



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-NINTH YEAR

1797th MEETING: 21 OCTOBER 1974

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1797)	1
Tribute to the memory of Mr. Shadhel Taqa, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Relationship between the United Nations and South Africa:	
(a) Letter dated 30 September 1974 from the President of the General Assembly to the President of the Security Council (S/11525);	
(b) Letter dated 9 October 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11532)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

SEVENTEEN HUNDRED AND NINETY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 21 October 1974, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Michel NJINÉ
(United Republic of Cameroon).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Austria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Costa Rica, France, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya, Mauritania, Peru, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon and United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1797)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Relationship between the United Nations and South Africa:
 - (a) Letter dated 30 September 1974 from the President of the General Assembly to the President of the Security Council (S/11525);
 - (b) Letter dated 9 October 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11532)

The meeting was called to order at 4 p.m.

Tribute to the memory of Mr. Shadhel Taqa, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Before turning to the agenda for the present meeting, it is my sad duty to inform members of the Council that the distinguished Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq, Mr. Shadhel Taqa, died yesterday. I take this opportunity to address to the representative of Iraq on behalf of the Council our sincere condolences on the loss that Iraq has just sustained and I request the representative of Iraq to be so kind as to convey our condolences to his Government and to the family of the deceased.

2. Mr. AL-SHAIKHLI (Iraq): Mr. President, I should like to thank you on behalf of my delegation for the kind expression of sympathy offered on the sad occasion of the sudden death of Shadhel Taqa, the Foreign Minister of Iraq, in Rabat, where he had gone to attend the forthcoming Arab summit conference.

3. I had known Shadhel Taqa for many years as a dear friend and close colleague. Shadhel Taqa was

appointed to his first diplomatic post as the Iraqi Ambassador to Moscow in 1969 while I was serving as Foreign Minister. Upon his return to Baghdad he served with me as the Permanent Under-Secretary at the Ministry, a post he held with distinction until he himself was appointed Minister for Foreign Affairs last July.

4. Shadhel Taqa was with us in New York to address the General Assembly and it was only last Thursday that we bade him farewell at Kennedy Airport. During the two weeks he spent here he worked with the same selfless dedication that had characterized his services for his country and for the Arab cause. His untimely death is a great loss for Iraq. He will be deeply missed by his many friends and all his countrymen.

5. I shall convey the kind words that have been said at this Council meeting to my Government and to the bereaved family.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Relationship between the United Nations and South Africa:

(a) Letter dated 30 September 1974 from the President of the General Assembly addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11525);

(b) Letter dated 9 October 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11532)

6. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decisions taken by the Council at its 1796th meeting I invite the representatives of Algeria, Cuba, Dahomey, Egypt, Guinea, Mali, Mauritius, Morocco, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zaire to participate, without the right to vote, under Article 31 of the Charter and in accordance with the pertinent provisions of the provisional rules of procedure, in the Council's discussion.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Rahal (Algeria), Mr. Alarcón (Cuba), Mr. Adjibadé (Dahomey), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mrs. Jeanne

Martin Clissé (Guinea), Mr. Traoré (Mali), Mr. Ramphul (Mauritius), Mr. Slaoui (Morocco), Mr. Ogbu (Nigeria), Mr. Baroody (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Luke (Sierra Leone), Mr. Ghalib (Somalia), Mr. Kelani (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Driss (Tunisia), Mr. Salim (United Republic of Tanzania) and Mr. Mutuale (Zaire) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

7. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Furthermore, I have to inform the members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Bangladesh, the Congo, Ghana, Guyana, Madagascar, Qatar, South Africa, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, Upper Volta and Yugoslavia asking that their delegations too should be invited, under Article 31 of the Charter and the pertinent provisions of the provisional rules of procedure, to participate, without the right to vote, in the Council's discussion. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate, without the right to vote, in the Council's discussion.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Karim (Bangladesh), Mr. Mondjo (Congo), Mr. Boatén (Ghana), Mr. Jackson (Guyana), Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mr. Jamal (Qatar), Mr. Botha (South Africa), Mr. Kinene (Uganda), Mr. Humaidan (United Arab Emirates), Mr. Yaguibou (Upper Volta) and Mr. Petrić (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

8. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The first speaker is the representative of Egypt. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

9. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt): Before I begin my statement, I should like to offer to the delegation of Iraq our sincere condolences on the sudden death of the Foreign Minister of Iraq. I would ask the delegation of Iraq to convey our deepest sympathy to the family of the deceased.

10. Mr. President, at the outset allow me to address to you the warmest congratulations of my delegation on the accession of your country, the United Republic of Cameroon, to the presidency of the Security Council. With your prominent skills—and since you come from a country whose tradition of justice and respect for human rights is well known—I am confident that you will discharge the duties of your high office with great competence and wisdom. It is a great honour and source of pride that one of the sons of Africa is presiding over this body during this month, and this confirms Africa's determination to shoulder its responsibilities for maintaining international peace and security based on justice and human equity.

11. On 30 September 1974 the General Assembly adopted an important resolution, resolution

3207 (XXIX), calling upon the Security Council to review the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa in the light of the constant violation by South Africa of the principles of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

12. We are here now to discuss the position of South Africa vis-à-vis the Organization and also to decide upon the action which should be taken in order to defend the United Nations against the perpetual violation of its Charter and principles.

13. *Apartheid*, racism, racial discrimination and racial segregation are all different versions of only one claim, that is to say, the superiority of one race over another. Such biological superiority was raised in the past by the Nazis and now by the South African régime. The natural result of Hitler's racial policies was the disappearance of international law in a twofold sense: there would be no equal right of nations and there would be no equal rights for minorities or human beings irrespective of race.

14. In the light of such anarchism in international relations, the outbreak of the Second World War was an anticipated reaction. That war cost humanity dear: over 20 million victims of the fanatic expansionist myth of racial superiority. Moreover, the fall of the League of Nations was another manifestation of the chaotic character of international relations at that time.

15. The paradox *par excellence* is that almost 30 years after the end of the Second World War drama we are meeting in this Chamber now to deliberate on the repulsiveness and atrocity of a replica of nazi racial superiority, represented by the *apartheid* policies of the South African régime.

16. South African *apartheid* policies are a historically cumulative and purposeful system of racial containment. That system's operational components, each with its own experiential profile and time-frame, fall into four distinct yet converging categories: one, racial prejudice and discrimination; two, racial segregation and separation; three, economic exploitation of natural and human resources; and, four, legal, administrative and police terror. Associated with each is a set of functions and instruments. Some are viewed as essential mainly to the attainment of *apartheid*; others are the basic ingredients of *apartheid*. For example, its proponents would have the world believe that genuine *apartheid* is racial separation, terror being simply a means to perfect the end. In reality, the terror, whatever the intentions of its white perpetrators, is also the true *apartheid* and perhaps its most indestructible component on which it is dependent for its continuation.

17. Through the *apartheid* doctrine, the South African régime has been consolidating power in its own hands and disposing of any opposition. It has

also been fragmenting the people of South Africa into racial and ethnic groups and effectively segregating these groups from one another. The Government has established four major "racial groups" by legislative measures and subdivided these into further "ethnic" categories. All in all, there are 20 such categories, which are divided as follows: one, whites, 3,960,000—English-speaking, 40 per cent; Afrikaans-speaking, 60 per cent; two, Coloured people, 2,144,000—these are people of mixed African and white descent and they are further subdivided into seven categories, the last of which is "other Coloured"; three, Indians, 668,000—these are people of Asian descent; lastly, African people, 16,217,000. The Government has divided the African people into a number of so-called nations, which are Xhosa, Zulu, Tswana, Venda, Sotho, Pedi, Swazi, Ndebele, Shangaan and others.

18. The major legislative distinctions are drawn between whites and non-whites. Almost every aspect of life conforms to this division. Sex and marriage across this line are prohibited by the Immorality Act. All social amenities—like buses, trains, cinemas and other places of public entertainment, beaches, restaurants and all residential areas—are segregated on this basis. Education is divided into the four major racial categories and mother-tongue instruction has been introduced. South Africans have to be educated in the language of their parents, at least for their first years of schooling, and education is given in almost a dozen languages at this level. Separate so-called governmental institutions have been established for each of the major black groups, and their participation in "white politics" is not allowed.

19. This body of racial legislation can divide and has divided families—mother from son, husband from wife—and where clear racial lines cannot be found, they are arbitrated by Racial Classification Boards. Every South African is identified by race. If nothing else, the 200 racial laws testify to the artificial nature of the order which has been imposed, as do the often severe penalties which reinforce those laws and the many breaches which occur. Further, this legislation has effectively broken the lines of communication, co-operation and understanding between the different groups. By means of the classic divide-and-rule policy the Government has reinforced the centralization of power. But the policy has also sown the seeds of inter-group tension and conflict, and seriously threatened relations not just between white and black but between black and black. The racial segments into which the people of South Africa have been divided now form a hierarchy of which economic status provides the clearest illustration. Over the 23 years it has governed, the régime has promoted the economic interests of the Afrikaners, who founded and support it, over those of every other group. It has also ensured the ever greater allocation of resources and material wealth to members of the white group as a whole at the direct expense of

all other South Africans. As the appearance of parliamentary democracy has been maintained by the Government and its supporters, so has the myth that economic development in South Africa has meant progress for all. The facts demonstrate that this assertion is not true.

