

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

UN LIBRARY

TWENTY-NINTH YEAR

SEP 5 - 1974

N/ COLLECTION

1806th MEETING: 29 OCTOBER 1974

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1806)	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.

EIGHTEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTH MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 29 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/1806)

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 3.40 p.m.

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 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. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decisions taken by the Council previously [1796th-1798th and 1800th-1803rd meetings] under Article 31 of the Charter and in accordance with the pertinent provisions of the provisional rules of procedure, I invite the representatives of Algeria, Bangladesh, Barbados, the Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, India, Kuwait, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar,

Mali, Mauritius, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, the United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia and Zaire to participate, without the right to vote, in the Council's discussion of the question before it.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Rahal (Algeria), Mr. Karim (Bangladesh), Mr. Waldron-Ramsey (Barbados), Mr. Mondjo (Congo), Mr. Alarcón (Cuba), Mr. Smíd (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Adjibadé (Dahomey), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Florin (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Boaten (Ghana), Mrs. Jeanne Martin Cissé (Guinea), Mr. Jackson (Guyana), Mr. Jaipal (India), Mr. Bishara (Kuwait), Mr. Harmon (Liberia), Mr. Maghur (Libyan Arab Republic), Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mr. Traoré (Mali), Mr. Ramphul (Mauritius), Mr. Zaimi (Morocco), Mr. Ogbu (Nigeria), Mr. Akhund (Pakistan), Mr. Jamal (Qatar), Mr. Datcu (Romania), Mr. Baroodi (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Palmer (Sierra Leone), Mr. Hussein (Somalia), Mr. Botha (South Africa), Mr. Kelani (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Driss (Tunisia), Mr. Kinene (Uganda), Mr. Humaidan (United Arab Emirates), Mr. Salim (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Yaguibou (Upper Volta), Mr. Petrić (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Mutuale, (Zaire) took the place reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. Mr. MAINA (Kenya): Mr. President, I wish to join those who have taken the floor before me in saluting you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council during this month. It augurs well for Africa that a dedicated and able son of that continent is presiding over the deliberations of the Council during the consideration of crucial questions for Africa and the maintenance of international peace and security. It is particularly important that as the Council reviews the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa, a son of that continent should be guiding our work. My delegation assures you of its unwavering support and co-operation in the discharge of your obligations.

3. I should also like to thank the representative of the United Kingdom for the able manner in which he guided the Council during the month of September.

4. The General Assembly, in its resolution 3207 (XXIX) adopted on 30 September 1974, requested 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."

5. That decision, which was adopted by 125 votes to 1, reflects the overwhelming view of the international community. The United Nations has spent nearly 30 years discussing what South Africa should do to make its membership consistent with the Charter obligations. That is a long time by any standards. No one can say that a Member is being rushed. No one can say that more time is required for discussion and gradual change, except perhaps South Africa's representative, who cancels this type of plea in the very first sentence of his speech [1800th meeting]. He pled protection under Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter. In short, he tells the Organization to stop interfering in South Africa's internal affairs. This question has been argued for a long time and no one but South Africa publicly holds the view, for its defence, that what is under discussion is an internal matter. What we are discussing is the relationship of South Africa and the United Nations in the light of the obligations South Africa has freely undertaken under the Charter.

6. What we are doing is being done every day in private life, even in South Africa. Every organization established for a common purpose lays down the principles of the organization and the requirements and obligations of those who wish to be members. The question may be asked as to why South Africa was admitted to the Organization at the beginning. The answer has been supplied by others before me. We are informed that when the United Nations was being founded South Africa appeared to be moving in the right direction and there was ground for expecting changes for the better. As how 1948, however, a sharp turn for the worse took place when it adopted positions that would have made it ineligible for membership in the United Nations a few years earlier. Ever since, the United Nations has regularly pointed out this incompatibility, but South Africa has turned a contemptuous deaf ear to the United Nations.

7. The initial admission of South Africa to the United Nations does not confer on it any right to be a permanent Member. It is a well-established practice that even after admission a Member can make itself ineligible if it does not conform to certain rules and regulations. That is why every organization, including the United Nations, has provisions in its constitution—in this case the Charter—for the exclusion of a Member who has become ineligible for membership after admission. The behaviour of South Africa has led the United Nations to review the relationship it wishes to have with that country. It has concluded

that the time for discussion and persuasion has run out and the means envisaged in the Charter must be employed.

8. South Africa has been proved fully unworthy of membership in the United Nations. It has not lived up to the hopes of the framers of the Charter, of which it was one. Indeed, it has by word and deed flouted every principle and obligation of the Organization, which was envisaged as a centre for harmonizing actions in the attainment of numerous common goals, among them the promotion and encouragement of the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all peoples without any distinction whatsoever. South Africa's conduct and continued membership in the Organization have to be measured against its respect for the principles and purposes of the Charter and the fulfilment of these objectives through the General Assembly, the Security Council and the other organs.

9. We are very grateful to have received the courtesy of the representative of South Africa, Mr. Botha, who condescended to an unusual level of indulgence in defending the position of his country after many years of contemptuous silence under the cover of Article 2, paragraph 7. We listened very carefully to what he had to say and we have spent some time pondering over it. To put it very briefly, the Council has not listened to a better or more authoritative statement admitting and confirming the guilt of South Africa for the offences of which it stands accused.

10. Mr. Botha treated the Council to a nursery-school lesson on the history of South Africa in order to establish the base for his later admissions. Unfortunately some of us have studied the history of South Africa in sufficient depth to know a little more than he had to say. Indeed, he may have honestly repeated to the Council what his *apartheid* group may be subjected to in their schools. I would advise him to make use of the free libraries in New York to study the history of South Africa without fear of committing offences against the *apartheid* laws of his country.

11. Before I proceed any further I should like to make it clear that I do not share the views or beliefs of Mr. Botha and many others who classify and describe human beings on the basis of their colour. The current popular basis of describing people simply as blacks or whites has its roots in the evil of racialism. Consciously or unconsciously many people and, very unfortunately, the mass media are spreading this cancer. This evil can and often does exist in those who frequently suffer at the hands of others because of it. If I use the terms employed by Mr. Botha in describing different peoples in his country, I do so simply to avoid confusion, not because I share his views.

12. Mr. Botha went to great pains to establish the existence of several nations in South Africa of which only one is made up of white people. Thus, all immigrant peoples from the whole world and particularly from European nations, irrespective of their culture, customs, language and history, become one nation of white people on arrival in South Africa and pit themselves against the other so-called nations he describes as black. There is nothing more absurd. If this is not racialism, what is it? We reject the attempt by Mr. Botha to confer on South Africa the status of a colonial Power within the Republic of South Africa. To accept the proposition is to accept the crime of *apartheid* and confirm its evils from the rostrum of the United Nations. We reject the proposition of bantustans and every proposition born out of *apartheid*. We know South Africa as one Republic, as originally accepted in the United Nations.

13. Mr. Botha made a very long statement in defence of South Africa, and I respect him for showing so much courage in defending what is indefensible and more particularly in making a statement full of contradictions without the slightest blush. I shall merely illustrate this by, with your indulgence, quoting briefly from his statement. He said:

“We do have discriminatory practices and we do have discriminatory laws. And it is precisely because of this that the greatest misunderstandings occur and our motives are most misrepresented.

“But that discrimination must no be equated with racialism. If we have that discrimination, it is not because the whites in South Africa have any *Herrenvolk* complex. We are not better than the black people, we are not cleverer than they are. What we can achieve, so can they. Those laws and practices are part of the historical evolution of our country—they were introduced to avoid friction, and to promote and protect the interests and the development of every group—not only those of the whites.

“But I want to state here today very clearly and categorically: my Government does not condone discrimination purely on the grounds of race or colour. Discrimination based solely on the colour of a man's skin cannot be defended. And we shall do everything in our power to move away from discrimination based on race or colour.” [*Ibid.*, paras. 102-104.]

14. What does all this mean? On what are the discriminatory laws and practices based? On sex? On religion? On what else if not on race or colour of the skin? The whole statement is nothing but a pack of half-truths, poorly presented in a hurry without any bearing on logic. If this were not the case the United Nations would have entered in its records for the first time a statement by an official of the

Government of South Africa repudiating the whole basis and concept of *apartheid*. Unfortunately even Mr. Botha does not expect us here to believe that a person with a black skin can be his equal within South Africa.

15. Since its first session in 1946, the General Assembly has been seized of the question of the racial policies of the Government of South Africa. Since then all reasonable measures have been taken to persuade the Government of South Africa to change its blind and dangerous course. Consultations between the Government of South Africa and the Government of India pursuant to resolution 44 (I) of 1946 ended in failure because of the intransigence of the Government of South Africa. Similarly, efforts pursuant to resolution 265 (III) of 1949, which called upon the Governments of India, Pakistan and South Africa to enter into discussion at a round-table conference on respect of human rights in the light of the principles and purposes of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, failed again as a consequence of the contemptuous intransigence of South Africa.

16. A three-member commission established by the United Nations subsequent to the failure of the round-table conference, mentioned again in resolution 395 (V) in 1950, also failed. The reason for the failure was the unchanged attitude of South Africa. The United Nations continued its efforts and in 1952, by resolution 615 (VII), the General Assembly established a United Nations Good Offices Commission of three members—namely, Cuba, Syria and Yugoslavia—charged with the duty of assisting South Africa, India and Pakistan to sort out the problem of the racial policies of South Africa against the peoples of Indian and Pakistani origin, but South Africa refused to co-operate with that Commission. The further efforts of the United Nations in resolutions 616 A (VII) of 1952, 719 (VIII) of 1953, 816 (IX) and 820 (IX) of 1954, 917 (X) of 1955, 1016 (XI) and 1178 (XII) of 1957 had the same results, as South Africa would not change its position.

17. For a long time a number of Member States have maintained a belief that South Africa might change its disastrous course and respect the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Some Member States, like my own, had doubts that South Africa would change. As the defiance by South Africa continued the United Nations established a Special Committee on *Apartheid* in 1962 under resolution 1761 (XVII). This Committee today reviews the policies of the Government of South Africa on *apartheid* and acts as a catalyst in United Nations efforts to help South Africa to meet its obligations under the Charter. The Committee has not so far received anything but contempt from South Africa.

