

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

UN LIBRARY

TWENTY-NINTH YEAR

SEP 5 - 1974

**1808<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 30 OCTOBER 1974

UN COLLECTION

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1808) .....	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 EIGHTH MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 30 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/1808)

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 3.35 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 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. Smid (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Adjibadé (Dahomey), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Florin (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Boatén (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. Slaoui (Morocco), Mr. Ogbu (Nigeria), Mr. Akhund (Pakistan), Mr. Jamal (Qatar), Mr. Datcu (Romania), Mr. Barody (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 places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

2. Mr. JANKOWITSCH (Austria): Mr. President, on an earlier occasion my delegation already had the opportunity of expressing to you its congratulations and pledging its support. I think that as the Council approaches the end of this important debate a renewed tribute is due to you for the excellent manner in which you have guided our debates, and I should like to congratulate you on behalf of my delegation.

3. During the past two weeks, the Council has reviewed "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", as the General Assembly had requested in its resolution 3207 (XXIX). This is the first time that the Council has ever been requested by the General Assembly to review the relationship between the United Nations and one of its Members.

4. The request of the General Assembly refers to a problem which has been before the Organization

ever since the first session of the Assembly convened in 1946. It was in 1946 indeed that the delegation of India succeeded in including the matter of the treatment of South Africa's citizens of Indian origin on the agenda of the Assembly.

5. In the following years the problem of South Africa, its racial policies and the meanings of these policies for the United Nations and indeed the world have increasingly occupied the agenda of the General Assembly, and later of the Security Council. The first resolution of the Assembly condemning *apartheid* was adopted in 1952—eight years before the new Africa could join its voice to that of the people of the world. By October 1963, hardly 10 years later, no fewer than 27 Assembly resolutions and 2 Security Council resolutions condemning *apartheid* had been adopted. By October of this year there were more than 50 resolutions of the Assembly and 7 resolutions of the Council, including one imposing an arms embargo on South Africa. During the past four sessions of the Assembly the credentials of the South African delegation have been rejected by a majority of the Members.

6. The basis for this consistent preoccupation with South Africa has been the universal recognition of the fact that basic concepts of the Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights were being openly violated by successive Governments of what was formerly known as the Union of South Africa and is now, after its withdrawal from the Commonwealth, the Republic of South Africa. These violations have been committed by one of the founding Members of the Organization, whose representative at the San Francisco Conference—ironically, as the report of the Special Committee on *Apartheid*<sup>1</sup> points out—had himself pressed for the inclusion of a clause in the Preamble of the Charter reaffirming “faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women”.

7. South Africa's attitude towards the Organization has further been characterized by its constant disregard of its duties vis-à-vis the Mandated Territory of South West Africa (Namibia) and its continued refusal to abide by United Nations decisions against Southern Rhodesia, in particular, decisions relating to economic sanctions.

8. For a long time world opinion has been unanimous in its view of South Africa's race policies. Describing the state of international opinion on South Africa some years ago, Colin Legum, a leading British voice against *apartheid*, noted that *apartheid* had been described as “abhorrent” by Britain, as “toxic” by the United States, as “hateful” by India, as “thoroughly repugnant” by Belgium, as “inhuman”

by Guinea, as “slavery” by Nigeria, as “degrading” by Canada, as “fundamentally immoral” by Japan, as “shameful” by the USSR, as the “negation of all social purpose” by Bolivia, as “a cancer” by Algeria and as “a catalyst of violence” by Tanzania. It would not be difficult to add to this list not only the views and voices of nearly all countries of the world, but also the views and voices of some of the most enlightened statesmen of our time. It would not be difficult either to quote views and findings on the nature of South Africa's régime from the large and growing volume of research and writing on this subject which today already constitutes a massive scientific *plaidoyer* against *apartheid*.

9. World bodies of the highest moral and professional calibre, such as the World Council of Churches, the International Commission of Jurists and many others, have thrown their spiritual and intellectual authority into the fight against *apartheid*. Popular movements in many countries of the world, including my own, have taken up the issue of South African racial policies and become the spearhead of world opinion on this matter.