20. It must be stressed that blacks make up the majority of the labour force. Official figures show ratios ranging from 8.56 to 1 in mining, 2.45 to 1 in manufacturing, 3.38 to 1 in construction, 1.12 to 1 in electricity, 1.25 to 1 in the railways, and 3.8 to 1 in the post office. It has been shown, however, that the 16 million Africans who make up 70 per cent of the population receive only 18.5 per cent of the nation's personal cash income. Whites, who constitute 17.5 per cent of the population, receive 73.3 per cent of its income. The average income in 1969 for whites works out at 95 rand, that is to say, \$133 per month; and for Africans at 7 rand, \$9.80 per month. This means that on average the *per capita* income of Africans is 6 per cent of that of whites. Whites and Africans represent the top and bottom of the racial hierarchy. Thus, the gap between black and white incomes has grown in proportion to the decline in black trade union activities, and Afrikaner income has grown at the greatest rate of all.

21. A further indication of the racial hierarchy is government spending. For example, in 1969, the State and provinces spent 238 million rand on education for whites and 39.5 million rand on African education. Expenditure per head on African education is less than one eighth of that on white education, and the gap has grown for 13 years.

22. The claims of the régime to maintain so-called "law and order" and so-called "stable government" may have impressed a number of critics, but they are clearly maintained at the cost of civil and human rights. The dimensions of the problem of enforcement illustrate this further and point to serious and growing social disorder. Official figures show that a total of nearly 3 million alleged contraventions of legislation took place in 1969. Of these, more than 2 million people were sent for trial and a further 170,000 people were sent for trial for crimes of violence (murder, infanticide, assault and culpable homicide). Of more than 6,000 alleged murders, 153 involved white people and 6,000 black people. Of the total number of people sent for trial, 932,000, or nearly 40 per cent, were accused of the so-called "technical" offences, primarily involving racial legislation such as the pass laws. This represents a figure of almost 2,500 people per day. The average daily prison population was 90,555 in 1969-1970.

23. With regard to African political movements, nation-wide political parties of Africans, except in the so-called "homeland", are proscribed in South Africa. None is, in any case, permitted to contest elections for seats in the Parliament or provincial

legislatures. The right of political assembly outside the "homeland" and African townships is refused to Africans. Wherever political gatherings do occur, they are subject to close police scrutiny. Violence is expected to escalate, since the majority of South Africans will continue to oppose *apartheid*.

24. Hence, the basic result of the *apartheid* policies of South Africa can be seen in its victims. The casualty list includes the inhabitants, the institutions and the future of South Africa. Chief Albert Luthuli and Nelson Mandela, the victims of the Sharpeville and those of the more recent Carletonville massacre are among the victims best known to the outside world. Africans have suffered every conceivable type of disaster, from homicide to humiliation, from the expropriation of land to grinding poverty, from brutal imprisonment to relentless persecution. With their family life shattered, careers wrecked, education disrupted, and in constant danger of bodily harm, the vast majority are permanently maimed in one fashion or another.

25. The Africans are joined by the Coloured people, who encounter disabilities and indignities at every turn in the road. As an excuse for segregation, they are deprived of their historic political rights and their heritage. They are a people divested of hope.

26. In a word, racial containment means control over conditions of compulsion, *apartheid* reflecting the aspirations and the determination of the 4 million "white" minority to rule over 16 million Africans and 2 million Asians and Coloured people.

27. The *apartheid* policy is not limited to South African territory; it is extended outside to the south and to the north, where acts of intimidation and aggression and threats to international peace and security are repeatedly perpetuated by the South African régime and its allies.

28. In that context my delegation would like to refer to certain flagrant examples. The readiness of the Government of South Africa to resort to force gives cause for alarm; hence the freedom fighters fighting on the borders of Rhodesia, in the territories under Portuguese administration and in Namibia. That conflict is escalating, and both the freedom fighters and the South African régime have given warning of unremitting hostilities. With the drastic escalation of South African defence expenditure and the commitment of most of Africa to the side of the freedom fighters, the potential for this situation to expand into an international conflict gives grave cause for concern.

29. This dilemma is crystal clear in the example of the military presence of the South African régime in Southern Rhodesia in order to back the illegal racist régime of Ian Smith, as well as to threaten any African country which lends its support to the liberation struggle.

30. The occupation by the South African régime of Namibia, in disregard of all United Nations resolutions and of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice,¹ confirms that racialism and colonialism are two faces of one coin.

31. Moreover, the collaboration between the racist régimes in South Africa and Israel represents a serious threat to the war of liberation and to international peace and security. The report dated 29 April 1974 of the Sub-Committee on the Implementation of United Nations Resolutions and Collaboration with South Africa,² a Sub-Committee of the Special Committee on *Apartheid*, casts light on that fact. It states that at the outbreak of the liberation war of October 1973 the Prime Minister of South Africa, Mr. Vorster, had said that if Israel lost the war its defeat would have important consequences for the Republic of South Africa. The report went on to state that Mr. Vorster had said that the Middle East conflict was greatly affecting South Africa and that it was important for South Africa to study the Middle East situation closely. It further stated that the South African Defence Minister, Mr. Botha, had drawn a parallel between Israel and South Africa as bulwarks of the West and declared that South Africa would find ways of showing its deepest sympathies for Israel in a practical manner, short of sending weapons or soldiers.

32. Press reports of October 1973 also alleged that South African military personnel had participated in the war on the Israeli side for training purposes. Earlier reports had stated that Israel had supplied military equipment and training facilities to South African counter-insurgency forces. The above-mentioned report of the Sub-Committee refers to certain incidents which could be complementary to the press reports I have mentioned. That report states that at the outbreak of the October war the South African Zionist Federation had launched an emergency appeal for contributions by individuals and companies to help meet the so-called "humanitarian needs" of Israel, and although the total amount collected was not disclosed, it was believed that millions of dollars had been sent to Israel as a result of fund-raising activities by the Israeli United Appeal, a voluntary organization which operates under the South African Zionist Federation, and by several community groups, over 340,000 rand having been raised in two days. In December 1973, hundreds of young South African volunteers flew to Israel in response to an appeal by the South African Zionist Federation to replace kibbutzim workers who were engaged in the war, the report stated.

33. The collaboration between the racist régimes in South Africa and Israel is not confined to military

¹ *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council resolution 276 (1970)*, Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 16.

² A/AC.115/L.383.

collaboration in order to suppress the liberation struggle but is extended into the political and economic fields. In that connexion, the report of the Sub-Committee to which I have referred states that the Government of Israel, for its part had also shown support for the South African *apartheid* régime at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly, when its delegation had abstained in the voting on resolutions 3151 D and E (XXVIII) and voted against resolution 3151 G (XXVIII), and been absent during the voting on other resolutions on *apartheid*.

34. The report goes on to say that economic relations between South Africa and Israel have been rapidly increasing, an Israeli-South Africa Chamber of Commerce having been opened in Tel Aviv in January of this year. Speaking at the inauguration ceremony—the report goes on—the Chairman of the new organization declared that Israeli exports to South Africa had increased from approximately \$9 million in 1972 to \$12 million in 1973 and that Israeli imports from South Africa had increased from \$11.6 million to \$30 million in the same period; and the South African Consul-General in Tel Aviv had declared that trade between the two countries was expected to increase again considerably this year.

35. In March 1974, the report of the Sub-Committee concludes, a correspondent of the Johannesburg *Sunday Times* who spent two weeks in Israel reported that South African firms were actively seeking investment opportunities in Israel in order to gain easy access to the European Common Market after Israel's application for associate membership of the Market had been formally approved later in 1974.

36. The Organization and the Charter are now facing a big challenge—that of *apartheid* policies, policies which not only deliberately violate the basic principles of human rights but also threaten the stability of international peace and security through the notorious collaboration between the different racist régimes and their supporters. Therefore, the members of the Security Council are now facing two specific alternatives—either to insist on sovereignty and the maintenance of our Charter against any persistent violations, or to consider the Charter merely a theoretical piece of work with no real application, by closing our eyes to violations while reciting its principles and concepts on different occasions without serious intent or sincerity. In other words, we must decide either to maintain the United Nations as an effective body for the maintenance of interdependent relations, justice, peace and security, or to sow the seeds of its decay, and see it follow the fate of its predecessor, the League of Nations.

37. Our sincere adherence to the Charter now imposes upon us the adoption of certain measures against South Africa. Among such measures is expulsion of the South African régime from the membership of the Organization in conformity with

the resolution adopted at Magadiscio by the Organization of African Unity (OAU), and resolution 3207 (XXIX), which the General Assembly just adopted, by which the credentials of the South African régime have been rejected.

38. Such a decision is based on certain specific judgements, mainly the following: the South African régime is perpetually violating the founding principles of the Charter; the South African régime disregards all United Nations resolutions that condemn and reject the *apartheid* policies; by applying racial policies, the South African régime has isolated and separated itself from the majority component of its society and therefore, in constitutional terms, that régime does not legitimately represent the South African people; the South African régime is intensifying its colonial and racist policies in Namibia; and, finally, the South African régime, through its practices and its collaboration with the other racial régimes, represents a serious threat to international peace and security.

39. There are some who contend that we should not expel South Africa on the grounds that the principle of expulsion would constitute a serious precedent vis-à-vis the permanence of United Nations membership. They also argue that we must maintain the membership of South Africa while putting pressure on it from within in order to force it to abandon its inhuman policies.

40. With regard to the first argument, one could inquire which is more vital to the Organization—to have the precedent of expulsion of an obstinate member or to establish the serious precedent of a perpetual breach of the Charter. Furthermore, the state of membership is valid as long as there is adherence to the aims and principles of the Charter. Once those principles have been violated purposely and repeatedly, it goes without saying that such membership would be non-existent and should be null and void.

41. Turning now to the other argument—that is, putting pressure upon South Africa from within the Organization—my delegation opposes that idea also, since over a period of years the United Nations has exhausted all possible remedial pressures and means against South Africa. But South Africa disregards and ignores all the United Nations efforts. Therefore, what are we waiting for? If we are waiting for a miracle that could change the South African attitude, I would say this is not the time for miracles.