18. South Africa has all along treated the United Nations with contempt. It has done nothing to deviate

from policies which are inconsistent with its Charter obligations. For nearly 30 years it has by word and action proved unworthy of membership of the Organization.

19. The United Nations, in turn, has since the creation of the Special Committee vigorously and tirelessly brought out the evils of *apartheid*, published considerable material on *apartheid*, educated many over the whole world on *apartheid* and exposed those who have been the principal pillars of South Africa in trade, commercial, consular, diplomatic and military ties. The United Nations resolutions have been more and more biting and stronger and stronger in effect and thrust. But in spite of all these efforts, South Africa remains impervious to reason and implacably opposed to positive changes. In such circumstances, can any one member here justifiably and convincingly argue against the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations? The duty of each one of us is strictly to observe the Charter and not to protect the violators of the Charter.

20. What more could we ask the United Nations to do other than to expel recalcitrant South Africa? Can it be argued that more time is needed by that Government—more time to defy the United Nations? Anyone who listened to the representative of South Africa could not fail to see the contempt South Africa has for the United Nations. He had the audacity to give the United Nations a lecture advising the Organization to concentrate on economic and social affairs and leave alone evils of the type of which South Africa stands accused. Even criminals in our societies do not have the courage to plead that way in our courts of law. He contemptuously asks the United Nations what would be gained by the expulsion of his country from this Organization. The answer can partly be supplied by reversing the question. What is to be lost if South Africa is expelled? If there is no value at all, for what was all that statement in defence made? The Organization will remove the anomaly which exists today if South Africa is expelled. If South Africa were applying for membership now, I am quite sure it would not be granted admission. Moreover, the provisions of Article 6 of the Charter were made to deal with the type of situation created by South Africa.

21. The United Nations, moved by the goodwill of the African countries through the Lusaka Manifesto,¹ five years ago urged South Africa to avoid confrontation with Africa and the United Nations and called for a constructive dialogue aimed at a genuine settlement of the racial questions. The goodwill of the African countries was spurned by South Africa. The intensification of South Africa's arrogance in its inhuman policies of *apartheid* and the creation of a ruthless machinery for enforcement

of that racist policy moved the United Nations to conclude the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*. Thus the international community has already legally ostracized South Africa. The Convention, though not yet in force, has been signed by over 20 Governments, including that of my own country and ratified by a number of these Governments. This Convention, which reflects the will of the overwhelming majority of the United Nations membership, is of crucial importance at a time when South Africa argues that the question of massive repression as official Government policy is a matter for domestic concern.

22. Such an argument has no merit under the Charter. The Organization is capable of interpreting Article 2, paragraph 7, and its handling since 1946 of the racial policies of the Government of South Africa indisputably demonstrates that that matter is not one falling directly within the context of this paragraph. Judge Ammoun, in his separate opinion on the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on Namibia of 1971,² rightly observed, in paragraph 7, that

“The successive resolutions of the resolutions of the General Assembly rejecting this contention by South Africa have given it to be understood that the equality and fundamental rights violated by *apartheid* constitute obligations which are in fact placed under the protection of international law and as such fall within the competence of the United Nations.”

And for this reason the Security Council has since 1960 considered the South African violation of human rights in its policies of *apartheid*.

23. My delegation is not calling upon the United Nations to control or regulate the affairs of South Africa; but we are calling on the United Nations to expel South Africa from the Organization because of South Africa's persistence in violating the principles of the Charter. The rudiments of civilized government are well known and do not here need spelling out for the Government of South Africa.

24. The Security Council has been seized of the question of South Africa and its racial policies since 1960, following the Sharpeville massacre. It adopted, among others, resolutions 134 (1960), 181 (1963) and 182 (1963) 190 (1964) and 191 (1964) and 311 (1972). The Council resolutions have equally been spurned by the Government of South Africa, which has continued to imprison, persecute and throttle any opposition to its racial policies. The Government

¹ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

² 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.

of South Africa has not co-operated in any way with the Council during the 15 years the Council has been seized of the deplorable policies of *apartheid*. The decisions and recommendations of the Council have gone unheeded.

25. It is time, therefore, that the Council fully implemented the provisions of the Charter and, in particular, Article 6. The Council should, under that Article, recommend to the General Assembly the expulsion of South Africa from the membership of this Organization. South Africa should be barred from the Organization until its Government drastically reverses its racial policies and related practices in accordance with the Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and international law. Only then would South Africa be worthy of association with the other members of the international community through the United Nations and its specialized agencies. At that time its application for readmission will receive the support of many Members, including that of my own country, Kenya.

26. What I have just described would be adequate reason for the Council to recommend to the General Assembly the expulsion of the Republic of South Africa from the United Nations, but it does not tell the whole story of South Africa's defiance of the measures adopted by the United Nations to resolve the crisis in that region. Article 25 of the Charter makes it obligatory for every Member to implement the decisions of the Council. There is no exception to that requirement. Similarly, mandatory sanctions imposed under Chapter VII call for their total observance by all States.

27. The Council adopted resolution 253 (1968) requesting mandatory sanctions against Southern Rhodesia following that colony's rebellion against the British Government and seizure of illegal independence. The Council is aware that the failure of sanctions against Rhodesia has been engineered and led by the Government of South Africa, contrary to the Charter. The recent rail link between Southern Rhodesia and South Africa is aimed at thwarting sanctions and practically integrating the economies of the two countries. The Council cannot do less than vindicate the Charter.

28. South Africa has continued to flout the decisions of the United Nations on the United Nations Territory of Namibia. It is illegally occupying the Territory of Namibia in spite of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), which terminated the Mandate of the Government of South Africa over Namibia. As if the act of illegal administration was not enough, the Government of South Africa exports its racial policies of *apartheid* to the Territory.

29. There might have been doubts in the minds of some as to whether the decision of the General Assembly, later endorsed by the Security Council

in resolution 276 (1970), was valid, but the Council sought the legal opinion of the International Court of Justice in its resolution 284 (1970). The Court, as is well known, concluded in paragraph 133 of its advisory opinion, that

"the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia being illegal, South Africa is under obligation to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately and thus put an end to its occupation of the Territory".

The opinion of the Court was accepted by the Security Council in its resolution 301 (1971). The Court further examined the effect of the decisions of the Security Council in relation to Article 25 of the Charter. It addressed itself to the submission that Article 25 applies only in respect of matters falling within Chapter VII where preventive or enforcement measures have been taken by the Council. The Court, in paragraph 113 of its advisory opinion, concluded:

"It is not possible to find in the Charter any support for this view ... If Article 25 had reference solely to decisions of the Security Council concerning enforcement action under Articles 41 and 42 of the Charter, that is to say, if it were only such decisions which had binding effect, then Article 25 would be superfluous, since this effect is secured by Articles 48 and 49 of the Charter."

Having found resolution 276 (1970), relating to resolutions 264 (1969) and 269 (1969) to be valid, the Court concluded in paragraph 116:

"... when the Security Council adopts a decision under Article 25 in accordance with the Charter, it is for Member States to comply with that decision, including those ... Members of the United Nations who are not members of the Council. To hold otherwise would be to deprive this principal organ of its essential functions and powers under the Charter."

30. The South African Government is still illegally occupying the Territory of Namibia, a glaring breach of international law and an aggression against the United Nations and the Namibian people.

31. Faced with such defiance by South Africa, the United Nations has recognized the real danger of racial conflict in southern Africa. The genesis of the racial conflict is to be found in the acts and omissions of the Government of South Africa. Mindful of its responsibilities under the Charter as the principal organ charged with the maintenance of international peace and security, the Council, and the General Assembly also, have constantly expressed concern about the situation in southern Africa. The preamble to resolution 182 (1963) of 4 December 1963, which was unanimously adopted by the Council, stated:

"Being strengthened in its conviction that the situation in South Africa is seriously disturbing international peace and security, and strongly deprecating the policies of the Government of South Africa in its perpetuation of racial discrimination as being inconsistent with the principles contained in the Charter of the United Nations and with its obligations as a Member of the United Nations".

In the preamble to its resolution 311 (1972), the Council deplored "the persistent refusal of the Government of South Africa to implement resolutions adopted by the Security Council in order to promote a peaceful solution in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations" and expressed grave concern that "the situation in South Africa seriously disturbs international peace and security in southern Africa". It is not only preambles which so grimly relate South African policies to a threat to the peace and security of Africa. Paragraph 9 of resolution 301 (1971) declared that "any further refusal of the South African Government to withdraw from Namibia could create conditions detrimental to the maintenance of peace and security in the region".

32. In its acts and omissions, the South African Government has had its security forces operating in the British colony of Southern Rhodesia contrary to law and reason. The presence of these forces in Southern Rhodesia acts as a veiled threat to the decolonization process in southern Africa and to the independence of nations nearby. It does not in any manner enhance good neighbourliness and friendly relations among nations.

33. In the wake of such defiance and abuse of the very foundation and values of the United Nations, what meaningful and decisive action can the Security Council take? I have observed that the Government of South Africa has, in vain, been given every opportunity by the United Nations to amend its policies, so as to conform with the Charter and its obligations as a Member State, that this Government has defied the Charter and disregarded measures taken by the General Assembly for nearly three decades in its over 100 resolutions as well as the decisions of the Council for a decade and a half, that it has not co-operated with any organ of the United Nations in resolving its difficulties with the international community, that it has ignored every single effort, consultations, commissions, experts, good offices, formal or informal, and finally that it has turned its back on every avenue open to it.

34. The patience of the United Nations as a whole and of each and every one of its well-motivated Members has run out. Repeated condemnations, warnings and other measures aimed at buying time are not good enough. The Council must act decisively to protect the Charter and the values of the United Nations and its system. In all Council and General

Assembly resolutions it has been recognized that South Africa's policies of *apartheid* and their ruthless implementation are contrary to the purposes of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; they also contradict South Africa's obligations as a Member of the United Nations. In the firm view of my delegation, therefore, the Council has only one logical and reasonable course of actions: it must recommend to the General Assembly the expulsion of the Republic of South Africa in accordance with Article 6 of the Charter.

