete want of understanding of Vorster and his clique, had long cherished the hope that the urgent appeals by the United Nations to South Africa would be heeded and that a peaceful solution and a policy of reason would prevail over South Africa's obduracy and

criminal instincts. Vorster's reply in the form of diversionary tactics of so-called "détente" or "dialogue" had not been well received, and his attempts to win over the African countries had met with little success.

21. It now seemed clear that the liberation of Namibia and Zimbabwe, the elimination of *apartheid* and the ending of the "bantustan" policy could only be brought about by pursuing the course advocated in the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and in the Dar-es-Salaam Declaration on Southern Africa, issued by the Council of Ministers of OAU at its ninth extraordinary session, held at Dar-es-Salaam from 7 to 10 April 1975. His delegation agreed with the Special Committee against *Apartheid* that the policy of "separate development", designed by Pretoria to create confusion, must be condemned. On the occasion of its thirtieth anniversary, the United Nations should remember that the situation in South Africa was continuing to deteriorate; for that reason, his delegation wished to appeal once more to all peace-loving countries and peoples to give full support to the many resolutions adopted by the United Nations on the racist régime. It urged all countries and all the great Powers to set aside their individual selfish interests and to refuse to collaborate with that régime.

22. His Government was doing all in its power to bring about the triumph of the democratic ideal and the advent of majority rule in South Africa. It supported all recommendations to that end and gave its full support to the courageous freedom fighters, the oppressed peoples of South Africa and the political prisoners of the racist régime who were fighting and dying for a just and noble cause.

23. Mr. CRAIG (Ireland) said that the Committee's debate had again illustrated the international community's concern at the maintenance in South Africa of an institutionalized system of racial discrimination designed to uphold minority rule. His Government's abhorrence of the policy of *apartheid* was well known and had been made clear on many occasions. In the circumstances, his delegation did not propose to analyse in detail the system of *apartheid*, but would instead examine recent developments and current prospects.

24. The declarations made by the leaders of the South African Government at the time of the impending transfer of power to the peoples of the Territories under Portuguese rule had given grounds to hope for fundamental changes in South Africa's policies. There had been some shift in South Africa's approach to the problems of Southern Rhodesia and Namibia, although there was as yet no evidence of change sufficient to meet the legitimate demands of the United Nations and the world community. In relation to South Africa itself, the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* clearly showed how little change there had been. The South African Government's own declared intention of putting an end to all unnecessary and purely irritating discrimination had not been fulfilled. The majority of the changes had merely been designed to change the appearance of things and not the reality. In fact, they served only to highlight the full extent of the body of discriminatory legislation and regulations in force in South Africa. The discrimination that the South African Government regarded as necessary was the foundation of the basic inequalities and injustices of the system. The fundamental

injustice of the system of "separate development", under which four fifths of the land area was assigned to a minority of one fifth of the population, resulted directly in other injustices. The system of "bantustans" was based on a fraud, and the intention of the South African Government to grant "independence" to the "bantustans" must be condemned. Finally, the attempt to maintain the system of *apartheid*, with its inherent injustices and inequities, led to the savage repression of all who worked to change the system.

25. His Government did not share the view that there was no choice between despair and recourse to violent means of changing the situation. It believed that recent developments had shown that the South African Government and the dominant white community did react to changing international circumstances and to international pressure, no matter how insufficient or misconceived that reaction had been to date. It felt that the international community must do all in its power to increase the exposure of influential white South Africans to world opinion. An attempt to isolate the entire white community along with the South African Government would lead them to even more extreme attitudes, which would inevitably bring about a reaction on the part of the oppressed majority and a tragedy for all communities in South Africa. His delegation believed that exposure to world opinion might well bring about a change in the attitude of white people in South Africa. The South African Government had shown that it was concerned about world opinion and, in particular, public opinion in those countries with which it had the greatest amount of contact; in fact, the very propaganda activities to which the Special Committee had rightly drawn attention in its report showed the South African Government's sensitivity in that regard. Furthermore, developments within South Africa itself gave grounds for guarded optimism. There were signs within the white community of the development of an opposition which rejected many fundamental aspects of the system. Within the black community there had been, despite the continuation of bans on political organizations and the prosecution of individuals, a certain development of political consciousness. The representatives of the banned organizations had also attested to the growth of political activity inside and outside South Africa.