42. Yet expulsion of South Africa does not contradict the universality of the Organization, since universality in essence means that all Members abide by the same Charter principles which imply brotherhood and interdependence.

43. Foreign investment in South Africa bears a heavy responsibility for *apartheid*. Although they

are by no means the exclusive underwriters of *apartheid*, foreign investors are none the less to be counted among the bankers and providers of know-how for the present version of *apartheid*. Their roles are to be identified directly with a major cornerstone of racial containment—namely, economic exploitation as reflected in the high rate of earnings, profits being repatriated regularly or ploughed back into plant expansion or new enterprises, as has occurred repeatedly now that the investment base is sufficiently broad and diversified.

44. Consequently, the decisive and fair action of expelling the South African régime from the United Nations should be implemented and observed by all the Members, since the main aim of such expulsion is the complete isolation of that régime. Such isolation implies that every Member State should refrain from any kind of dealings with the South African régime. That action should go hand in hand with full and unconditional support for the people of South Africa and Namibia in their legitimate struggle for national liberation.

45. The situation in South Africa is mounting to a crisis that will either be followed by further repression or explode into active conflict, the dimensions and impact of which may extend far beyond South Africa itself. Thus let us all shoulder our responsibility towards the Organization and also towards peace, justice and human dignity.

46. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Nigeria; I now invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make a statement.

47. Mr. OGBU (Nigeria): The Nigerian delegation wishes to extend to the Iraqi delegation its sincerest condolences on the sad death of the Foreign Minister of Iraq.

48. Mr. President, it is a matter of great satisfaction to my delegation to see you presiding over the affairs of the Security Council for this month when it is seized of this matter of great concern to the world and particularly to the continent of Africa. As you come from the friendly neighbouring country of the Cameroon, we are aware of the total commitment of your Government, your people and yourself to the cause of the total eradication of *apartheid* from the face of the world. We congratulate you.

49. Today, the United Nations, especially its principal organ, stands on the threshold of a momentous decision: a decision which may strengthen the faith of nations and peoples in the United Nations or start a gradual process of eroding its credibility and moral authority.

50. The Security Council has been requested by the General Assembly—by an overwhelming majority

vote of 125 to 1—to take necessary action under the Charter in the face of persistent and flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the South African régime.

51. The facts of the situation are very clear and have long been acknowledged by the Security Council and the General Assembly. The relevant provisions of the Charter are equally clear. Article 6 states that a Member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the principles contained in the Charter may be expelled from the Organization by the Assembly upon the recommendation of the Council. It is time that the Council took the action that is incumbent upon it.

52. The Organization has been seized of the problem of racism in South Africa ever since the first session of the General Assembly in 1946. In scores of resolutions, the Assembly has appealed to, demanded and warned the South African régime to abandon its racial policies, but to no avail. The Security Council itself has considered the situation since the Sharpeville massacre in 1960 and adopted seven resolutions calling upon the South African régime to desist from its policies, which are not only contrary to the Charter and to the norms of the civilized world, but are a menace to international peace. Indeed, the Council determined, as long ago as 1963, that the policies and actions of the South African régime seriously disturbed international peace and security in southern Africa.

53. The transgressions of the *apartheid* régime in South Africa have been fully documented. I would like to draw your attention in particular to the report of the Special Committee on *Apartheid*, of which I have the honour to be the current Chairman, on "violations of the Charter of the United Nations and resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council by the South African régime".³ This report has been transmitted to the Security Council [S/11537]. The Special Committee has recalled that the two principal organs of the United Nations have already determined that the South African régime has persistently violated the principles of the Charter. I would draw your attention to paragraphs 16 to 26 of the report, where it is pointed out that the General Assembly determined thus in no less than 11 resolutions between 1953 and 1972.

54. As long ago as 1962—in resolution 1761 (XVII)—the General Assembly requested the Security Council to consider action under Article 6 of the Charter. In 1973, in its resolution 3068 (XXVIII), the General Assembly declared that *apartheid* was a crime against humanity and adopted an International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*.

³ Official Records of the General Assembly, twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 22 A, part one.

55. The Security Council itself recognized, in resolution 134 (1960), that the grave situation in South Africa had arisen because of the disregard by the South African régime of the General Assembly resolutions calling upon it to bring its policies into conformity with its obligations and responsibilities under the Charter. In resolution 182 (1963), it determined that the discriminatory and repressive measures imposed by the South African régime were contrary to the principles and purposes of the Charter and were in violation of its obligations as a Member of the United Nations and of the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In resolution 191 (1964), the Council again determined that the policies of *apartheid* were contrary to the principles and purposes of the Charter and inconsistent with the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as well as South Africa's obligations under the Charter. In resolution 311 (1972), the Council condemned the South African régime for continuing its policies of *apartheid* in violation of its obligations under the Charter.

56. Thus, both the General Assembly and the Security Council have determined, over a period of many years, that the South African régime has violated the principles of the Charter. That régime, which has elevated racial discrimination and segregation to a national creed, has shown no willingness to revise its course and abide by the principles of the Charter.

57. The Security Council has, therefore, an inescapable obligation under the Charter to take action to secure compliance with the provisions of the Charter and to avert the threat to international peace and security created by the policies and actions of the South African régime. One of the first steps to exclude the South African régime from participation in the Organization is action under Articles 5 and 6 of the Charter. That régime does not represent a peace-loving State. It is neither able nor willing to carry out its obligations under the Charter. Preventive action was taken against it by the Security Council when it instituted an arms embargo in 1963. It has persistently violated the principles contained in the Charter. It has refused to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council on the problem of *apartheid* and with regard to Southern Rhodesia and the Territory of Namibia, for which the Organization has a sacred duty and responsibility.

58. I should like to remind the members of the Council that Article 24 of the Charter, under which the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security has been conferred upon the Council, provides that in discharging its duties, the Council acts on behalf of all the Members of the Organization and shall act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

59. The paramount consideration must be the record of the South African régime in the light of the clear provisions of Articles 4, 5 and 6 of the Charter. Any other considerations, especially the diplomatic, economic and other relations, which some members of the Council have regrettably continued to maintain with the South African régime in contravention of the appeals of the General Assembly, cannot be and must not be allowed to influence the decision of the Council.

60. My delegation hopes that the Security Council will act in such a way as to preserve the integrity of the Charter and the confidence reposed by Governments and peoples in the Organization.

61. We are aware of the doubts expressed by some delegations as to the desirability or wisdom of expelling the South African régime from the Organization. We believe that there is little basis for any hesitation at this time, after all the warnings given by the United Nations for over a decade and the record of the South African régime, which has, during this period, merely reinforced the structure of *apartheid* and threatened peace all over southern Africa.

62. Some people have suggested, for instance, that the principle of universality of the Organization will be violated if the South African régime is expelled. This argument comes rather strangely from those who have obstructed the universality of the Organization by hindering the processes of decolonization, not to mention their record with respect to the representation of the People's Republic of China. Universality can be pursued only in accordance with the principles of the Charter, and not as a means to condone and defend gross violations of the Charter. Otherwise, Articles 5 and 6 of the Charter would become inoperative and it would become impossible for the Organization to take any step to bring an erring Member State into line.

63. Let us imagine for the moment the absurdity of the proposition that the community would be deprived of the presence of a convicted criminal if he were sent to jail. If this could be successfully pleaded, criminals would roam the streets of every country free to continue in their illegality. The same morality which justifies a national authority's depriving an offending citizen of his or her rights compels a body like this to enforce the rules and regulations of the Organization.

64. In an equally important respect, it is the principle of universality itself which is called into question by the policy of *apartheid*, which deprives 80 per cent of the population of South Africa of the most elementary rights, including the right to be represented in the Parliament or the Government. Universality is secured, not by accepting the minority régime, but by effective action to eradicate *apartheid* so that all the people of South Africa can enjoy equal

rights on the basis of universal suffrage, irrespective of race, colour or creed. The expulsion of the South African régime is an essential step towards this goal.

65. Some people say that we should allow the Pretoria régime to occupy the South African seat in these halls, though it does not represent the South African people and though it continues flagrantly to violate and to defy the principles of the Organization, because it can be influenced by the abhorrence expressed by all the other Members of the Organization. This argument, I submit, can hardly carry any conviction after all these years of appeals, demands and condemnations of *apartheid*.

66. The Pretoria régime has only intensified racial discrimination and resorted to increasing brutality against opponents of racism during this period because of its confidence that some Member States would prevent effective action under the Charter. It has, moreover, committed aggression in Southern Rhodesia and challenged the Organization with respect to Namibia.

67. Any delay in action against this régime will only serve to encourage it in its defiance of the United Nations. On the other hand, prompt action to deprive it of the rights and privileges of membership will oblige its supporters to rethink their course and will also serve as a deterrent to any other régime which seeks to pursue racial discrimination. The South African régime has been anxious to remain in this Organization because it derives benefit from its participation. On the other hand, the continued presence of the South African régime is of no benefit to the Organization. As the Council knows, the South African régime has refused, until now at least, to participate in the debates on *apartheid* in the General Assembly or the Security Council. It has refused to co-operate with any of the bodies established to deal with *apartheid*, and it has shown utter contempt for the decisions of the Council on southern Africa.