35. We have all been united in condemnation of the policies of the Government of South Africa. We have been united in searching for ways and means to liquidate the sordid system of the South African régime. Let us together take the only course open to us: let us recommend the expulsion of an incorrigible Member. Let none of us use excuses. This recommendation will not necessarily be followed by others, *en masse*, so no fear should be generated anywhere. This is a specific case whose thorough examination for nearly 30 years has led to the weighty and indisputable conclusion that the interests of the Organization will best be served without the presence of the Republic of South Africa as a Member.

36. In the course of this debate, the question of the overriding vote, popularly known as the veto, has been raised too often to be ignored. Attempts to cast gloom over the issue by invoking the threat of the veto have been numerous. My delegation approaches this important question, not with gloom, but with optimism. We regard it not only as a question of the constitution of the United Nations, but more important, as a question of conscience.

37. It is quite wrongly believed that in the United Nations no conscience exists. It is said by cynics that it is all a question of national interests and instructions given to delegations. We do not entirely share this view. We believe that every nation has a conscience and it must exercise this conscience when important issues confront it. Those who believe in truth and justice, I am sure, will vote for the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations. Who can say that South Africa has not outraged the conscience of the international community?

38. Those who support the continuation of the membership of South Africa have argued that the strength of the Organization depends on its universality. My delegation and, I am sure, all those who have spoken against South Africa, also believe in the universality of the United Nations. We have stated this often enough, and no one can doubt our sincerity in this. But as I have stated earlier, we must decide what is more appropriate and advantageous to the Organization. We must decide at what price we should continue the membership of South Africa. My delegation does not accept the

continued presence of South Africa in the United Nations at the price of the Charter. For if we compromise the Charter, we shall be eroding the very basis on which the Organization was founded, and the memories of the League of Nations are not yet forgotten by us.

39. The issues have been clearly spelt out, and there is no room for doubt about the guilt of South Africa and the strength of the case made for its expulsion from the United Nations in accordance with Article 6 of the Charter. That is what the Council must recommend to the General Assembly.

40. Mr. President, I should like now, with your permission, to introduce, on behalf of Iraq, Mauritania, the United Republic of Cameroon and Kenya, the draft resolution in document S/11543. This draft clearly outlines the various aspects of the question before us. It sums up very briefly the statements made by nearly all participants in the debate, including the one I have just made. It is self-explanatory and I shall therefore not go into detail on the various paragraphs. I wish strongly to urge the Council, at this juncture, to take up this draft resolution immediately after all those who wish to make statements have done so. We consider the matter so fundamental and important that we advocate the conclusion of this issue before taking up any other matter. In short, we formally ask that a vote be taken on this draft resolution before we proceed to any other matter that is before the Council. We urge that there should be no debate on this text, as we believe that all the facts have been brought out in the general statements. We commend it to the Council as the most appropriate action that can be taken against a rebellious Member. We are confident that all those who are for the maintenance of peace and security and the upholding of the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter will cast a positive vote. Kenya is ready to cast a positive vote as soon as you call upon the Council to take a decision on the draft resolution.

41. The PRESIDENT (*interepretation from French*): The Council takes note of the recommendations that the representative of Kenya has just made.

42. The next speaker is the representative of Saudi Arabia. I invite him to come to the Council table and to make his statement.

43. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): The draft resolution in document S/11547, which I submitted last Friday and which I am presenting today, is concise, clear and self-explanatory.

44. The Security Council is seized of the item under discussion, namely, the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa. Nothing could be more relevant to that item than the question of Namibia, or the Mandated Territory of South West

Africa as it was formerly known until its present name was recognized by the General Assembly about 10 years ago.

45. Before the First World War, Namibia, as we all know, was a German colony. The First World War was allegedly fought, *inter alia*, to save the world for democracy, which implied the liberation of peoples and their preparation for self-rule. What did those who were contemporaries of the First World War, including myself, find out? At the Versailles Peace Conference in 1919, the victorious Western Allies allotted the Territories they seized from the defeated Powers to themselves, under the pretence that the people of those Territories had to be groomed for self-rule. Hence, the Western Powers appointed themselves guardians of the peoples they considered inept so far as self-rule was concerned.

46. So the victors labelled themselves "Mandatory Powers" and became the self-appointed guardians, or trustees, of many peoples around the world. High commissioners, with retinues of colonial administrators, were dispatched to each Mandated Territory to "guide" the people to the process of governing themselves. As I have mentioned time and again, those Mandated Territories were colonies in disguise and the high commissioner presiding over the political destiny of the people was no less powerful than the proconsul of the Roman Empire. To sweeten the bitter political pill the people of the Mandated Territory were forced to swallow, stooges were appointed to carry out the will of the colonial masters, and if any of those stooges woke up or became wise and rebelled, he was either imprisoned or exiled.

47. How do I know all this? I saw it happen, before my eyes. I am not talking to you from history books. I fought two mandates in the region. I had to quit my own land. I say, I saw it happen before my eyes. I am not talking from history books.

48. All this was done in the name of democratic rule, and the external affairs of the Mandated Territory were, of course, in the hands of the high commissioner.

49. We woke up, many of us of my generation, when we were in our late teens. We finally knew that sovereignty lies with the people and should not lie with the rulers, whether of the Mandated Territories or of the independent countries. Many of us fled and went to the League of Nations; and I, for one, was an *ex officio* observer at the League of Nations. We raised our voices, not before the League of Nations but before many people of the Western Powers. Many understood us, but they themselves were helpless, as indeed they were, and were goaded into another world war, and they shed their blood on foreign battlefields.

50. I was born an Ottoman subject. The Ottoman Empire was the first commonwelath, as we know it,

in modern times. Instead of certain Arab territories being "liberated" from Ottoman rule, they were placed under foreign mandate. Hence when I joined the United Nations about 28 or 29 years ago I thought it was a sacred task, a sacred duty, for me to elaborate the principle of self-determination, enunciated by none other than President Wilson, into a fully fledged right. It took us eight years in this same Organization, in the Third Committee, to do that; and now the right of self-determination figures as the first article in both International Covenants on Human Rights. When did we finish elaborating the principle into a right? I forget the exact date, but it was in the mid-sixties, about 10 years ago. We passed many resolutions in the Organization to the effect that no human rights could be fully enjoyed without the right to self-determination.

51. What are my new African brothers doing? They are concentrating only on discrimination, which is the violation of one human right. But what about the other 18 or 20 human rights that were elaborated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which figure *in extenso* in the International Covenants on Human Rights, covenants that have the power of treaties and that we are all trying to ratify so that they may come into effect in a short time? If we are to take only one human right and wonder whether it is being violated or not—and here there is no question that *apartheid* is a violation of a human right—we should not neglect the right of self-determination. In Namibia there is double jeopardy. There is *apartheid* and there is the violation of the whole gamut of human rights—perhaps if not all, then most of them being violated. There is nothing like liberty and freedom. Is it any wonder that one of the leaders of the American Revolution, Patrick Henry, said "Give me liberty or give me death"?

52. It is said that Namibia is a white man's burden and that the white South Africans are trying to prepare the Namibians for self-rule; this song, this cacophonic disharmony that we listen to—I myself have listened to it for over half a century—is not valid any more. It is too ridiculous. What about all those States of Africa and Asia that had been colonized which now sit as Members of the Organization? Were they part of the white man's burden? Or were they part of the white man's treasure for exploitation?

53. But why indulge in recrimination and go back to the past? So far, so good. When we were elaborating the principle of self-determination into a fully-fledged right it was beyond our dreams that within less than two decades most of the Africans and Asians living under a foreign yoke would have their representatives sitting around the tables of the Organization. We all saluted Portugal the other day for sparing its sons, its own sons and the sons of the colonial peoples in Africa, for seeing the light and resolving to liberate those who were colonial peoples under its rule.

54. I listened very carefully to the representative of South Africa, Mr. Botha. I do not know whether he is in this room. I cancelled a statement I had to make in another committee to hear what he had to say, hoping that we would move on to the right path by a statement from him that perhaps the South Africans were wrong and should accelerate the process of self-rule of Namibia. But nothing of that nature was forthcoming. And this reminded me of a simple Arab proverb: "Read and thou shalt be happy. Try and thou shalt be saddened".

55. No African, no Asian, no European, no liberal-minded person can be beguiled by promises that may not be kept by a régime obsessed with fear about its identity. But we are not here to cure the whites of South Africa. We are here to try, in a last-ditch stand, to reason with their Government, to put them to the test: if you mean what you say then show us your goodwill by liberating South West Africa.

56. Many of my African friends said to me: "Why don't you present your resolution in the Fourth Committee where the question of Namibia will be discussed, or is being discussed?" I know that the Fourth Committee was one of those committees that was seized with the question of Southern Rhodesia. I believe that both the question of Namibia and that of *apartheid* carry in them the seed that might germinate and spread in the tropical climate of Africa; if they get dry, as much vegetation does, a single spark can set Africa aflame against the white régime. So it is in mercy to the whites, if not during this decade, in the next decade, that we sound grave warnings that the whole of Asia will be aflame, and the Africans will not lack friends and allies to join in the fight for liberation. And I will present a draft resolution similar to the one I will read to you today—in the Fourth Committee, in the Special Political Committee or in any other committee, as long as there is life that surges in me; we will present it until the United Nations comes to realize that we are obsessed with the liberation, not only of Namibia and Southern Rhodesia, but of all the blacks who live under the foreign yoke in the continent of Africa.

57. Will there be goodwill on the part of South Africa and will it declare forthwith that Namibia will be entrusted to the United Nations? Or will they engage in panegyrics about their good intentions? We shall know after this draft resolution has been adopted by the Council, as I hope it will be. And if they do not act, then this resolution will stand as a testimony of our having given the white régime every chance to act with goodwill.

58. There is an Arab proverb—and I think it exists in all languages—and don't think it does not apply to us: "As long as the caravan is moving forward, let the dogs bark." As long as those Africans and Asians have no power to exercise, let them make

speeches. Let them get it off their chests. Maybe they will feel better; then we keep on going in accordance with the plans we have set for ourselves; and if any benefit comes to the blacks from liberalized policies, it will be the crumbs that fall from the table of white régimes.