26. The problem which the United Nations faced was how to bring the pressure of world opinion to bear most effectively on the South African Government and on white public opinion in order to persuade them of the urgent need for changes of substance rather than of form. Those changes must, in the view of his Government, lead ultimately to a society in which every individual would have equal rights and in which those who were currently inhabitants of South Africa could participate on the basis of individual equality.

27. The maintenance of contacts could be justified only if they were used to emphasize opposition to the system and to bring pressure to bear for change. For example, an area where action was required on grounds of principle and was effective as an instrument of pressure was that of sport. Believing that South Africa had brought politics into sport by segregating teams and sports activities generally, his Government had constantly supported the Olympic prin-

principle that no discrimination could be permitted in sports events on grounds of race, religion or political affiliation, and had drawn the attention of Irish sports organizations to the relevant recommendations of the General Assembly. While maintaining that it was for the sports organization concerned to determine its attitude, the Irish Government had publicly opposed participation by Irish athletes in events organized in violation of the Olympic principle and had made known its views to the organization concerned whenever the issue of a sports event with a South African team had arisen. Sports organizations throughout the world had increasingly declined to participate with South African teams and such action was an effective way of bringing home to white South Africa their feelings of repugnance for the system of *apartheid*.

28. While advocating the maintenance of contacts in order to press for change, his delegation recognized that in certain areas a co-ordinated attitude by Governments was appropriate and indeed necessary. In the light of the South African Government's policies of internal repression and its possession of modern arms, which made it able to resist change, his Government had constantly supported and strictly observed the embargo on arms to South Africa. It welcomed the decision of the French Government to limit the sale of military equipment to South Africa and that of the United Kingdom Government to terminate the Simons-town Agreement.

29. The treatment by the South African Government of those who worked to change the system required a particular response from the advocates of peaceful change. His delegation had already made clear its solidarity with the political prisoners; it had gladly associated itself with the consensus on the draft resolution concerning that question (A/SPC/L.325) and on the draft resolution dealing with the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa (A/SPC/L.324), to which it had made annual contributions in recent years. It had been honoured that the International Defence and Aid Fund for Southern Africa, one of the principal bodies through which the Trust Fund worked, had chosen to hold its annual conference in Dublin.

30. The United Nations had a particular role to play in the campaign to bring to an end the system of *apartheid* by making the world aware of its evil nature. His delegation applauded the work of the Special Committee and of the Unit on *Apartheid*, as well as that of the many national voluntary organizations. The mobilization of public opinion in States Members of the United Nations would have its effect in demonstrating to white South Africans the extent of international concern.

31. Mr. NEUGEBAUER (German Democratic Republic) said that his country supported the struggle for the elimination of all forms of racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid* by whatever means were necessary and rendered all possible political, moral and material assistance to oppressed peoples. It maintained no relations with the racist régime in South Africa and scrupulously complied with all relevant resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council. It considered solidarity with the national liberation movement to be a decisive factor in the struggle for the elimination of the *apartheid* régime.

32. The German Democratic Republic had been one of the first States to sign and ratify the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*, and it urged all States to become parties to it. It welcomed the recommendations of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* in chapter II of its report (A/10022), with a view to further intensifying the struggle against *apartheid*. His delegation was prepared to co-sponsor and support all resolutions aimed at ending the anachronism of *apartheid* and would implement them scrupulously.

33. Events since the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly had clearly shown that the inhuman *apartheid* régime was, in violation of international law, seeking to remain in power by the use of pressure, slander, terror and hypocritical assurances, and by exploiting foreign assistance. The anachronistic nature of the racist régime in South Africa, whose practices were reminiscent of the worst periods of Hitlerite fascism, became more obvious as the last bastions of colonialism collapsed and imperialist, colonialist and neo-colonialist oppression and exploitation ended. However, the Vorster régime, as in the past, was seeking to halt the course of history. By promises of "détente", and by such devices as the "bantustan" policy, it sought to gain time and to distract attention from the true situation in South Africa. However, in the view of the overwhelming majority of States, the tensions in South Africa could be eased only by the elimination of the racist *apartheid* régime and the granting of self-determination to the oppressed peoples of South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe.