68. The presence of the South African régime in the Organization is an anomaly which cannot be tolerated indefinitely. Nor can we ignore the enormity of its crimes. Despite the warnings of the Security Council, it has continued in its disastrous course of imposing racist oppression on the great majority of the people of that country, at the risk of a violent race conflict. It has forcibly moved, or is moving, millions of people from their homes to impose segregation and dispossess the African people of their rights. A million Africans a year are put in jail under racist laws. The leaders of the black people are subjected to vengeful persecution under laws and regulations which have no parallel in any country. Even a few days ago, after meetings in observance of the tenth anniversary of FRELIMO, [*Frente de Libertação de Moçambique*], it imprisoned numerous leaders of the black people all over the country. Early this month, I received a telegram from the children of Nelson and Winnie

Mandela announcing that this régime, which has sentenced Nelson Mandela to life imprisonment in defiance of the United Nations, has also imprisoned his wife, Winnie. Nelson and Winnie Mandela are now in jail, for no offence other than opposition to racial discrimination and the upholding of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

69. In calling for action by the Security Council, we are not moved by anger. We take no pleasure in proposing the expulsion of the South African régime from the Organization. We believe that this action is essential to restore confidence in the Organization and to advance its efforts to secure the eradication of *apartheid* and to assist all the people of South Africa to attain their inalienable rights.

70. Action by the Security Council will enable the United Nations and the specialized agencies to isolate the South African régime and deprive it of the benefits of international co-operation and recognition. It will serve as a warning to the white minority in South Africa that they must re-think their course and seek their destiny in accordance with the principles of the Charter. It will serve as an encouragement to all those in South Africa who have been struggling to defend the principles of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

71. We have no doubt that the South African People will eradicate *apartheid* and achieve freedom and equal rights. The question is whether this Organization has played its role, in accordance with its commitments under the Charter, in promoting a solution and averting bloodshed and suffering in the inevitable process of liberation.

72. Let it not be said by future historians that, when the people of South Africa were striving against all odds in defence of the principles of the United Nations, the Organization gave comfort to the minority racist régime and even accepted it as the spokesman of that country, because of the short-sightedness or the selfish interests of a few Member States.

73. The Security Council declared in its resolution 191 (1964) that "all the people of South Africa should be brought into consultation and should thus be enabled to decide the future of their country at the national level". It is only by rejecting the credentials of the racists to speak for South Africa and by listening to the voice of the authentic representatives of the South African people that the Organization will promote this goal, to which all Member States are committed.

74. While calling for the expulsion of the racist régime, we look forward to the day when the South African people will be properly and effectively represented in the Organization and will play their rightful role in the international community.

75. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Mauritius.

I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

76. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): My delegation joins the Security Council and previous speakers in extending heartfelt condolences to the delegation of Iraq, a member of the Council, on the demise of its distinguished Foreign Minister.

77. The question of South Africa's position in the United Nations involves three major areas in which that Government is defying the authority of the Organization. I think we should keep these three aspects firmly in mind when considering the gravity of the confrontation to which South Africa is building up.

78. First, there is the illegal occupation of Namibia, in defiance of international law as defined by the International Court of Justice, as well as the resolutions of the Security Council and General Assembly on this Territory, for which the United Nations has direct responsibility.

79. Secondly, there is South Africa's refusal to observe the mandatory resolutions of the Security Council imposing economic and diplomatic sanctions on the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia. This is the only case of the Council adopting mandatory resolutions under Chapter VII of the Charter, and the fact that South Africa is the major channel for international violations, as well as being itself the major violator, must be considered as a serious threat to the credibility of the Council's decisions.

80. Thirdly, and at the root of the other two issues, we have the fact that South Africa is controlled by a white minority of less than 17 per cent—the previous speaker said 17.5 per cent and I stand corrected—which maintains a monopoly of political and economic power by means of a police State that controls the movement, employment and social life of the non-white majority. This is in short the policy of *apartheid* which the Government in Pretoria has refused to discontinue, and it is because of that refusal that the Council is called upon to review the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa.

81. I should like to summarize very briefly the reasons for which the South African régime's policy is so destructive of United Nations policy decisions in the three areas just outlined. I do not think that we need go into the details of the three issues: an excellent job of monitoring and debating the South African régime's role in them has been carried out by the Committee of 24,⁴ the Special Committee on *Apartheid* and the United Nations Council for

Namibia and its distinguished Commissioner, Mr. Seán MacBride. There is little question as to what the major problems are as regards the South African régime's intervention in these areas of United Nations concern and responsibility.

82. In Namibia the occupation régime has, since the inception of the Mandate, used the Territory and its people for the purposes of the South African minority, without regard for the rights and aspirations of the Namibian people. The mineral and agricultural wealth of Namibia has been stolen from the people for the exclusive use of white settlers and foreign corporate interests.

83. Together with this theft of Namibia's assets, the occupation régime has forced its people into virtual slavery, forcing them to work for the white usurpers and rigidly controlling them by a ruthless apparatus of pass laws, identity documents and Draconian laws which compel the people to work on terms decided unilaterally by the whites. In response to the courageous resistance of the Namibians in the form of local uprisings, strikes, boycotts of spurious elections, and the armed struggle itself—much of this under the banner of SWAPO [*South West Africa People's Organization*], both within and outside Namibia—the occupation régime has imposed a crippling burden of repressive legislation on the Territory, including martial law throughout the northern region.

84. Within the last year alone, the leaders of SWAPO operating legally inside Namibia were arbitrarily arrested, detained for many months without trial and without access to lawyers or to the outside world and, apparently, suffered torture. At the same time, many hundreds of people were detained and tortured under the so-called emergency regulations applied in the north. SWAPO and other legal parties have been prevented from holding meetings or conducting normal political activities. A wave of barbarism has been set in motion by the local nominees of the occupation régime, in the form of brutal floggings of men and women accused of supporting SWAPO; severe injuries have resulted, as well as excruciating pain. Many hundreds of people have fled their country in fear of their lives and liberty as a result of this wave of terror.

85. The South African armed forces have moved into Namibia, abandoning all pretence of observing their commitment to demilitarize the Territory. Continual reinforcements of personnel and equipment are being brought in, including missiles reportedly bought from France and Jordan. The air base at Katima Mulilo, a few miles from the Zambian border, with its bombers, fighter jets and missiles, represents a most serious threat to Zambia and to the whole of independent Africa. This threat is intolerable to Africa, as it must be to all true friends of Africa.

⁴ Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

86. The question of Southern Rhodesia is equally outrageous. South African forces are actually fighting to preserve the illegal Smith régime, in defiance of Security Council decisions that the situation is a threat to peace. Whether the South African régime calls them police or armed forces is of no concern to us; they are forces deployed by that régime to suppress the movement for self-determination and independence in Zimbabwe. Their presence there, which is now indispensable to the Smith régime, is the most blatant case of South Africa's using violence to achieve its aim of white supremacy in southern Africa in an open challenge to the United Nations and to the country responsible, the United Kingdom.

87. Over the matter of sanctions, South African intervention is in open opposition to the mandatory resolutions of the Security Council under Chapter VII of the Charter. The extremely disappointing progress of United Nations economic sanctions until recently is, as we all know, due to the open collaboration between the South African régime and South African private interests, which not only provided the major trade and investment facilities directly to the whites in Southern Rhodesia but also furnished the means for Smith's supporters in innumerable other countries to evade sanctions virtually with impunity. In effect, South Africa acted as the agent of the illegal Smith régime for its own profit, fully justifying their Rhodesian nickname of "our friends plus 10 per cent".

88. It is intolerable, and destructive of the United Nations itself, that a régime which openly opposes the collective decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly be allowed to continue participating in our decision-making process. However, I note with interest the decision of this Council earlier to allow the representative of Vorster to speak here in this debate. My delegation formulates no protest at this stage. Who knows, a pleasant miracle may be about to be performed. Vorster may have regained his sanity. His representative may announce the end of *apartheid* and the illegal occupation of Namibia. So we shall wait and listen.

89. Let us look very briefly at the nature of this régime. It is one founded on white privilege and a white monopoly of all the country's assets. Only the white minority votes for the régime, and only the whites are eligible to live in the best areas, using the best farmland, with access to the major ports and facilities of all kinds. Although their way of life depends on the human resources provided by the black majority, every means—including force and the use of police terror—is used to deny that majority its basic human rights. Increasingly, Africans living throughout both urban and rural South Africa are being classified as "surplus appendages" if they are not actually working for whites and are being forcibly removed to the comic-opera, so-called "Bantu homelands", small and scattered areas, the

most part of which cannot possibly offer even subsistence living to those already there, let alone to those in the camps proliferating in and around these areas, who are without land, without work and, what is worse, without hope of escape. There is no element of choice in the deportations to these notorious dumping grounds. The population removals are determined by the white régime and enforced by the police forces.

90. Now the irony of the situation is that the South African régime is trying to project these bantustan areas as a great achievement and even a vindication of the theories of white supremacy and *apartheid*. It has a multimillion-dollar public relations campaign to persuade international opinion that, although access to the bantustans is rigidly controlled to prevent the facts from coming out, they are some kind of paradise of African self-determination and, ultimately, independence. It is manipulating the procedures of the United Nations for this outrageous propaganda, even bringing one of its bantustan stooges to the General Assembly to promote the illusion of African self-determination—a mockery of that concept as it is understood by the United Nations. It has tried to deceive the Security Council and induce it to believe that this form of so-called "self-determination" is a solution for its illegal occupation of Namibia—and we should recall that the imposition of the bantustan plan on Namibia has been explicitly rejected by members of the Council, including France, the United Kingdom and the United States. The attempt to deceive the international community as to the true nature of the African deportations and the construction of these pathetic camps is outrageous.