59. Beware: Africa, although it may have dogs that bark, has lions and leopards that pounce. Remember that those who, drunk with power, have ruled the world from time to time in history, got so drunk that they finally fell and new people arose.

60. And are you any exception to what has happened in history? Where are the Pharaohs, Babylon, Rome? Where is the breadth of the Arab empire which stretched from the Atlantic in what today is Morocco to the confines of China? Where is the Mogul empire? And in recent times, what vestiges are left of the Western European empire? None whatsoever. Should it take another World War to liberate these two enclaves in Africa?

61. Some people once told me, "Hitler was a liberator". I said, "Shut up". They told me, "Had it not been for Hitler, you would still be under the yoke". I said: "Yes, if Hitler had survived, he would also have enslaved you, and you should rebel anyway". "We did not think of that", they said.

62. But we do not need a third world conflict, or any conflict, even if it could be confined to the continent of Africa, in order to ensure that the blacks are liberated in the so-called Republic of South Africa, in Namibia, in Southern Rhodesia, and in what is left of the so-called Portuguese provinces.

63. Mr. President, you have a number of speakers and I have to go to another place and talk, so I shall read the draft resolution to the Council submitted by Saudi Arabia:

[The speaker read out the draft resolution contained in document S/11547.]

64. As I said at the beginning, this draft resolution is clear, concise and self-explanatory. It does not need any interpretation. There is no equivocal paragraph in it.

65. So where are you, South Africans? Are you going to heed this draft resolution, and within a reasonable period of time, and let the United Nations know? Or shall we declare continued war in the Organization and have many other meetings of the Security Council? And will the committees of the General Assembly be asked to discuss this and cognate questions pertaining to South Africa? The answer lies with you.

66. We have been frank and forthright about Namibia. This does not mean that our concern about *apartheid*

is less. But Namibia, if it is liberated, will be the refuge of many Africans who, until the South African régime sees the light, will be able to live there with dignity until such a time as their brothers are freed and the whole world is rid of colonial rule.

67. Mr. EL HASSEN (Mauritania) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, my delegation has already had an opportunity to convey to you my country's congratulations. None the less, I should like personally to tell you how gratified and proud we are to see the Security Council, in the course of this month, presided over by you. Our satisfaction and pride are, of course, expressed to you personally, as you are a worthy and eminent representative of Africa. But these expressions are also addressed to your country, the United Republic of Cameroon, whose scrupulous respect for human rights is known and appreciated by all of us. My country is honoured to maintain with your country the best possible relations of friendship and understanding.

68. Allow me, as well to express our gratitude to your predecessor, Mr. Richard of the United Kingdom, who was our President over the past month.

69. In truth, very little remains to be said about *apartheid* and South Africa. However, for my part, I should like to confine myself to a few general considerations.

70. The world has witnessed deep and far-reaching transformations ever since the Second World War. As we know, that struggle ended in the defeat of the camp which had founded its philosophy on racial segregation and on the aberrant principle of the superiority of certain races over others. The defeat of that camp, while it was and continues to be a striking victory for all mankind and a victory for human rights, was also to become an important stage in the irreversible advance of peoples towards progress and total liberation.

71. The end of that conflict tore the veil from the eyes of the oppressed peoples and showed them the monstrous, anachronistic nature of their position; and it aroused a vigorous resumption of their struggle to regain their freedom and dignity and, in a word, to resume control of their destiny. Many dominating Powers of that time came to understand, whether quickly or slowly, the reality of the current state of affairs. Some of them paid attention to the legitimate aspirations of the oppressed peoples. All of them have been compelled, under the combined pressure of the liberation struggles and international public opinion, to bow to the demands of the time and to recognize formally the inalienable rights of peoples. The United Nations, which was founded on the morrow of the Second World War, has contributed in large measure to the speeding up of this irreversible process. In that lies one of its highest claims to glory and one of its most worth-while successes.

72. Nothing could better illustrate the inevitable nature of this evolution than the new trend of events ushered in last April in Portugal, and the political course which that country has committed itself to follow in the Territories still under its domination.

73. As a matter of fact, the choice was and continues to be clear for those who support racial discrimination and colonialism. They can either bring their behaviour into line with the universal principles of justice, equality and the rights of men and of nations or, on the other hand, put themselves beyond the pale of mankind by basing their philosophy on injustice, racial discrimination and the flouting of the inalienable rights of individuals and peoples. The minority and racist régime of South Africa, for its part, has chosen the philosophy of *apartheid* by setting up as political systems racial discrimination and the denial, pure and simple, of the most elementary human rights.

74. There is no need for me to dwell at length on the foundation of this philosophy of the racist régime of South Africa or on its pernicious day-to-day manifestations. Many of those who have spoken before me have dealt at length and clearly with this. Suffice it for me to recall that the minority and racist régime in South Africa is made up of a handful of white men who represent barely 18 per cent of a population of nearly 21 million. That minority has provided itself with an arsenal of texts which are improperly termed laws to codify in specific terms the racial segregation and domination imposed upon the overwhelming majority of the non-white population. Those texts, which have been drafted, voted upon and applied by these geniuses of racism, leave nothing to chance. They cover all aspects of life in South Africa. In particular, they deal with the specific delimitation of the areas in which non-whites must live, the suppression of the right to vote, the prohibition of the setting up of associations, the prohibition of the right of assembly and of demonstration and the places that the various races should occupy in public conveyances, places of entertainment, the offices of public services, hotels, restaurants, cafes and even public conveniences, beaches and so on. This, of course, is not an exhaustive list, but in addition that minority has arrogated to itself 86 per cent of the territory of South Africa and all its wealth, whereas it represents only 18 per cent of the population.

75. Any citizen of South Africa who goes so far as to dispute these conditions of servitude is immediately thrown into prison for life, if he is not condemned to capital punishment. Need I recall here the record of capital punishment held today, as yesterday, by the racist régime of South Africa? Accordingly, the Africans and the non-whites of South Africa are not only deprived of their rights but are also the subject of blind and pitiless repression. They have not even the right to hope and perhaps not even the right to sigh. But the racist policy of the minority régime is not confined to South African

territory. It is manifested in Southern Rhodesia in the support granted to the racist and illegal régime of Ian Smith. It is also manifested in the unlawful occupation of Namibia, which flouts all the resolutions of the United Nations and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice. I say this to show that the presence here of the minority and racist régime of Pretoria is an affront to the Organization and to the Charter, just as it is a very serious attack on human rights and the dignity of the African peoples which we represent.

76. It was certainly on the basis of this series of considerations that the General Assembly, on 30 September 1974, adopted resolution 3207 (XXIX) calling upon the Security Council to examine the relations between the United Nations and South Africa. If it had been only a matter of once again condemning the policy of *apartheid* of the white régime of South Africa, the General Assembly would certainly not have needed to put the matter before the Security Council. Indeed, this Council has been seized of the question for as long as 15 years, and on many occasions it has condemned the policy followed by the Pretoria régime in the clearest and most formal terms. Despite all this, the racist minority of Pretoria has not changed its policy. On the contrary, day by day it strengthens its repressive policy and its methods of domination. The statement made before the Council by the representative of the Pretoria régime [*1800th meeting*] is a perfect illustration of what I say.

77. The Security Council is therefore invited not to grant a further respite to a régime which is constantly violating the resolutions of the United Nations, but rather to take the measures recommended in the Charter for cases similar to that with which we are dealing today. All the principles and purposes set out in the Charter, and particularly those in Articles 1, 2, 6, 55 and 56, have been violated and flouted by the Pretoria régime. Therefore there remains no alternative but for the Council to take the decision dictated to it in Article 6, namely, to recommend to the General Assembly the expulsion of the South African régime.

78. This is the purpose of the draft resolution which has just been introduced on behalf of my country and other delegations by my colleague, the representative of Kenya. The adoption of this draft resolution by the Council would restore, we are convinced, the somewhat diminished confidence of peoples in the United Nations. It would also serve as a lesson to those who support racism in South Africa and induce them to follow the dictates of reason and try to become members of the great family of nations.

79. Mr. PÉREZ de CUÉLLAR (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly, in a resolution adopted by an overwhelming majority, has asked us to review the relationship between the United Nations

and South Africa. We have already heard statements by all parties directly or indirectly concerned from the African continent as well as the points of view of representatives of other regions justifiably interested in the item now under discussion.

80. First of all, I should like to state that in considering this grave controversy the delegation of Peru bears in mind the humanitarian and freedom-loving spirit of its Government, the multiracial and egalitarian composition of its population and the traditional respect of our country for the purposes and principles of the Charter, for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and for the resolutions of United Nations bodies. I should also say that the fact that Peru is a member of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* has enabled my delegation to observe closely the inhuman nature of that policy and the culpable tenacity with which the Government of Pretoria pursues it.

81. After the thorough and clear statements of the speakers who preceded me, I do not wish to tire the members of the Council by engaging in an elaborate exposition of South African conduct vis-à-vis the United Nations. I shall consequently confine myself to repeating its broad lines in order to place my own analysis in context.

82. Racial discrimination began in South Africa with the very formation of the Union in 1910 and was institutionalized in 1948 under the name of *apartheid*. That racial policy was denounced and condemned in the United Nations from the very first General Assembly session in 1946. At subsequent sessions, the Assembly adopted clear and categorical resolutions aimed at persuading South Africa to cease these racist practices. The Security Council, for its part, examined the policy of *apartheid* from 1960 on and adopted resolutions which recognized that that policy could jeopardize international peace and security. However, during that long period of time—which we could well call a warning or preventive period—there was no sign whatsoever of a serious intention to cease or even to relax the South African policy of *apartheid*.