10. It is hardly necessary to mention at this stage that the Austrian Government, firmly supported by the Austrian people, rejects the policies of *apartheid* being pursued by the South African Government, as it rejects any policy which is based on human inequality on grounds of race, religion, political beliefs or other motives. Thus, since the early days of its membership in the United Nations, Austria has been on the side of those who spoke up against *apartheid*. At a meeting with the Special Committee on *Apartheid* as recently as May of this year, the Austrian Foreign Minister, Mr. Kirchschräger, who a month later was elected President of Austria, emphasized in his welcoming statement that Austria had never left any doubt about its strong rejection of any policy which is based on human inequality. Mr. Kirchschräger underlined the fact that *apartheid* was not merely an abstract political concept, but had concrete effects, and that no one should close his eyes to the human suffering endured as the consequence of such a policy.

11. We have listened with the utmost attention and great care to the statements which Members of the Organization representing all continents have made in the course of this debate in the Security Council. An impressive volume of facts and figures has been put before the Council, and it is hardly necessary now to offer any further comments.

12. We have not failed to be deeply moved by the statements made in particular by the representatives of the African National Congress of South Africa and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania whose eminent role in the struggle against racial discrimination, economic exploitation and political oppression is already a legendary fact of the history of the liberation movement within South Africa. They

<sup>1</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 22A, part I.

have also spoken for those whose voices have been silenced by death, imprisonment or oppressive laws: they have spoken for Chief Luthuli, whose untimely death deprived his people of one of its finest and most authoritative and respected leaders, and they have spoken for Nelson Mandela and Robert Sobukwe, who are languishing in gaol, but also for many white South Africans exiled, imprisoned or silenced, but whose support demonstrates the non-racial nature of the fight against *apartheid*.

13. The debate in the Security Council has thus been one of the most profound and far-reaching investigations into the practice and theory of *apartheid*. It has become obvious that after more than two decades of *apartheid*, this system has not solved the race problems of South Africa. Indeed, one of the main effects of the years of *apartheid* rule has been to turn a non-violent situation into one of increasing violence. The attempt to divide the economy in defiance of economic laws and with total disregard for humanitarian considerations has created more massive injustice. Externally, *apartheid* rule has isolated South Africa within the world community.

14. Over the years South Africa has rejected again and again the innumerable efforts of the world community to lend a helping hand in correcting the evils of a situation which it has imposed upon itself. In particular, it was the African States themselves that tried to impress upon South Africa the principles which must govern modern human society. To quote only one such example, the Lusaka Manifesto on Southern Africa, emanating from the Fifth Summit Conference of East and Central African States held in April 1969, provides a particularly impressive example when it states:

“Our stand towards southern Africa ... involves a rejection of racialism, not a reversal of the existing racial domination. We believe that all the peoples who have made their homes in the countries of southern Africa are Africans, regardless of the colour of their skins; and we would oppose a racist majority government which adopted a philosophy of deliberate and permanent discrimination between its citizens on grounds of racial origin. We are not talking racialism when we reject the colonialism and *apartheid* policies now operating in those areas; we are demanding an opportunity for all the people of these States, working together as equal individual citizens, to work out for themselves the institutions and the system of government under which they will, by general consent, live together and work together to build a harmonious society.”<sup>2</sup>

The sense of that declaration is clear: the people of Africa do not dispute the right of South Africa's white population to live in their ancestral homes in peace and security, free of racial discrimination.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes, agenda item 106, document A/7754, para. 8.

15. Only the most reactionary and backward régimes in history have aspired to national or racial purity against the human reality of today's world, which cannot be viable without multiracial and multinational coexistence.