91. There is an argument which is popular among the friends of South Africa, namely that the régime should keep some representatives around at the United Nations so that it can listen to the expressions of "abhorrence" which the United Kingdom, France and the United States repeat in ritualistic fashion when they are required to say something on this issue. Such an argument appears somewhat weak in the light of the very extensive bilateral relations which these countries maintain with the South African régime on the political, social, economic and cultural levels; these extensive contacts should be capable, one would have thought, of communicating the attitudes of the Governments maintaining them to the South African régime. Furthermore, access to the public meetings of the Security Council and General Assembly and its organs is freely available to any interested observer; news agencies and the South African press cover these meetings without any restrictions whatsoever, and any South African may sit in the public gallery to hear what is being said. The question is one, not of communication but of South Africa's right to participate in United Nations deliberations while that régime is doing everything

possible to sabotage our decisions on southern African issues.

92. Another red herring frequently raised by defenders of the South African racist régime is to invoke the principle of universality of membership. Let it be clearly understood that we Africans are strongly in favour of applying the principle of universality so that all the nations of the world should have representation in our deliberations. At the beginning of the present session of the General Assembly we welcomed, as a new Member, the Republic of Guinea-Bissau, which has finally achieved independence and sovereign status in spite of all the efforts of the previous Portuguese régime to suppress its aspirations. That is what we hope to see very soon in the case of Mozambique and Angola. We are no less determined to see in the near future the admission of a delegation from the legally independent States of Namibia and Zimbabwe. It should be clearly understood that the obstacle to participation by the people of Namibia and Zimbabwe, as well as the majority of the people in South Africa, is the minority racist régime in South Africa. By refusing to invoke the relevant provisions of the Charter against this régime, the credentials of which the General Assembly has firmly rejected, the Security Council would, in effect, be blocking the representation of the people of southern Africa in this great Organization. Let us, therefore, appreciate the principle of universality as demanding the self-determination and independence of the people of Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa itself, and as requiring for its realization a determined move to reject the repressive and unrepresentative régime in South Africa, which is the major obstacle to universality. Expulsion or suspension of the offending régime is the least of the provisions of the Charter which can be resorted to in the struggle for self-determination. We are not at this stage asking for economic sanctions or for military operations by the United Nations, although they would be the most likely measures to achieve the universality of membership which we all look for in southern Africa. We are seeking the expulsion of the minority régime in South Africa—just as it was expelled from the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the World Health Organization and the International Labour Organisation and other international organizations and conferences, and just as it was forced out of the Commonwealth—as a contribution towards liberating the people in that region, just as Guinea-Bissau has been liberated.

93. I wish now to refer to the procedures which are being used in this case to challenge the participation of the South African régime in the decision-making of the United Nations. It is important, I believe, for the permanent members of the Security Council in particular to realize that in referring this serious matter to the Council for its consideration, the General Assembly has, in fact, put the Council itself on trial. Its composition is such, and the record of votes—that

is, the negative votes of permanent members—on colonial issues is also such, that legitimate doubts may be raised about its ability to debate seriously any colonial or *apartheid* issue. The question may be asked whether the Security Council operates as a preserve of the former colonial Powers to impede progress on all such issues which may be brought before it. Where the South African racist régime is openly and consistently undermining the Security Council's own major resolutions on Namibia and Southern Rhodesia, will the Council be prepared to take appropriate action under Chapter II of the Charter? Or is there a built-in bias in favour of South Africa, no matter what that racist régime does and no matter what contempt it has for the principles of human rights and self-determination which lie at the very heart of the United Nations and its Charter? It should be remembered that this may not be a final decision; the question of South African participation in the General Assembly and its organs can be decided by the Assembly, which is master of its own procedure. The determination has been made by the Assembly's Credentials Committee, backed by a large majority of the Assembly itself, that the credentials of the present purported representatives of South Africa are unacceptable. The Assembly can therefore decide on its own account to withdraw from these purported representatives access to the rostrum and the voting procedures of the Assembly and its organs.

94. In this we should recall that a lead has already been given by a large number of international organizations in the United Nations family—as I mentioned earlier—which have expelled South Africa. Most recently, South Africa has been removed from the decision-making executive bodies of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. This resulted largely from the initiative of the Government of Australia, and we owe that Government our grateful thanks for its determination to stand up for its principles and its integrity, in sharp contrast to other Governments, in following up its claims of opposition to *apartheid* with a move to translate a moral position into actual policy. Unfortunately, Australia and the Nordic countries seem so far to be the exception among Western countries in their approach towards the South African racist régime. It is well known that three countries here with the power to protect South Africa with their veto also have some interests in the *apartheid* régime and its occupation of Namibia.

95. Everybody knows to which three countries I am referring. I need not name them nor speak in detail about their relationship with South Africa. However, I should like to dwell very briefly on one point. It has become common knowledge that apparently secret negotiations disguised under the euphemistic title of "contingency planning" have been taking place between some of the Western Powers that are members of NATO [*North Atlantic Treaty Organization*] and

the South African naval and military forces. These developments are frightening. On the one hand, they indicate defiance of the United Nations resolutions concerning military collaboration with South Africa while, on the other hand, they indicate a sudden leap by the NATO alliance onto the southern African scene, a jump by NATO from the north Atlantic into the southern Atlantic and the Indian Ocean. It is not without significance that NATO manoeuvres are taking place between the British and the South African navies and between the French and the South African navies. It is also known that Admiral Boermann, Commander-in-Chief of the South African forces, has been in close contact with the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the United States defence forces. These facts, taken in conjunction with the recent public disclosure in the United States press of some hitherto secret documents, are causing grave concern to the African States, and certainly to Mauritius, a neighbouring State of South Africa in the Indian Ocean. Africans are therefore deeply preoccupied by the growing number of reports from reliable sources that the United States—and it would seem other Western Powers as well—have been secretly increasing assistance and support for the minority racist or illegal régimes while paying lip-service to the idea of eliminating *apartheid*.

96. After a review of these links between some of the Western Powers and South Africa, one is prompted to ask whether it is ethical for powerful States which have such financial and military entanglements to have the right to veto the suspension or expulsion of South Africa.

97. If this were a court of law, the countries to which I have referred would be required to withdraw from the jury on the grounds of prior commitment to the defendant in the context of its serious breaches of the Charter of the United Nations and its principles. It is intolerable that three permanent members should be allowed to veto any constructive draft resolution to apply the provisions of the Charter, particularly Articles 5 and 6, when they are all in violation of the Charter and the major resolutions adopted in accordance with it.

98. Mr. President, beloved African brothers, let us hope that these three members can set aside their interest in South Africa and vote with us according to the issues. If they fail, we shall at least know who cannot be counted as a friend of Africa. And we shall also know that they are not interested in the peaceful settlement of this dispute by the means provided in the Charter.

99. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Zaire, whom I now invite to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

100. Mr. MUTUALE (Zaire) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, allow me first of all to

associate myself with the condolences you expressed on behalf of the Security Council to the delegation of Iraq on the untimely death of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of that country.

101. I should like first of all to express my gratitude to you and to the members of the Council for having allowed the delegation of Zaire to participate, without the right to vote, in this important debate. May I also say how very happy I am to see you presiding over the Council in regard to a situation which is so close to our hearts and which is taking place on the African continent, our continent of origin. In this context, your presidency naturally acquires a symbolic value. It is a symbol of good augury for the outcome of the debate, certainly. But it is also a symbol of the role of your highly esteemed country in particular and of independent Africa in general, in a common effort undertaken by Member States to ensure the peace and dignity of mankind. Your personality, combining a high sense of responsibility and modesty rendered pleasant by a good temper, and aided by *savoir faire* and diplomatic tact, will, I am sure, be very useful in the negotiations which will follow this debate.

102. Several distinguished speakers have preceded me in this debate. Among them, two were outstanding, namely, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Somalia and President of the Council of Ministers of OAU, Mr. Omer Arteh Ghalib, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Sierra Leone, Mr. Desmond Luke. We thank the Council for having invited them to speak. We are pleased to see in this attitude on the part of the Council not simply a gesture of politeness and courtesy, but also proof of its attention to and consideration for their important statements and for the resolutions and decisions of OAU on the problem under debate.

103. And what exactly is that problem? The essential question which is this time placed before the Council and on which it is called upon to exercise its wisdom does not consist so much in recognizing once again the guilty and criminal nature of *apartheid* but, rather, to consider its persistent character—in other words, its continuance despite repeated and severe warnings—and, from the observation of this persistence, to apply the sanctions prescribed by the Charter.

104. There has in fact been unanimity for years in the Security Council and in the Organization, and also outside it, regarding the guilt and criminality of the racist régime which was established years ago on our continent. It is rare in the history of the socio-political régimes devised by man to find one so inhuman and so cruel. Heart and mind meet to reject it.

105. In the General Assembly since 1946, that is for 28 years, and in the Council already in 1960 and

subsequently, the consideration of this question has aroused deep feelings of indignation and given rise to torrents of eloquence against *apartheid*, a régime which no philosophical, ethical, sociological or legal conception has been able to justify to the deep conscience of our being and of our human nature.

106. We therefore came forward to this table on the one hand convinced that our move is legitimate and, on the other, with that feeling of confidence which the Council can inspire, which is at the same time the heir of the accumulated experience of the Organization since its inception and the guardian of the flame of the highest human aspirations. Our move is not due purely and simply to a reaction of racial solidarity. It arises out of something loftier which goes above and beyond this solidarity, and out of something universal, which is exactly what is at stake in the evil doings and criminality of the *apartheid* régime. What is at stake is the ideals and principles proclaimed for the benefit of all the inhabitants of the earth by the Charter as well as by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

107. *Apartheid* is not only a violation of the principle of equality among peoples, nations and races. It is also quite simply the most total denial of respect for the fundamental human rights of any man, whoever and wherever he may be. Furthermore, it is an arrogant and shocking repudiation of the principle of self-determination. And worst of all it is pregnant with a real risk of racial confrontation in the south of the African continent.