83. As regards the question of Namibia, which is another facet of the problem we are considering, the General Assembly, in 1953, adopted an unequivocal resolution asking South Africa to place that Territory under United Nations trusteeship and in 1966 it ended the Mandate exercised by South Africa over Namibia. This Council in 1969 urged that country to withdraw forthwith its administration from the Territory and in 1970 condemned it for not implementing United Nations resolutions on Namibia and declared that its defiant attitude towards the Council undermined the Organization's authority. Moreover, in 1971 the International Court of Justice handed down an advisory opinion to the effect that, since South Africa's presence in Namibia was illegal,

that State was obligated to withdraw its administration from and to put an end to its occupation of the Territory. As a member of the group of three States members of the Council which, with the Secretary-General, co-ordinated the contacts established pursuant to our resolution 309 (1972), I was personally able to ascertain the lack of political will of South Africa in the matter. In view of the non-compliance by South Africa with the provisions legally depriving it of its authority to administer Namibia, its presence in Namibia is a case of occupation of a Territory by force.

84. Finally, the Pretoria Government has flagrantly violated Security Council resolution 253 (1968) by providing all kinds of assistance to the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia.

85. It is thus obvious that the Organization has been forced to be a helpless witness to and victim of the non-compliance by the Government of South Africa with the Charter and with the provisions of its main bodies, which, in varying degrees, were binding on it by virtue of its status as Member State.

86. We are faced with a grave confrontation between a Member State, on the one hand, and the provisions of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, on the other.

87. In considering this situation, we should first of all bear in mind that the attitude of South Africa violates the aims, purposes and principles of the Charter, which is a treaty fully binding upon the States that signed it, a treaty which stands above their own internal law and which is at the summit of the international legal order. Secondly, without entering into a discussion of the legal consequences of United Nations resolutions, we should bear in mind that their moral and political scope is undeniable, coming as they do from forums such as the General Assembly and the Security Council which represent the collective conscience of the world and whose actions are endowed with a moral force which, as has rightly been said, is an emergent legal force. For all these reasons, my delegation believes that it is incumbent upon the members of the Council to hear the verdict of that collective conscience, which should be the guardian of the supreme international interest, and that we are on duty bound to act to strengthen the authority of the Organization and the Charter, punishing those who do not comply with its provisions.

88. My delegation should now shoulder its responsibility and support any effective measure aimed at putting an end to the obstinate rebelliousness of the Government of South Africa. But in saying "effective measure", the obligation arises to weigh the action that we must take. Numerous speakers, and the draft resolution submitted by our African colleagues in the Council, propose to us the immediate

expulsion of South Africa from the Organization. The measure is an extreme and unprecedented one and we feel this especially as, like many others, we harbour the fear that the rebel will be outside the control of the Organization and free to carry on its illegal conduct unhindered. We could think of using other preventive measures, including those contained in Article 41 of the Charter.

89. From a careful study of the statement made in the Council by the representative of South Africa, we cannot see, unfortunately, that that country has any firm purpose, in keeping with United Nations resolutions, of putting an end to the policy of *apartheid*, to its occupation of Namibia or to its assistance to Southern Rhodesia. Nor does the history of the systematic violation by South Africa of those resolutions enable us to think that it would abide by new preventive measures. Experience shows that the implementation of such provisions by all the Members of the Organization cannot be guaranteed.

90. Finally, we do not believe that the aspiration of the Organization to universality—that is, to the universality of peace-loving States—will be contradicted by the expulsion of a Member State whose Government obviously represents only a minority of its population, when, as has been shown, it does not meet the conditions for membership under either Article 4 or Article 6 of the Charter.

91. After this long exposition, my delegation can draw no other logical conclusion than to support the draft resolution in document S/11543 submitted by the delegations of Iraq, Kenya, Mauritania and the United Republic of Cameroon.

92. Mr. HUANG-Yen (China) (*translation from Chinese*): At the current session, the General Assembly adopted, by an overwhelming majority of 125 votes, a decision rejecting the credentials of the representatives of the South African racist régime and calling upon the Security Council to review the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa. This is a decision of great political significance, for it reflects the righteous indignation of the Governments of numerous Member States at the South African racist authorities and expresses the powerful support they extend to the South African people. The resolution calls upon the Council to come to a solemn verdict on the South African racist régime in accordance with the principles of the Charter and in the light of the South African authorities' serious crimes of persistent contempt for and violation of the relevant United Nations resolutions, continued pursuance of the *apartheid* policy and illegal occupation of Namibia. That is entirely just.

93. For a long time the South African racist régime has persisted in violating the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and has stubbornly pursued the policies of *apartheid* and of racial discrimination.

The South African authorities long ago promulgated the "*apartheid* law" by which they forcibly evicted the Africans, who comprise over 70 per cent of the population, and removed them to the so-called "reservations", which account for only 13 per cent of the total area of South Africa, where the Africans have been ruthlessly exploited and oppressed. In order to carry out this policy by force, the South African authorities have issued countless fascist decrees and laws depriving the Africans of all the freedoms of speech, the press, assembly and association and the right to strike, have resorted to forced labour and have repeatedly created appalling incidents of massacre, such as the one at Sharpeville.

94. The South African racist régime has persistently violated the relevant United Nations resolutions, illegally occupied Namibia over a long period and threatened to counter by force any action aimed at ending its illegal occupation. In order to alleviate the pressure of just world opinion and to extricate themselves from their increasing isolation, the South African racist authorities have resorted to various clumsy tricks. Three years ago they played the trick of conducting a so-called "dialogue" with the United Nations which eventually proved to be a sheer mockery of and insult to the United Nations. At the same time, they have redoubled their efforts to create bantustans in pursuance of the policy of "divide and rule". Recently they have resorted to the trick of holding discussions with the so-called population groups of Namibia for the real purpose of carving up and dividing Namibia so as to perpetuate their illegal occupation of the Territory.

95. The South African racist régime has all along violated the relevant United Nations resolutions on sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and has been stepping up its collusion with the reactionary authorities of Southern Rhodesia. In 1967, it sent troops to Southern Rhodesia to suppress the Zimbabwe people's struggle against the Southern Rhodesian racist tyranny. Moreover, it has entered into a secret "joint defence programme" with the Southern Rhodesian authorities and the former Portuguese colonialist régime. They have formed a counter-revolutionary "holy alliance" and continuously reinforced their military apparatus to be used for joint repression of the national liberation struggles of the people in southern Africa and military threats to the independent African States, thus seriously menacing the security of those countries. In January of last year that régime collaborated with the racist régime of Southern Rhodesia in creating tension along the Zambian border and making armed provocations against Zambia. More recently, it has repeatedly created incidents along the Zambian border. Last September, its chief, Vorster, clamoured in swollen arrogance that if the régime after the independence of Mozambique "failed to live up to expectations", South Africa would "take the necessary measures

to protect its interests", which was an open threat to the people of Mozambique.

96. To sum up, the South African authorities are pursuing a genocidal policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination and practising fascist tyranny at home, while externally it is colluding with Southern Rhodesia and other colonialist régimes to repress the national liberation struggles and making repeated provocations against the neighbouring independent African States in a serious threat to their independence and security. Moreover, they are the faithful agent protecting the enormous economic interests of world imperialism in southern Africa.

97. In his speech at the Security Council meeting a few days ago [1800th meeting], the so-called representative of this reactionary régime did not scruple to misrepresent history and distort the facts, calling black white and confusing right and wrong. His speech was indeed a masterpiece of a combination of lies, calumnies, threats and hypocrisy. Just as dog's dung may be used as manure to fertilize the soil, so the rubbish of this most reactionary speech may be used as material for learning by negative example. The so-called Republic of South Africa was clearly the result of colonial conquest and plunder by the white colonialists, yet he had the cheek to style its members "the first African nationalists". Is this not a brazen misrepresentation of history? The South African racists have clearly subjected the African and other coloured people to the most brutal persecution and discrimination and the areas under their rule have virtually become a hell on earth for the African and other Coloured people. Yet he chose to misinterpret these facts, alleging that owing to the difference in the modes of life between the blacks and the whites, it was natural that South Africa did have discriminatory laws. Is this not a brazen propagation of the Fascist fallacy of white superiority? He even slanderously described the relevant United Nations resolutions and the just demands of Member States for compliance with them as being unjust and biased and as distortion and vendetta. His speech has brought home to the people of the world that the handful of the South African racists are diehards who are dead set to carry on the racist policies and who will never lay down their butcher's knife and become Buddha overnight. This will help dispel whatever illusions may exist in people's minds about the South African racists.

98. The deeds of the reactionary South African authorities have revealed their utter contempt for the Charter of the United Nations and its numerous resolutions. This is a challenge to the overwhelming majority of Member States.

99. Taking up a previous initiative by Asian, African and Latin American States calling for the expulsion of South Africa, when necessary, in accordance with the provisions of Article 6 of the

Charter, Iraq, Kenya, Mauritania and the United Republic of Cameroon have now submitted a draft resolution also calling for the expulsion of South Africa. In the view of the Chinese delegation, this just demand is in full conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter, and the Security Council should adopt this resolution without any delay.

100. Some say that the expulsion of South Africa is not in keeping with the legal procedure of the United Nations. In our opinion, this assertion is in itself contrary to the spirit of the Charter. The reactionary South African authorities have always defied the relevant United Nations resolutions, wilfully trampling upon the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. In pursuance of Article 4 and Article 6 of the Charter, the expulsion of South Africa is entirely proper and absolutely necessary both politically and legally. This is also the ineluctable duty of all Member States which truly uphold the relevant United Nations resolutions and the Charter principles.

101. Some others say that the expulsion of South Africa will lead to the loss of United Nations restraint over it. This is even more untenable. The United Nations has been considering the question of South Africa for more than two decades, during which it adopted many resolutions. Nevertheless, the South African authorities have never been restrained. If anyone is really interested in "restraining" the South African authorities, he should support the demand of the numerous African and other world countries for the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations, immediately sever all political, economic and military contacts with the South African racist authorities and support further measures to be taken by the United Nations to force the South African authorities to change their reactionary policies. Yet while talking about restraint, these people are actually giving energetic support to and conniving with the South African authorities. Does this not fully reveal that their call for restraint is a sham while their shielding of the South African authorities is real? As a matter of fact, those who sing such a tune with the greatest vigour are exactly those who have long been deliberately violating the arms embargo against South Africa and giving energetic support to the reactionary South African authorities in various fields.