16. South Africa has been no less intransigent towards all the efforts of the Organization regarding Namibia. It was only a short time ago that the Security Council itself, during its historic series of meetings on African soil, in Addis Abeba, offered South Africa the chance, through the good offices of the Secretary-General, to engage in meaningful negotiations with the Organization on the future of Namibia. It must be noted with particular regret that South Africa did not see fit to take adequate advantage of that opportunity.

17. It is all those facts and developments which confront the United Nations with the undoubted necessity of looking into new ways and means to deal with the situation which the international community seems no longer prepared to tolerate and which, as one speaker after another has pointed out, is in total contradiction to the values and ideas on which the Organization is founded.

18. Indeed, as far as the United Nations is concerned, the provisions of the Charter, in particular those laid down in Article 6, are quite clear. It can hardly be denied that the prerequisites for invoking that Article exist. It may well be argued, furthermore, as indeed it has been, that successful action under Article 6 would be in the interest of the world Organization as it would benefit its moral standing and increase its internal cohesiveness.

19. We therefore fully understand the feelings and motives of those members, especially the African members of the Council and the many other members who have spoken in this debate, who find it difficult to share membership in an Organization with representatives of a Government that professes to political principles so diametrically opposed to our own. But we are dealing not only with a State, with a Government or with a régime but, in the final analysis, with people living in a country. What we are concerned with, in other words, is the future of 23 million human beings in South Africa.

20. It is because of those considerations that one should not forget that one of the major functions of the Organization is to expose a Member State to the pressure of world opinion and to confront it again and again with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

21. We can cite no less authoritative a voice from South Africa itself than that of Patrick van Rensburg, who, on page 209 of his memorable book *Guilty Land*<sup>3</sup>, said:

<sup>3</sup> Frederick A. Praeger, New York, 1962.

“Perhaps I am over-optimistic, but I have a strong faith in world opinion. Of all the possible ways of changing South Africa, I think that international intervention is the strongest.”

22. We have seen only recently how a Member State can, with courage and determination, chart a completely new course and find its way back into the community of ideals which this Organization represents. We should not exclude from our deliberations trust in the legal and moral force of this Organization, and we should most certainly uphold this trust when the question at stake is the abolition of a political, social and economic system which is based on racial criteria, which is consequently, by any standard, untenable in the second half of the twentieth century and which, finally—again in the practically unanimous opinion of the world community—is irreconcilable with the concepts of human dignity.

23. We feel it to be imperative, therefore, for the Council to take a decision regarding the future relationship between the Republic of South Africa and the Organization. Indeed, that is the mandate which the General Assembly has given to the Council, and it is the task before us. It has become abundantly clear that this relationship cannot continue to be one-sided, with the United Nations demanding specific action and attempting to open new ways to deal with the problem in a positive and constructive way, and South Africa continuing to reject all these efforts. Today the world community is unanimous in its rejection of the policies of *apartheid* in South Africa, and it must therefore strive to achieve the same community of purpose in its approach to South Africa. Austria continues to believe that that community of purpose can be achieved and that the best basis on which the Organization can work towards that goal is the basis of a universal organization. However, the principle of universality, to which we firmly adhere, applies first and foremost to the human community of the United Nations. While we feel that its possibilities have not been exhausted and still provide powerful instruments, it must not become a shield behind which those unwilling to perform the tasks imposed upon them by the Charter can hide.

24. It is those principles and considerations that will guide my country's vote on the draft resolution now before the Council. Yet, whatever the outcome of the vote on the draft resolution before us [S/11543] may be, my delegation strongly feels that, looking beyond the present stage of our deliberations, everything must be done to ensure the most intensive and most wide-ranging examination of viable alternatives which will enhance the prospects for a speedy solution.

25. The emphasis so far has been on one particular alternative: the expulsion of the Republic of South

Africa from the United Nations. This is indeed, as so many speakers have stressed, a historic choice for the Security Council. It is for that reason that my delegation would advocate continued and scrupulous study of the possibilities open to the Council. In taking that approach we do not want to invalidate the arguments that have been advanced so far. We would, on the contrary, reinforce in advance the value of any decision we might take in the future. The ultimate alternative of expulsion has now been put before us, and it will remain before us as a very specific and dramatic warning signal. We hope that it will not be ignored, as so many previous warning signals have been.