108. This part of our planet is continually the theatre of racial tragedies: tragedies of families uprooted in their own homeland, of human beings torn apart body and soul, of people thrown into prison and subjected to exploitation and plunder without recourse, without even the hope of recourse—we wonder in the name of what, in the name of which god, in the name of what vision of the world or of the destiny of the white race on this earth. The degree of criminality attained by *apartheid* is without parallel among the practices of racial discrimination.

109. We reach the point here where we see the really traumatic dimensions of the aspect of the problem which the Council has to deal with and, at the same time, the final significance of our action. Despite the innumerable condemnations of its criminal practice and the lengths to which it has gone, Pretoria remains imperturbable and true to itself. To the multiple appeals and requests that for 28 years have alternated with warnings, Pretoria has not deigned to give the slightest sign, to make the slightest indication which would at least allow us to assume its good faith or its good intentions, whether for now or for the future, as regards the abandonment of its policy of *apartheid*, and its will to comply with the provisions of the Charter.

110. On the contrary, as the years have gone by, with the United Nations constantly extending a hand to the racist Governments, *apartheid* has developed, hardened and branched out and, as though to give obvious proof of its bad faith, its obstinacy and its guilty conduct, both to its allies and to the undecided, Pretoria has devoted itself to improving and institutionalizing *apartheid* so that today it provides a spectacle of the most abject human subjection, the increasingly pitiless, systematic degradation of the black man on his own soil and great tyrannical brutality. Through colonialist measures and slave laws, the black man finds himself from day to day deprived not only of his soil but also of his most elementary rights and freedoms.

111. As regards this institutionalization, I hope the Council will allow me to recall the statement made on 4 October 1973 in the General Assembly by the President of the Republic of Zaire, Citizen Mobutu Sese Seko:

"[South Africa] is the only country in the world where the whites have raised segregation to the level of an institution. The term *apartheid* would not exist in human language had the whites not been in South Africa."⁵

112. Could the Council have better proof of the persistence of the South African Government of the conduct of that Government—and it is a conduct which is not of today alone.

113. While, on the one hand, the Organization condemns *apartheid* and recognizes that it is criminal, on the other hand, the Government concerned openly continues its guilty policy and even strengthens it, and does so despite repeated warnings over a period of 28 years—throughout the entire lifetime of the Organization. There is not the shadow of a doubt that the main conditions laid down in Article 6 of the Charter for a recommendation of expulsion have been met.

114. Africa raises its voice to call upon the Council collectively and upon each member individually to arouse the Organization from the comfortable position of immobility which becomes complicity and which has lasted for 28 years. We want the Organization to move away from futile and fruitless condemnations, which, because they are ineffective, undermine the authority, the prestige and the credibility that should surround and ennoble it.

115. We do not share the view that this forum is a debating society where cynicism, duplicity and hypocrisy have a place. The Council is the incarnation of the great hopes of the Organization, and the voice of relentless selfishness and of the thirst for

⁵ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eight Session, Plenary Meetings, 2140th meeting, para. 121.

predominance must be silenced, at least here in this chamber where the few represent the many. The principles of the Charter are at the service of all mankind, of all nations, of all races. One cannot continually tolerate, without becoming an accomplice, the persistent and obvious trampling underfoot of those principles by the adventurers on the black continent. That is why the Dar-es-Salaam, Lusaka and Kinshasa trio is determined to prevent the growth of that virus and is committed to agreeing to any sacrifice to fight it to the end.

116. The voice Africa raises in this forum is an echo which comes from the depths of its soul. We are the repositories of a rare experience of racial discrimination which has emerged from the ideologies of supremacy. The Organization must totally sever itself from Pretoria. It must not fix itself in an immobility of artifices and measures, the fate of which is known in advance through a long experience of 28 years. The complacency imposed by alliances must yield to strictness and to justice, as is required by the functions vested in the Council.

117. History, past and recent, has proved that the principles and ideals of dignity and respect for the human being contain in themselves the forces of evolution which, sooner or later, will bring about the necessary changes. The Council has the historic opportunity to demonstrate its solidarity either with those principles and ideals which are at the basis of the evolution of the human species or with the criminality and bad faith of Pretoria. The latter assumption, however, has nothing in common with our genuine wishes. Rather do we pray that the Council will recover the wisdom and inspiration of its best days and that its decision on the problem will contribute to restoring vigour and hope to those of our fellow-men whose human nature is being consistently and systematically denied.

118. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic; I now invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

119. Mr. KELANI (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from French*): May I first express the sincere condolences of my delegation to the delegation of our sister country, Iraq, on the tragic death of the Iraqi Minister for Foreign Affairs.

120. Mr. President, I should like to congratulate you on your accession to the presidency of the Council for this month. Through you and through your country, this is an honour to the whole of Africa—Africa, which has always valiantly struggled for the principles of the Charter and human rights to be respected and serve as the foundation for the progress of the world.

121. I should like to thank you for having been kind enough to call upon me today. Indeed, Syria

feels itself very much involved in the struggle against racism and colonialism because it has itself had to suffer those evils and it is a member of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* and the Committee of 24.

122. The recent occurrences in Africa reflect a deliberate and definite change in the development of events. The struggle that has been waged by the Organization for many years is finally yielding its fruits. Colonialism, racism, *apartheid* and injustice are falling back. Soon those words will simply be something reminiscent of the past. Events are gradually running their course. There remain only a few bastions, and they are becoming increasingly isolated and broken down. I am referring in particular to the régime in South Africa, the racist and segregationist régime whose philosophy has been elevated into a doctrine by a foreign minority, a minority that has the audacity to claim to represent among us the majority of the legitimate inhabitants of a land whose rights it flouts.

123. The representatives of the white colonialist minority in fact claim to represent 80 per cent of a people which has no representative in the South African Parliament because even the very limited suffrage that used to be enjoyed by some Africans was abolished in 1946. Can the delegates of South Africa, which represent 3 million foreign colonialists, affirm that they represent here the aspirations and desires of 16 million Africans who are under their yoke?

124. What organization do the representatives of the racist régime of South Africa claim to belong to? They have the audacity to wish to belong to an Organization whose fundamental principles and whose decisions they violate outrageously. Any State that wishes to belong to the United Nations does so by choice and not by force. Thus it freely commits itself to accept and respect the principles of the Charter by signing and ratifying it. South Africa has never made any positive gesture along those lines.

125. South Africa is not the only régime that scorns the principles of the Charter and the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. It finds its best support among similar racist authorities such as the Zionist authorities of Israel. It is not surprising to see those two régimes maintaining close diplomatic, economic and trade relations, because they are like brothers in their contempt for mankind, for fundamental human rights, international law, the right of peoples to self-determination and the decisions of the United Nations.

126. What does the Organization represent? It is an association of peoples which in the first place have adhered to the Charter and then have adopted a number of resolutions whose intention is to eliminate the evils that beset the world, evils among which *apartheid* is the most anachronistic.

127. Lack of respect for the Charter is only a drop in the ocean of acts of contempt on the part of the authorities in South Africa. The numerous resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council during the 29 years of existence of the Organization have continually been flouted and scorned by the South African régime.

128. Let us start with the Charter. It is quite obvious that South Africa has never implemented its principles. Article 1, paragraph 3, expresses clearly the following purpose:

"To achieve international co-operation ... in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

It is thus the very essence of the Organization that is flouted.

129. The provisions of the Charter on non-discrimination have been violated in their entirety in view of the fact that the South African Constitution and laws are based on discrimination, and, instead of attempting to remove that discrimination, the successive Governments of South Africa have ceaselessly taken steps to reinforce that philosophy.

130. Article 13 of the Charter stipulates that

"The General Assembly shall initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of ... assisting in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion."

Article 55 emphasizes that

"the United Nations shall promote ... universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion."

Finally, Article 25 makes it quite clear that every Member State must "agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter".

131. The General Assembly and the Security Council have frequently had occasion to address warnings to the white minority Government of South Africa in connexion with its policy, which is incompatible with the obligations of a Member State. The South African Government has remained deaf to those warnings. Its only response has been to go on to promulgate new discriminatory laws. It has even been bold enough to state openly that its decisions were not incompatible with the obligations and responsibilities incumbent upon it under the Charter.

132. Each year the General Assembly has adopted new resolutions, all making unheeded appeals to the

Government of South Africa, asking it to put an end to the practices which endanger the peace of the world. In particular, on 15 November 1972, in its resolution 2923 E (XXVII), the General Assembly condemned

"the racist Government of South Africa for continuing and intensifying the implementation of its inhuman policy of *apartheid*, and subjecting the opponents of *apartheid* to ruthless repression, in violation of its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations, thereby creating a grave threat to the peace".

133. South Africa has also imperilled world peace by frequently threatening the territorial integrity of independent African States under the pretext that they had given assistance to the opponents of *apartheid*, whereas, in acting in this way, those States were simply responding to the appeals which had been addressed to them by bodies of the United Nations. Furthermore, it continues its illegal occupation of Namibia, although the General Assembly terminated its Mandate in 1966.

134. South Africa does not stop short at threatening the territorial integrity of independent neighbouring States and illegally occupying a territory. It goes even further, by initiating military operations in Southern Rhodesia, thus violating United Nations sanctions against Rhodesia.