102. In the final analysis, to eliminate the evils of racism and colonialism, it is necessary first of all to overthrow the rule of colonialism and imperialism and win complete national liberation. In the course of our deliberations over the past few days, the representatives of a number of African countries and the South African people have rightly pointed out that the final victory in the struggle against South African racism and colonialism hinges on the united struggle of the African people.

103. Historical development shows that the enemy will not perish of himself. Everything reactionary is the same; if you do not hit it, it will not fall. This is also like sweeping the floor; as a rule, where the broom does not reach, the dust will not vanish of itself. Consequently, the oppressed people and nations must never pin the hopes of their liberation on the "good sense" of the imperialists and their lackeys. The oppressed peoples can win victory only by strengthening their unity and persevering in the struggle. This is an incontrovertible truth which has been repeatedly borne out by the experience of the world peoples' struggle and once again proved by the experience of the struggle of the people in the Portuguese colonies.

104. The General Assembly has already rejected the credentials of the representatives of the South African racists. If the United Nations further adopts a resolution to expel South Africa from the Organization, that will constitute a support and encouragement to the people of southern Africa who are carrying on their struggles. If the draft resolution calling for the expulsion of the South African racists should be vetoed, as predicted, that will only further expose the intransigence of the South African racists and their supporters, who will find themselves in greater isolation and powerlessness among the peoples of the world, but the African peoples' struggle will not be affected in the least.

105. Africa belongs to the African people. Azania belongs to the Azanian people, and not to the handful of racists. In the final analysis, all reactionaries are paper tigers. It is the unity and struggle of the Azanian people and the entire African people that will decide the final victory in their fight.

106. The Chinese Government and people have consistently supported the people of Africa and Azania in their struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racism. The road of struggle is difficult and tortuous, yet we are deeply convinced that so long as the people of Azania and the rest of Africa strengthen their unity, persevere in struggle and guard against infiltration and division by the super-Powers, they will certainly overcome all hardships and hazards on the road forward and remove this cancer from the organs of the African continent. After all, ours is no longer a time in which colonialists and imperialists can lord it over others. Imperialism, and particularly that of the super-Powers, is beset with troubles and is increasingly on the decline. The struggle of the third world countries and the peoples of other countries is pushing forward the tide of world history. The international situation of great disorder under heaven is developing in a direction favourable to the peoples of all countries. The South African racists, like their behind-the-scenes bosses, are nothing but paper tigers. The diehards may be hard, but they are not hard unto death. They may be diehards today and remain so tomorrow, but not for ever. Confronted with the united struggle of

the people, they cannot escape from their doom of complete defeat in the long run.

107. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): Mr. President, I have already had occasion to welcome you to your post. I pointed out at the time that your task is not an easy one, and the further course of events has confirmed that.

108. With your permission, I should like also, a little belatedly perhaps, to discharge a painful duty and express our profound condolences on the untimely death of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq, Mr. Shadhel Taqa. All of us here in the United Nations knew that outstanding statesman and diplomat from Iraq. Just recently, at this twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly,³ Mr. Shadhal Taqa spoke from the rostrum of the Assembly, setting forth the position of his country on the main questions of concern to the international community. Mr. Taqa is well known in the Soviet Union, where he represented his country as Ambassador. The news of his untimely death is especially saddening to us, since he was the Minister for Foreign Affairs of a country with which the Soviet Union maintains the closest and most friendly relations. We hope that the representative of Iraq in the Security Council will convey our profound condolences to the Government and people of Iraq and to Mr. Taqa's family.

109. In response to the just demand of the African States, strongly supported by their friends, the Security Council, following a recommendation by the General Assembly, has begun its consideration of the question of the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa. General Assembly resolution 3207 (XXIX) calls 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.

110. That decision was taken by the General Assembly not by chance or at the prompting of fleeting emotions. It was the result of prolonged, tireless efforts on the part of all the progressive forces of mankind and of the United Nations to put an end to the most shameful phenomenon of the twentieth century—the monstrous colonialist-racist policies and practices of *apartheid* applied by the racist régime in South Africa.

111. The positive changes now taking place in the international arena, the détente which is the dominant feature of the development of present-day international relations and which has become possible chiefly because of the peace-loving policies of the USSR and other socialist countries, the establishment of

³ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 2262nd meeting.

normal relations and businesslike co-operation between States with different social systems—all these things are creating more favourable conditions and prospects for a further broadening of the liberation struggle of oppressed peoples for freedom and independence, for the speedy elimination of the last vestiges of colonialism and racism from the earth, and for the full implementation of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

112. The strengthening of peace and the tasks of the anti-colonialist struggle urgently require that the efforts of all countries—large, medium-sized and small—should make détente irreversible and extend it to every continent. Many heads of delegations referred to this during the general debate at this twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

113. Under the conditions of international détente, there has been, over the last few years, a further upsurge in the national liberation movement of the colonial peoples of the African continent. One result of the consistent and single-minded struggle of the colonial peoples, with the support of all the democratic forces of the world, and above all the socialist countries, is the significant anti-colonialist transformations that have been achieved on African soil. The independence of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau has been won, and there have been positive moves towards attaining independence for the Territories of Angola, Mozambique and the Cape Verde Islands, formerly under Portuguese administration. The last colonial empire has crumbled under the united blows of the national liberation movements in the former Portuguese colonial possessions and the anti-fascist movement of the Portuguese people. The collapse of Portuguese colonialism is a major historic watershed in the struggle for the complete and final elimination of colonial slavery on the African continent.

114. We, the Soviet people, are proud of the fact that our country is steadily developing and consolidating its relations of friendship, mutual understanding and co-operation with the countries of Africa and with all States of the third world. Our country is linked with them by the ties of a joint struggle for peace, security and the permanent destruction of the shameful system of colonialism and by the unfailing support given to the national liberation movements.

115. Speaking in the general debate at the present session of the United Nations General Assembly, A. A. Gromyko, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, said the following:⁴

“Impressive victories have been won of late in the struggle for national independence, economic liberation and the elimination of the remnants of the colonial system. However, that struggle is far from over. We cannot permit colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination to remain as dark blots upon this planet. Until they disappear, the peace-loving States and the United Nations as a whole cannot slacken their efforts to eradicate them.”

116. On the African continent there are still colonialist-racist régimes in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. The main bulwark and breeding ground of colonialism and racism in southern Africa is the South African régime. The racist authorities in South Africa are not implementing the United Nations decisions on Namibia. Pretoria is in a direct confrontation with the United Nations regarding that Territory. Despite the United Nations decision which ended the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia, it continues to occupy that Territory illegally and to extend its *apartheid* régime and bantustan practices to it. The General Assembly and the Security Council have adopted numerous resolutions stating that the continued occupation of Namibia by the South African authorities is illegal. The rulers of South Africa were told to withdraw all their police and military forces and all civilian personnel from the Territory of Namibia, but they are continuing to ignore these decisions. They are not implementing them. They are persisting in their annexationist, colonialist, racist policies towards Namibia and its people.

117. Acting in violation of the Security Council decisions on sanctions against the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia, which, as we all know, have binding force, the South African authorities are maintaining extensive economic, military, political and other links with that régime. It is no secret to anyone that economic and military assistance from South Africa is the main reason for the Smith régime's ability to remain in power in Southern Rhodesia, imposing the same racist system as that which exists in South Africa.

118. *Apartheid* is the official State policy of the South African régime. What this policy is and what it means in practice to the nearly 20 million African inhabitants of South Africa is well known to all members of the Security Council and to all States Members of the United Nations. The distinguished representatives of African and other countries who have spoken in the Security Council have given the Council detailed accounts and cited numerous examples and facts concerning the monstrous oppression, violence and terror which have been elevated by the South African racists to the level of State policy towards the indigenous population. This is the cruelest oppression, and exploitation of the indigenous population. It is depriving the indigenous African inhabitants of the country, and also those of Asian origin, of their elementary rights and freedoms. It is the application of the Fascist ideology of the superiority of one race.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 2240th meeting.

119. For many years, the United Nations has concentrated its attention on the struggle against colonialism, racism and *apartheid* in all their forms and manifestations. Numerous resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly have strongly condemned colonialism, racism and *apartheid*, which are tools for the imperialist exploitation and oppression of peoples. They firmly demand the complete elimination of these grisly relics of a past colonial era, which are intolerable in the second half of the twentieth century. The policy of *apartheid* is a gross violation of the United Nations Charter, and many resolutions have described it as a crime against humanity. Indeed, the United Nations has declared that it creates a situation which seriously threatens international peace and security.

120. The struggle against colonialism, racism and *apartheid* have been marked by such outstanding events as the adoption by the United Nations, on the initiative of the Soviet Union, of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples; the adoption of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*, proposed by the USSR and Guinea, and the adoption of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

121. Condemnation of the policies of colonialism, racial discrimination, *apartheid* and segregation, together with a call for an end to these shameful policies, is to be found in important documents adopted by many international organizations and conferences.

122. The United Nations is a unique international organization, created as a result of the victorious struggle against Hitlerian fascism, which the Soviet Union played a decisive role in overthrowing; the Charter lays special stress on the resolve of the peoples of the United Nations "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small". One of the Organization's main aims, in addition to strengthening the peace and security of peoples, is according to the Charter, "promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion".

123. After the defeat of fascism and the utter condemnation of the inhuman racist ideology which it propagated, these lofty basic principles were written into the Charter by the founders of the United Nations as a guarantee against the rebirth of Fascist ideology and practice, of policies of racial discrimination and *apartheid* in any shape or form or of the doctrine of the superiority of one race or nation over others.

124. A decision calling for an end to the policies of racial discrimination and *apartheid* was also adopted by the Algiers Assembly of the Heads of State and Government of Non-Aligned Countries, and similar decisions were taken at the eleventh session of the Assembly of Heads of State or Government of the Organization of African Unity. An authoritative voice of the international community in support of the struggle against colonialism, racism and *apartheid* was raised at the World Congress of Peace Forces in Moscow in October 1973, at the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations in Geneva this year, and in other leading international forums.