34. Like other enemies of international détente, the racist régime had in recent years greatly increased its military budget. During the fiscal year 1974/75, its military expenditures had doubled by comparison with those for 1972/73. It was an undeniable fact that the régime played an important role in the strategic plans of imperialist circles and was meant to serve as a link and bridgehead for the military bases in the Indian Ocean. His delegation therefore supported the demand for a binding embargo on arms to the Pretoria régime. His delegation was also deeply concerned about South Africa's access to nuclear arms, which clearly increased the danger to peace and security in southern Africa. Any activity by a State Member of the United Nations enabling that régime to have access to atomic know-how and equipment prejudiced the efforts of the United Nations to eliminate the racist régime.

35. As was well known, diplomatic, consular and trade relations were inseparably linked; the trade policy pursued by Western countries towards Portugal in recent months showed how trade could be used as a means of influencing political developments. His delegation believed that a strict economic embargo against South Africa by all States Members of the United Nations would contribute effectively to ending racist domination in that country, whereas any co-operation with the régime strengthened it and violated United Nations resolutions. South Africa also received support in other forms, such as loans, which had enabled it to set up its own arms industry. The régime sought to induce foreign banks to invest in the public sector, thus establishing ever closer ties between those banks and the racist régime. His delegation welcomed the

proposal to undertake a thorough study of the activities of transnational corporations and felt that the Information and Research Centre of the Economic and Social Council's Commission on Transnational Corporations should be instructed to examine their activities.

36. Thirty years ago, Hitlerite fascism had been defeated by the heroic struggle of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the anti-Hitler coalition. That historic victory had strengthened national and social liberation forces through-

out the world and had accelerated the collapse of colonialism and racism, enabling many peoples to follow successfully the path of peaceful development and social and economic progress. The South African régime represented a threat to international peace and security, and both States and transnational corporations that co-operated with it in the military, economic or financial field were responsible for the continuance of *apartheid*.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

966th meeting

Monday, 27 October 1975, at 3.25 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Roberto MARTINEZ ORDOÑEZ (Honduras).

A/SPC/SR.966

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Tellmann (Norway), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

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

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the representative of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) to address the Committee.

2. Mr. MAKOTI (Observer, Pan Africanist Congress of Azania) said that the policies of the South African Government had been discussed in the United Nations for 30 years. They had been discussed in Azania for more than 300 years. In view of what had been done in the United Nations in particular and at the national, regional and international levels in general, it might have been thought that the Government of South Africa would have been persuaded to succumb to the pressure of international public opinion and the internal opposition of the South African people. But that had not been the case, perhaps because there seemed to be a tendency in all bodies where the policies of South Africa were discussed to regard them as a matter of conscience rather than of coercion. Yet a matter of conscience was a matter of conference and co-operation, whereas South Africa's policies involved conflict and confrontation, coercion and colonialism. South Africa would yield only to measures which took that fact into account.

3. Referring to the history of the creation of South Africa and to various aspects of British colonialism, he said that the struggle of the black population had not started when the administration of the Territory had been entrusted in 1910 to a white coalition government of the former British

colonies in southern Africa. The form of the struggle had changed but its fundamental nature and character had remained as before. The only change which had taken place had been the form of colonial authority. For that reason, the African people of Azania did not accept the claim that South Africa was an independent sovereign State. A people discriminated against racially was not considered an independent people. The granting of so-called independence to the white coalition government had not constituted an act of decolonization, but had been merely a transfer of colonial authority. The oppressed majority of South Africa's population was therefore determined to fight for its right to self-determination within the framework of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as a fundamental principle of international law in so far as it related to the political status of indigenous peoples on their ancestral land. Denial of the right to self-determination was the manifest expression of a colonial situation.

4. He referred to the recent statements of the South African Government concerning its discriminatory policies and particularly those relating to political prisoners. That Government said that there were no political prisoners in South Africa. The confusion arose from its legislative and judicial policies. Under the South African laws, any legitimate political activity constituted a criminal offence. Therefore, any participation by citizens in the defence of their human, civic or political rights made them common criminals and thus common prisoners and not political prisoners. All the statements by the Vorster Government concerning changes which might be made in the legislation on which the *apartheid* régime was based were quite worthless and could be only misleading if one overlooked the deeply-rooted prejudices which had led to the establishment of that policy and which were still reflected in all aspects of society in South Africa. It should also not be forgotten that the whole series of measures and policies apparently designed to strengthen racial discrimination were, in essence, policies of deprivation. The African people had been deprived of their land, of their property and of their status in order that they might submit consciously and voluntarily to the exploitation of their labour as cheap labour and to the sapping of their will to resist and their