135. The United Nations must immediately take up the challenge which has been thrown down to it by the racist authorities of South Africa, for the very existence of this régime, its philosophy and its fundamental principles, are based each and every one of them on racism and colonialism. These are not the authentic representatives of the people of South Africa which we have among us, but rather the representatives of *apartheid* and of colonialism. These representatives of *apartheid* and colonialism represent a danger to the United Nations. Their very presence here as a Member is a serious anomaly and is a mockery in the eyes of the entire world. The United Nations should no longer tolerate being thus flouted. Therefore, because of the South African régime's violations of the Charter, of the resolutions of the Security Council, of the resolutions of the General Assembly, and of human rights, and also because of the threat which this régime represents for the peace of the world, immediate action should be taken by the Council.

136. The urgency of the situation was stressed a few days ago by the General Assembly when it adopted resolution 3207 (XXIX), which recalls that South Africa has paid no heed to its previous decisions and has continued to practise its policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination and which notes the persistent refusal of South Africa to abandon its policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination

in compliance with relevant resolutions of the Assembly.

137. It is now the bounden duty of the Security Council to take radical steps against the Government of South Africa and the last resort—since this Government is acting as if the United Nations did not exist—is to remove it from the United Nations and to expel it in accordance with Article 6 of the Charter, so that this can serve as a lesson to all those who may wish to violate the principles of the Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the resolutions of the United Nations.

138. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Saudi Arabia, whom I invite to take a seat at the Council table and to make a statement.

139. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, it seems only yesteryear since Cameroon was a colony, and it heartens all of us to see one of its illustrious sons preside over the Security Council. We are indeed elated that you are guiding the deliberations of the Council, which is now focusing its attention on how to liberate the indigenous people of South Africa from the foreign yoke, the blacks that have a majority of 10 to 1 in Namibia—I do not have the statistics with regard to the so-called Republic of South Africa. I venture to predict that it will not be many years from now when the South Africans living in South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia will gain statehood and, like Cameroon and other African countries, will be admitted to the United Nations.

140. The writing is on the wall and the writing is clear; but it seems the régimes of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia have eyes and do not wish to see, and have ears which they have blocked in order not to hear the clamouring voice of reason.

141. Freedom can be suppressed for a time but never stifled. Sooner or later it will erupt like a volcano, and the lava will burn the oppressor to ashes.

142. The régimes of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia have become an anachronism, a vestige of colonial rule, and it will not be long before the surge of freedom will burst out and liberate those sons of Africa, those sons who are still dominated by people who hail from abroad.

143. In the United Nations the Africans have been called emotional. They are emotional about South Africa; all of us are emotional—it is a healthy emotion, better than the hypocrisy based on rationalization. They tell us that the eventual liberation of South Africa should be achieved by peaceful means. Peaceful means, of course; I for one have been addressing the Council for many years, and we have all said that we wish to persuade the South

African whites to accelerate the liberation of the people under their yoke so that we may have peace, by persuasion and not by war. But our words have fallen on deaf ears.

144. What is the alternative? Did the Americans who fought the war of liberation from the British use peaceful means? No, they were Americans, they could use force for their liberation. Did the French, who liberated themselves from the Nazis, do so by peaceful means? Of course, the Government was subdued, but the sons of France, known as the *maquis*, fought valiantly. They had a right to do so. But when the sons of Africa try to overthrow tyranny, people say, "Please, we are in the era of the United Nations, be peaceful, use peaceful means." Nothing will happen with peaceful means. I for one am for peaceful means. Every one of you here is for peaceful means. But what is the alternative?

145. This is the preface to what I want to say. Let us engage in some analysis and go to the roots of the matter. As I mentioned quite recently, I believe, on the question of Southern Rhodesia, we have to study the question from three aspects before we go into finding solutions, peaceful or otherwise. I would say that we should handle this question with what I would call three approaches. First, we should engage in diagnosis; secondly, in prognosis; and thirdly, in choices, options, alternatives.

146. We now come to the diagnosis. Why is the South African white régime, in the face of world-wide opinion, acting in such a manner? I believe that here there are three aspects to its behaviour: the social, the economic and the political. And those are factors in the South African problem. It is not such an imbroglio as many would want us to believe. Those three aspects or factors are interdependent and interconnected.

147. Let us take first the social aspect of the problem. We find the white people of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia really frightened. They are not stupid. They are frightened. They are obsessed with the fear that they will lose their white identity. They are a small island in an ocean of black people, remnants of the white colonialists, and the intelligent ones among them know they will be assimilated or absorbed by osmosis. And that frightens them. "How can we keep our identity?", they say. That is a real fear and we have to take it into account. Our black brothers might ask them, "Who told you to come here?" And after all, they could reply: "We did not come, our ancestors came." "Well", the blacks will retort, "Let us find a solution and try to be represented in the Government." "No", the whites say, "we are doing this for your good." The blacks are treated like schoolboys. They are told: behave, and we will give you some candy if you do not make any trouble. The white régime forgets that the sons of Africa have been liberated from colonial rule. The blacks are not schoolchildren to be given candy.

148. Time and again since 1964, I have been told, by none other than the Foreign Minister of South Africa, Mr. Muller: "We are doing things." With the permission of my colleague from the United Kingdom, it reminded me of the time when his country had its Empire, and said that the constitutional processes must be observed before certain countries could be liberated. And then Gandhi—he was a lawyer—could not find any meaning for that constitutional process. I salute the United Kingdom for having finished with its colonies, or their colonies for having finished with them, whichever way you want to put it. Now it is the time of the South African régime, and they say: "We are doing all we can to improve the condition of the South Africans; to educate them, to prepare them for statehood." It is quite a long time since they have done anything to accelerate the process—if they really are taking any steps in that direction. Hence we have an explanation for *apartheid* and racial discrimination—the social aspect.

149. We come to the economic aspect. Now open your ears wide. Who are the best customers of the South African régime? They themselves know who they are. Once, in the presence of a chief of State, I said: "Some Ministers do not deserve to be garbage collectors." And one of the Ministers said: "Can you name them?" I said, "Why should I name them, they know it themselves." So I am not going to embarrass those States, because we are here to try and find a way out, rather than to embarrass one another.

150. Did you know that chrome, for instance, was purchased a few years ago by countries which were supposed to observe the sanctions? It was bought from Southern Rhodesia and mingled with Russian chrome ore—the Russians did not know about it—so that the brokers could make a price in Europe. This is done in business. There is no patriotism in business, unfortunately. Do you know that many ships went to South Africa, ships of countries that had agreed to the sanctions, and carried goods, such as ore, that went into South Africa, and carried exports from South Africa? I will leave aside Southern Rhodesia: that is another story and we are not talking about Southern Rhodesia. Well, you cannot close economic loopholes, I submit. I mentioned only a couple of days ago how in the First World War the tiny State of Luxembourg sold steel both to the central Powers and to the so-called Allies which opposed them: it sold both to Germany and to France. And the politicians seem to have done nothing about it. These are the facts of life. Trade and economics are not imbued with patriotism. Therefore, try your best to intensify your efforts to see that the sanctions are applied, yet somehow you will find that these sanctions are not foolproof.

151. The political aspect of this should not be neglected. South Africa and Southern Rhodesia are enclaves in the African continent which can be used

for strategic purposes. Therefore, although I would not say that South Africa and Southern Rhodesia are wooed, the eyes of certain Powers are closed when it comes to the political aspect of the situation. They would not do anything to interfere with any arrangement between themselves and South Africa or Southern Rhodesia, and here in the Council they rationalize their policy. They say we should go slowly, we should persuade South Africa and Southern Rhodesia to do something that will lead eventually to the liberation of the blacks in those enclaves. If we follow such a policy and pursue such a course it will be years and years, decades, before the blacks there will gain statehood. But we are living in different times: there is an awareness, everywhere in the world, of one's rights. You cannot delay the eruption of the volcano unless a new policy is adopted and pursued.

152. Having disposed of the social, economic and political aspects, we come to the choices. What are we going to do? Are we going to let things drag on, our African brothers, and we Asians and others who are with the blacks on the basis of their worth and dignity as human persons—leaving aside racial discrimination and the question of being dominated by someone from abroad? What can we do? Just talk, without action, adopt resolutions that will not be implemented? And who can implement these resolutions, who has the means? There are again here three ways of attacking the problem and of surmounting our difficulties.

153. Let me say forthwith that a few years ago—and here I mention names because I am embarrassing no one—when Mr. Fedorenko was the representative of the Soviet Union in this very Council and we were discussing the same subject, either Southern Rhodesia or South Africa, and I could see no way out of the impasse, I thought that as long as the Soviet Union supported the liberation movement, it could perhaps, as a major Power, do something about it. So I went to Mr. Fedorenko and spoke very frankly with him. He said, "Our representative on the Fourth Committee is Mr. Mendelevich. Go and talk to him. He is the specialist on this question." I spent an hour talking to Mr. Mendelevich, a very fine man, and that was during the so-called cold war era. Mr. Mendelevich was very frank, very honest. He said, "If we were to use force, we would have a confrontation with the other major Powers. Do you want war?" I said we did not, we were committed to the United Nations. In other words, the Soviet Union knew at that time that it might precipitate a conflict were it to help the South Africans and the Southern Rhodesians openly. You cannot blame it. I am not saying this to blame anybody.

154. However, I must salute the United States Government for having at one time subscribed to the sanctions, but what can they do with their Congress and Senate, which sometimes force the hand of the Government so that it does something which is

unwise? Some automobile manufacturers say they need chrome at a certain price and can get it cheaper there, or they have special interests there, and the Congress decides to overrule the executive branch of the Government. I remember that poor Mr. Bush—he is in China now, I think—was embarrassed when I spoke to him about this.