125. The United Nations has done everything possible to put an end to the colonialist racist policies of the South African régime, but all its efforts to influence the racist rulers of Pretoria have so far been in vain. This can be explained by the well-known fact that the South African racist régime has until now enjoyed support from outside, as the representatives speaking in the Security Council and in the General Assembly have testified. We all know very well just who supports this racist régime, the forms their support takes and its extent. The régime relies on the direct support of certain Western countries, especially the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and their imperialist transnational monopolies. In defiance and in violation of the Council decisions prohibiting the sale or supply to South Africa of all types of weapons and military equipment, these items continue to reach the South African racists in a steady flow. Many speakers have pointed out that joint Anglo-South African naval exercises are being conducted in South African coastal waters.

126. The progressive forces of the world, the countries of Africa and the United Nations, will no longer tolerate that situation. The decision adopted at the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly rejecting the credentials of the delegation of South Africa as not representing the people of that country attests to the international community's determination to put an end to the shame of the twentieth century in southern Africa—the policies of racism, segregation and *apartheid*. This determination is also evidenced by the Assembly decision calling upon the Security Council to review the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa.

127. The unswerving and consistent position of the Soviet Union in the struggle against colonialism, racism and *apartheid* is well known despite certain slanderous fabrications on that point. The socialist system, under which all the means of production belong to the workers, ensures true equality of rights for all, regardless of nationality or race. In the Soviet Union, a new and historic society, the Soviet people has come into being. All the peoples of the multinational Soviet Union enjoy the benefits of the social and economic achievements of socialism. Equality in all areas of life is not only officially

proclaimed by the Constitution and other legislative texts but is guaranteed in practice. To the old world of class and national oppression, of national division and discord, the Communist Party and the working class of the Soviet Union have opposed a new world—a world of the unity of working people in which there is no place for any oppression of one nation by another or for any national privileges.

128. Colonialism, racism, *apartheid*, fascism, zionism and all other forms and manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism based on false and unscientific concepts of the superiority of one race over another, one nation over another—the “exclusiveness of the Aryan race” or God’s chosen people—wherever and in whatever form these concepts have appeared, whether in South Africa, in the Middle East or anywhere else in the world, are rejected in principle by the Soviet Union and by the whole Soviet nation of more than 120 peoples and nationalities.

129. All of these inhuman, racist “theories”—if one may use the word—are incompatible with the communist and socialist principles and philosophy of our multinational State, with its high ideals of peace, labour, freedom, equality, brotherhood and the happiness of all peoples.

130. True to Leninist principles, which are designed to enable all the peoples of the world to achieve freedom, equality and the sovereign right fully to decide their own fate, the Soviet Union consistently advocates the complete and final liquidation of colonialism, racism and *apartheid*. Speaking in Berlin on 6 October last on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the German Democratic Republic, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, said the following: “We are convinced that the day is near when all of Africa, from the Cape of Good Hope to the Sahara, will be free.”

131. The national liberation movement is today one of the main guiding forces of the world wide progressive, anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist front. The Soviet Union is strengthening its solidarity with the peoples struggling for their national liberation and is giving them all possible assistance and support. In the Berlin speech to which I have just alluded, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev stated in this connexion:

“The socialist countries have never ceased to give full aid and support to those who fight to liberate the colonies. As in the past, we regard this as our international duty. And together with the peoples which have cast off the colonial yoke we welcome the victories of the anti-colonialist revolution, which is one of the powerful forces accelerating the pace of contemporary history.”

132. The Soviet Union supports all measures and activities directed against colonialism, racism and

apartheid and actively co-operates in this regard with the African States and with all the countries of the third world. The USSR has actively supported and co-sponsored the initiative of the African countries in the Assembly calling for a review by the Security Council of 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. On the basis of its position of principle regarding the elimination of colonialist and racist régimes, the Soviet Union supports the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to use all available means in its struggle, including armed force, against the illegal occupation of its territory by the South African racists.

133. The Soviet Union urges the United Nations to take the most decisive and uncompromising measures against the South African racist régime. The USSR actively supports the proposals of the African countries to apply to the racist régime in South Africa the measures provided for by the United Nations Charter such as mandatory sanctions by all States against that régime. So far these proposals have unfortunately been blocked in the Security Council by the countries which give moral and material assistance and support to the racist régime in Pretoria. For its part, the Soviet Union has strictly complied with the United Nations resolutions aimed at the elimination of colonialism, racism and *apartheid*.

134. Yesterday, one of the speakers, the representative of a public organization, tried—albeit in rather vague terms—to cast a shadow over and throw doubt upon the advantages of détente in comparison with the cold war. However, it is quite apparent that the discussion in the General Assembly and in the Security Council regarding the relationship between the United Nations and the racist, Fascist régime in South Africa, and this representative’s statement were possible only because of détente. In the years of the cold war, this would have been unthinkable and impossible.

135. Attempts have also been made to pretend that there is no difference between the policy and position of Eastern and Western countries with respect to the national liberation struggle of the colonial peoples and of the peoples under the Fascist, racist yoke. Only those who are insufficiently informed or who are not saying what they think can reason in this way. One has only to look at United Nations documents to see that it was precisely on the initiative of what the speaker calls the “Eastern countries”, precisely on the initiative of the socialist countries, that the United Nations adopted the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Anyone who does not see a difference between the Eastern countries’ approach to the national liberation struggle and the approach of certain Western countries either understands nothing at all

about these matters or is pursuing some secret aim, deliberately sowing doubt in order to divide and weaken the united front of the socialist countries, the African States, the countries of the third world and the national liberation movements in their unceasing joint struggle for the freedom and national independence of the colonial peoples.

136. It is obvious to all that the actions and policies of South Africa constitute a gross and premeditated violation of the Charter, are contrary to the elementary principles of international law and run counter to the demands set out in numerous decisions of the United Nations and its principal organ for the maintenance of peace and security, the Security Council.

137. The representatives of African countries speaking in the Council have demanded the expulsion of South Africa. The delegation of the USSR supports that demand. The Soviet Union is also ready to support the most vigorous measures within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations, on the basis of the decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, in order to put an end to the colonialist racist policy of the South African racists. The Security Council should take measures to encourage all States, including the allies of South Africa, to cut off all aid and support to the South African racists.

138. In this connexion, we can hardly fail to note the numerous appeals addressed by the representatives of African and other countries speaking in the Security Council to those permanent members of the Council who they believe may intend to vote against the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations. The delegation of the USSR supports these appeals and in its turn calls upon those permanent members of the Security Council, if they should indeed have such intentions, not to put any obstacles in the path of the adoption of a just and overdue decision to expel South Africa from the United Nations.

139. The Soviet Union for its part is prepared to go on making every effort to obtain a speedy positive solution to the problem of liberating the peoples of southern Africa from the yoke of colonialism, racism and *apartheid*. In the programme of peace adopted by the twenty-fourth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union it is solemnly proclaimed that:

"The decisions of the United Nations calling for the elimination of the remaining colonial régimes must be fully implemented. All manifestations of racism and *apartheid* must be universally condemned and boycotted."

140. In concluding its statements, the delegation of the USSR would like to bring to the attention of the members of the Security Council, and of all representatives of Member States who are participating in the present debate, the appeals of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet

Union on the fifty-seventh anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, which the Soviet people will celebrate as their national holiday on 7 November this year. These appeals relate to the struggle of colonial peoples for their freedom and national independence. In a compressed and concentrated form they reflect the policy and position of our Party and of the entire Soviet people and Soviet State with regard to the struggle of the colonial peoples for national liberation and against colonialism and racism and the provision of all possible support to them in that struggle. These appeals read as follows:

"Warm greetings to the peoples who shed the colonialist fetters and who are fighting for stronger independence and the social progress of their countries!

"Warm greetings to the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries, struggling against imperialism and racism and for freedom and national independence!

"May the mighty alliance of the revolutionary forces—the world socialist system, the international working class movement, and the fighters for the national and social liberation of the peoples—grow stronger!"

141. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of the Soviet Union was good enough to mention the difficulties we are having this month and I should like to tell him that, while the Council's task is certainly difficult during this month of October, I venture to hope that with the objective co-operation of each of its members, the Council will succeed in overcoming these difficulties in the best interests of the international community.

142. Members of the Council will recall that at its 1804th meeting the Council decided, under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, to invite Mr. Noël Mukono, Secretary for External Affairs of the Zimbabwe African National Union. Mr. Mukono has made it known that he is ready to address the Council at its present meeting. With the consent of the Council, therefore, I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

143. Mr. MUKONO: Mr. President, may I, through you, take this opportunity to express our condolences on the untimely death of the distinguished Foreign Minister of Iraq.

144. Mr. President, allow me, on behalf of my delegation and my party, the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU), to express to you and, through you, to the members of the Security Council my gratitude for giving my delegation an opportunity to participate in the deliberations of the Council in the crucial item before it—the relationship between

the United Nations and South Africa. It is even more gratifying that this critical issue is being debated under your presidency, particularly in view of the fact that your country is in the forefront in supporting the liberation movements of Africa.

145. My delegation's main reason for speaking is to reply to the allegations made against my party by Mr. Botha, the representative of South Africa.

146. When Mr. Botha addressed the Council on Thursday, 24 October 1974, he included the following statement by his Prime Minister in his remarks on Southern Rhodesia:

“‘However, I must also say that I know it is being said in some quarters, on the one side, that South Africa is holding the Rhodesian Government back. In fact, this accusation has been made, and will be made more and more, and I want to say that this is not so, as anybody in Rhodesia, or elsewhere, who knows anything about this position will be able to tell. On the other hand, there are ZANU and ZAPU leaders outside Rhodesia [or elsewhere] who are suspected ... of exerting influence on black Rhodesians not to come to terms.’”
[1800th meeting, para. 130.]

My delegation categorically refutes this allegation and unreservedly condemns such irresponsible and cunning utterances with the contempt which they deserve.