155. So what can we do? There is the fear of confrontation on the one hand and the pressure of a legislative body serving special interests on the other. That is the situation, African brothers. Do not let anybody fool you. You are emotional, but I am more emotional than you because of these facts. It is a healthy emotion. What shall we do? There are 20, 30, 40 speakers on the long list. They will engage in platitudinous statements, the same rubrics, the same stereotyped speeches—with all due respect to their eloquence and diction. What will happen? Someone will submit a draft resolution and, although I never gamble, I bet there will be a veto. Nobody has to pronounce the veto. Somebody will raise his hand against. That is a veto. And then they can afford to have the thing discussed again at the thirtieth session of the General Assembly, and the Credentials Committee will look into it, and some of us will say it has no legal power, only the Security Council can decide on the suspension or expulsion of a State, which is true. I hope I am wrong—if there is no veto I will ask those 20 speakers not to speak—but the Council will veto any draft resolution which is inimical to the interests of the white régime of South Africa or Southern Rhodesia.

156. So what shall we do? The number three seems to be felicitous today: there are three ways open: war, civil disobedience and persuasion.

157. War is the least satisfactory, whether or not it is by freedom-fighters; it would mean shedding the blood of the innocent. Whether white or black, they are human beings; they have mothers, fathers, sisters, brothers and husbands. It would be deplorable in the era of the United Nations that such a question should be resolved by war—whether the classical type of war, which is not very wise in these days, for after all the South Africans and the Rhodesians are armed to the teeth; or by the new type of so-called guerrilla warfare, which is as deplorable as any kind of violence.

158. Civil disobedience is one way, but the blacks who work there have to eat. I once asked why should not the United Nations create a fund at the time when the United Kingdom wanted to contribute £5 million, in the event that Mr. Ian Smith and the African nationalists in Southern Rhodesia came to terms, so as to accelerate the education and the political readiness of the African people to assume responsibility in the future in Southern Rhodesia, and I was told by the United Kingdom representative recently that neither the white régime nor the nationalists accepted

that £5 million to accelerate the march towards freedom of the black population. There was an impasse.

159. But what about still creating such a fund, and using it to help those who strike, who refuse to go to work in the mines and factories of the white régime? Nothing talks more eloquently than stringency. When they of the white régime find themselves in a condition deleterious to their economic welfare, maybe they will come to terms. But we are not sure. At least civil disobedience accelerated the liberation of India, although the Second World War was, of course, the climax of the liberation. Why not use civil disobedience? It was not Gandhi who used it, but Emperor Ashoka, who at one time was one of the biggest conquerors on the subcontinent and, finally, he felt so sad that so much blood was shed that he said: "Do not resist even the invader." And he won all hearts on the subcontinent. Go to your history books; there it is. Why not use civil disobedience in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia?

160. Are those who vote for sanctions prepared to create a fund to give relief to those who go on strike in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia? Are we prepared? We should thank the British for being willing three or four years ago to contribute £5 million to a fund—true, for a different purpose, but it can be used for the purpose of bringing pressure to bear on the white régime.

161. The last means is persuasion, provided reason prevails. And we—at least I will not—are not going to ask the South Africans to change overnight, assuming that there will be a veto. If there is no veto there is no problem. The problem remains in so far as the blacks are concerned, but there will be no problem for us here in the United Nations.

162. The persuasive process goes back to a draft resolution that I submitted in the General Assembly in 1967 during a special session held on South West Africa. A colleague of mine, none other than Mr. Goldberg, said "Why listen to Baroody? I have something for you." What was it? "We will establish a Council for Namibia." And my African brothers got drunk with the idea: Council for Namibia—not Committee for Namibia—Council! And I remembered from my younger days what Clemenceau said at Versailles: "If you want to shelve any problem, create a committee for it; pass it to the committee and it will remain on the shelf for a long, long time."

163. Then three or four years after my African brothers turned their back on my project—and I shall forthwith tell you what it was—they said, "Why did we not listen to Baroody?" I said: "Go and bang your heads against the wall; it is too late now." They have their Council for Namibia and there is the Commissioner for Namibia and there are Namibian representatives; but the white régime has the people under its thumb. Whom are you fooling here? Council

for Namibia, without fighting. It is like fighting a war with binoculars or with telescopes.

164. Now, in order for the blacks not to resort to both open and covert warfare against South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, we could persuade the "friends"—in quotes, because in political and economic matters there is no such word as "friend". I am reminded of Palmerston who, during the Victorian era, said: "Let it be known that this country has no eternal enemy or perpetual ally. Only her interests are eternal and perpetual." These are the facts of life. In Arabic we say: "Interest is served".

165. Personal friendship is all right but when it comes to national interests there is no friendship even between a man and his own brother. It is up to the "friends" or the supporters of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia to propose the following—I am not a member of the Council but I am giving them a suggestion if they want to demonstrate their goodwill: let South Africa, within a period of two years, transfer authority over Namibia to the Trusteeship Council so that after two years Namibia will become an independent State to which many blacks in South Africa could immigrate if the worth and dignity of the human person mean anything to them because they will be the majority and they will have their own rulers. After all, South West Africa, known now as Namibia, was a Mandate and you know what a Mandate was—it was, of course, colonialism in disguise. All the mandates have been liquidated and I salute Australia and New Zealand to whom were entrusted the preparation of the people of Papua and New Guinea. They were headhunters and I was elated when I shook hands with one of their representatives standing next to our beloved colleague, Sir Laurence McIntyre, there in the West Lounge. Are the blacks of Namibia and South Africa "backward" or "more backward" than the Papuans and New Guineans? That is why we should salute Australia and New Zealand for having done a marvellous job against odds and for accelerating the liberation of these Territories.

166. What can anybody say to this? If the Papuans can be made to feel that they are independent, cannot the South Africans prepare the blacks? No, they cannot prepare them because they are obsessed with fear. They have interests there. It is high time, therefore, that they should be persuaded to transfer the authority over South West Africa, or Namibia, to the Trusteeship Council with the proviso that in the process of the transfer there will be two co-administrators to make sure that the transfer is carried out properly. Those co-administrators will be appointed by the Security Council and/or the General Assembly with the help of the Secretary-General. That is the test of the goodwill of the South African white régime. Otherwise they are fooling us. They are resorting to clichés that are *passé*. Constitutional

processes have to be observed. The only step that we can take at this stage is the transfer of power within a period of two years so that Namibia might emerge as an independent State.

167. Then, how can we solve the problem of the blacks of South Africa? It can be solved. If the whites are afraid of their identity there, let them segregate themselves from the blacks. I think that the blacks would be proud that the whites are segregating themselves from the blacks. I think that the blacks call it the white enclave. The rest would be under the direct government of the majority of the people. If the whites would like to confederate in the future with the black majority, then it is their choice. If they want to live in a fortress surrounded by blacks then that is their choice. But sooner or later the whites there will have to be assimilated whether they like it or not.

168. How do I know? I know from our area, the Middle East. Before Egypt was Semitized the Pharaohs invaded a good part of the Fertile Crescent. They could not go to Arabia as it was too much of a desert in those days but the Fertile Crescent was there. Then came the Hittites. They were a non-Semitic people. After the Hittites came Alexander the Great. After Alexander the Great came the Seleucids and then the Byzantines, then the Mongolians from the northern tier of Asia. After the Mongolians came our brothers the Saluqs and then the Ottomans and the Turks. Then, as if that were not enough, came the British and the French as Mandatory Powers. Now, still in a small enclave, we have the Zionists there. Do you know that place called Palestine? But where are they all? From the time of the Pharaohs until now they have come and gone and we have assimilated them. Oh, I forgot the Crusades over 200 years. There are some tribes now in Arabia which are remnants of the Crusades with blue eyes and golden hair. Have you ever heard of an Arab in the desert with golden hair and blue eyes? But they are as Arab as anybody else. The whites of the South African régime are afraid of intermarriage. What is wrong with *café au lait*, or chocolate drink with milk: if you want it bitter keep to your area, segregate yourself, until the new generation gets wiser and intermingles by intermarriage and so on. Look at the ancient civilizations. Look at this country, the host country. Its greatness is due to the diversity of people of different national origins. Look at us, the Arab world. We have no racial discrimination. Some of the best Arabs among us are the Sudanese, and many of them are pitch black. We do not say that their colour is black and therefore they cannot be Arabs. Look at the Chinese. They have all kinds of strains. Look at them. Do not look at your watch, look at them. The Mongols came and invaded them and they absorbed them. Their leader was Kublai Khan. Look at the British and Harold. In 1066 the Normans came and poor Harold was slain on the battlefield. But they survived. Once in a while we hear of secession

by the Scots and the Welsh. Common interests bind them. Why should those white Africans be different from the others? You cannot live by yourself.

169. Therefore, in mercy to those who still want to have a late cocktail this evening, I would say: try, you friends of the white régimes, to see to it that within two years—I repeat, within two years—Namibia becomes a Member State. Then we shall try to find a solution for racial discrimination. There are other organs. The General Assembly is seized year in and year out of *apartheid* and racial discrimination, and we shall have our say there at fuller length.

170. Thank you, Mr. President, for being generous with me, and I also thank my colleagues for being patient and lenient. I hope that something will emerge from the Council this year, under your presidency, because it is high time that we extricated ourselves from the web of platitudinous statements and vetoes, and even consensus, when there is no implementation. We have had enough words. What we need is action.

171. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*). I should now like to inform members of the Council that I have just received a letter dated 21 October

from the representative of the German Democratic Republic asking to be invited, under Article 31 of the Charter, to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion. If I hear no objection I propose, in accordance with the Council's practice and with rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure, to invite the representative of the German Democratic Republic to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Florin (German Democratic Republic) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

172. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should also like to inform members of the Council that a letter dated 21 October has been addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Kenya and Mauritania [S/11540]. In that letter a request is made that the Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Duma Nokwe, Director of Political Affairs, member of the African National Congress. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to that request.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 7.20 p.m.