147. It is common knowledge that the people of Zimbabwe are at war—a war for national liberation right inside the country. Hence it is an insult to the integrity of the Africans of Zimbabwe to say that somebody outside is exerting influence on them. The leadership of the liberation movements outside Zimbabwe are part and parcel of the African masses of Zimbabwe struggling and fighting for national liberation. They are one and speak with one voice and for one cause, that is, majority rule in Zimbabwe.

148. It is inconceivable that the representative of South Africa should shamelessly declare that his Government is not helping the illegal régime of Ian Smith when only last Friday, 25 October, in Cape Town Mr. Jimmy Kruger, South Africa's Police Minister, announced a further invasion of Zimbabwe, as reported in a Reuters telex dispatch dated 25 October, as follows:

“‘Rhodesia's fight against guerrillas is becoming more and more like conventional warfare', Mr. Jimmy Kruger, South Africa's Police Minister, told Parliament here today.

“Mr. Kruger made the statement in announcing that South Africa will establish a volunteer corps trained to take over the guarding of borders from police units.

“He said the corps was being set up to counteract the disruption of work at police stations in the Republic as a result of border duties.

“Meanwhile, South Africa police assisting Rhodesia police on border duties would receive additional allowances and bonuses.

“These steps are being taken because the combating of terrorism in Rhodesia necessitated the use of weapons of war and was to an increasing extent becoming a sort of conventional warfare.

“The services rendered by members of the South Africa Police there in extremely dangerous circumstances could not be compared with ordinary police services in the Republic.”

149. The South African racist Government invaded Zimbabwe in 1967 and since then they have been increasing their Fascist troops in Zimbabwe to the tune of thousands of so-called security forces. South Africa has financed the illegal, racist régime of Ian Smith and has equipped its illegal and fascist army with war weapons. The South African troops have fought the indigenous Africans of Zimbabwe in their own country and have committed acts of untold atrocity and brutality. They practise all known terror and torture tactics. In December last year two so-called South African policemen cut the throat of a three-month old baby and raped the mother simply because she refused to furnish them with information regarding a freedom-fighter. The two South African policemen were named Quinn and Visser.

150. South African soldiers have been and still are involved in the massacre of the masses of Zimbabwe, the destruction of their homes and food stores and the killing of their cattle, sheep, goats, pigs and donkeys. It is the South African Government that defiantly and arrogantly violates United Nations sanctions against rebel Rhodesia. The presence of South African troops in Zimbabwe constitutes a grave threat to peace in that part of the world. My delegation and my party view this as an arrogant demonstration of power, which the Security Council cannot tolerate.

151. My delegation wishes to express its grave concern at the collaboration and connivance between South Africa, on the one hand, and the double-dealing United Kingdom, the sanction-breaking United States of America and France, on the other, aimed at providing defence aid to the illegal régime of Rhodesia. I am referring to the following instances:

—First, the arms deal between Britain, Jordan, South Africa and Rhodesia. Those weapons are being deployed in Zimbabwe today to massacre the African people.

—Secondly, the joint naval exercises between the British Royal Navy and the South African Navy.

—Thirdly, the United States policy towards South Africa and Rhodesia as spelled out in the Kissinger secret papers and approved by the former President, Mr. Nixon, in 1970. The intention of this policy is to violate the United Nations arms embargo against South Africa with a view to giving defence aid to South Africa and thence to Rhodesia. It was one year after Mr. Kissinger's policy was approved that the United States Congress legislated to violate United Nations sanctions against Rhodesia.

—Fourthly, a French company has, in violation of United Nations sanctions, granted licences to South Africa for the manufacture of helicopters and spotter planes and other instruments of war.

152. The people of Zimbabwe, under the undaunted leadership of ZANU, will not be deterred by these evil collaborations and connivances. They will continue to fight for their liberation until victory is won.

153. However, the presence of South African troops in Zimbabwe is a violation of the integrity of our land. Since the purported administering Power, the United Kingdom, has abdicated and forfeited its authority in Zimbabwe and is incapable of forcing out the invading South African troops, ZANU is prepared to take over this responsibility and fight to expel the invaders.

154. In view of all the aforesaid deliberate and blatant violations of the Charter of the United Nations by racist South Africa, my delegation supports unequivocally the draft resolution recommending to the General Assembly that it expel Fascist South Africa from the United Nations.

155. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Morocco. I request him to take his seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

156. Mr. ZAÏMI (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): The condolences of Morocco on the untimely death of the Foreign Minister of Iraq were offered at the due time to the Government and people of Iraq and to the family of the deceased by the authorities of my country. I should like here to add my own personal condolences.

157. Mr. President, may I first of all express to you, as well as to the members of the Council, the heartfelt gratitude of my delegation at having been given the opportunity to express the view of my Government with regard to this indispensable and extremely timely re-examination of the relations of the United Nations Organization with South Africa.

158. I hasten to say that the main characteristic of these relations is one of conflict. The Government of South Africa indeed is in permanent and direct

conflict with the United Nations Organization. Thus, in opposition to the stipulations of the Charter, which clearly affirms fundamental human rights, the dignity of the individual and equal rights for men and women, the Government of Pretoria obstinately practises the policy of *apartheid* against the majority of the South African population. In so doing, it thus violates both the principles of democratic majority rule and of equal rights and duties under the law.

159. The racist minority Government has never bothered to conform to the principles and provisions of the Charter, which guarantees fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race. The last statement made by Mr. Botha further confirms our conviction to this effect.

160. There are many resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council unequivocally condemning this shameful practice, which has been set up as the official policy of that Government. As an example I shall refer to resolution 2671 F (XXV) adopted by the General Assembly on 8 December 1970 which declares that the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa are a negation of the Charter of the United Nations and constitute a crime against humanity. This same resolution reiterates the appeal of the General Assembly to the Security Council to resume urgently the consideration of effective measures, including those envisaged in chapter VII of the Charter. Furthermore, it urges all States to terminate diplomatic, consular and other official relations with the Government of South Africa and to suspend all cultural, educational and sporting exchanges with that racist régime. Other resolutions of the General Assembly refer to the situation in South Africa as an "explosive situation" and call upon the specialized agencies in the United Nations system to put an end to all forms of co-operation with the Government of South Africa.

161. For its part, the Security Council has always condemned the Government of Pretoria and its wicked policy of racial segregation. It has consistently felt that the situation in South Africa seriously disturbs international peace and security and has expressed its grave concern in this connexion. In its resolution 311 (1972), the Council, convinced that it was in duty bound to adopt measures to ensure the application of its resolutions and help to bring about an end to the serious situation in South Africa and southern Africa, condemned the South African Government for continuing to pursue the policies of *apartheid* in violation of the obligations imposed on it by the Charter. I should like to recall in this connexion the fact that Article 25 of the Charter states that the Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Council in accordance with the Charter.

162. But the conflict between the racist Government of Pretoria and the United Nations, which has existed

for many years, does not end there. This Government is illegally occupying an African Territory placed by the international community under the aegis of the United Nations. Despite many resolutions which have emerged from the Security Council and from the General Assembly calling upon the South African Government to leave the Territory of Namibia, and despite the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice dated 21 June 1971, which stipulates in paragraph 133 that "the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia being illegal, South Africa is under obligation to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately and thus put an end to its occupation of the Territory", the Government of Pretoria obstinately refuses to bow to the decision of the international community represented by the United Nations and to allow the United Nations Council for Namibia to fulfil its legal mandate. The Security Council, by its resolution 264 (1969) had already recognized that the Mandate which the League of Nations had entrusted to the South African Government over the Territory of South West Africa had been terminated and had requested the South African Government to withdraw immediately from that Territory.

163. Many attempts have been made to put an end to this grave conflict which has always been a major characteristic of the relations between the Government of South Africa and this international body. The Secretary-General has conducted repeated missions in this connexion. However, the cynicism and obstinacy of that Government compels us to look at the facts as they are.

164. The resolutions of the Security Council in this connexion confirm this situation: resolution 276 (1970) of 30 January 1970 strongly condemns the refusal of the South African Government to comply with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Council and declares that the attitude of defiance of the South African Government vis-à-vis the decisions of the Council undermines the authority of the United Nations. But resolution 264 (1969) had already stipulated that "in the event of failure on the part of the Government of South Africa to comply with the provisions of the present resolution, the Security Council will meet immediately to determine upon necessary steps or measures in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter". Resolution 269 (1969) had even fixed the deadline of 4 October 1969 for the withdrawal of the administration of the Government of South Africa from Namibia.

165. The United Nations has therefore warned the Government of South Africa several times to revise its attitude with regard to its obligations under the Charter, obligations which all Members States must logically respect.

166. The General Assembly in the last four years has resorted to another means for convincing and warning, namely, the rejection of the credentials of the delegation of South Africa. That was a last appeal to reason.

167. The General Assembly magnanimously decided that this rejection of credentials should signify a broad condemnation of the racist policy of Pretoria, in the hope of producing change. However, for the last four years an anomalous and ambiguous situation has been maintained. We sincerely believe that it is high time to put an end to what is, at the least, an abnormal state of affairs. In this case we are confronted with two legally different situations which nevertheless have the same effect. It is this anomaly that the General Assembly, at its present session, has tried to do away with by adopting resolution 3207 (XXIX).

168. This time the General Assembly intends to give full weight to its decision to reject the credentials of the representative of the minority racist Government of South Africa. It requests the Security Council to examine the relations between the United Nations and South Africa in the light of the continued violation by the latter of the principles of the Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. There is hardly any need for me, in this connexion, to recall the relevant provisions of the Charter, particularly Article 6, which states:

"A Member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the Principles contained in the present Charter may be expelled from the Organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

169. The Security Council is therefore called upon to take into consideration the will of the General Assembly and to act in conformity with the spirit and the letter of the numerous resolutions which it has adopted on this matter, thus enforcing the relevant provisions of the Charter. My delegation is deeply convinced that by acting in such a manner the Council will dissipate all ambiguity, will strengthen the prestige and the authority of the United Nations and will help bring about the triumph of the sacred principles of the whole international community: the principles of justice, of law and of peace.

170. Mr. President, it is never too late for my delegation to express to you on the occasion of your accession to the post of President of this august Council our warmest congratulations. It is a source of pride and great satisfaction to us.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استلم منها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