26. Mr. del CASTILLO (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Security Council is considering the present item in accordance with the desire of the General Assembly, which in its 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”.

27. When that resolution was adopted, Costa Rica voted in favour of it because we have long held that it is the Council that must initiate action to alter the status of a Member State.

28. My delegation has always taken that position, even at the risk of its opposition to other positions being misinterpreted. It is well known that the discussion on South Africa, and particularly on the credentials of its representatives to the General Assembly, has time and again in the past few years taken place in the Credentials Committee. Costa Rica, as a member of that Committee, has always opposed invalidating the credentials of a Member State when the formal requirements of rule 27 of the Assembly's rules of procedure have been met. However, the General Assembly supported those in the Committee who wanted to reject the credentials of the representatives of South Africa. That decision has had more symbolic than practical meaning, because the procedure for depriving a State of its membership in the Organization has to be in accordance with Articles 5 and 6 of the Charter, and that is something that falls first within the authority of the Security Council, and then within the jurisdiction of the General Assembly.

29. The authorities of South Africa, in statements heard in the Council, have been accused of violating the Charter, primarily through practices of racial discrimination and by illegally occupying Namibia.

30. The position of my country on those two subjects is very clear. In line with the respect for human rights which is found in Costa Rica, we have always been in the vanguard of the Organization's efforts to ensure that human rights are faithfully observed everywhere.

31. We do not condone the type of racial discrimination being practised in South Africa in the form of *apartheid*, and our support for all condemnations of those policies appears in the records of the Organization.

32. Costa Rica participated as a member of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* since it was established in 1962. From that date on, until 1968, Messrs. Volio and Tinoco, the Permanent Representatives of Costa Rica, to the United Nations, were in turn Vice-Chairmen of the Committee.

33. That has been in accordance with our principles, for we do not believe that some violations of human rights rank below others. Our passion for human rights has made us advocate machinery to reconcile the clear contradiction between the commitment of Member States to abide by the provisions of the Charter relating to human rights, and the absence of means to make those obligations a reality. We feel a certain amount of frustration when we see that the clear feeling expressed here against racial discrimination was not to be found when we were seeking support for our proposal to create a high commissioner for human rights.

34. On the subject of human rights, well-founded complaints, which my delegation supports, have been made against the abhorrent practices of *apartheid*, but they do not seem to be enough to produce action against South Africa. The truth is that there is no machinery in the Organization—certainly it is not the Security Council—which is empowered to intervene when there are violations of human rights.

35. On 10 December 1973—almost a year ago—during the commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Mr. John Humphrey—one of the drafters of the Declaration—said in his statement, with a certain degree of bitterness:

“... it is now over a quarter of a century since the San Francisco Conference, and the United Nations has not yet been able to devise effective procedures for the implementation of the rights and freedoms to which it is dedicated and whose respect and observance it is committed to obtain. Whether or not it will be able to do this will be the ultimate test of its ability to make the Charter's finest purpose a reality.”<sup>4</sup>

36. Our reference to this lack of protection and lack of guarantees for fundamental human rights should not be taken as a reflection on the Organization's efforts to denounce violations of human rights.

37. The segregationist policies of South Africa have made some impression in the Security Council, and we are encouraged to see that violations of human rights have reached this principal body of the United Nations. Does this mean that other violations of human rights will meet the same fate? Perhaps our optimism should not take us that far. To be perfectly realistic about it, although the problem has reached this point—and it is true that the segregationist policies of South Africa have set this whole process in train—the Security Council's doors have been opened, not to receive denunciations of the shameful forms of racial discrimination being practised in South Africa, but primarily because that country has begun to have very tense relations with African countries, and that is beyond any doubt something which can imperil international peace and security, responsibility for which must be assumed by the Council.

38. As regards the illegal occupation by South Africa of the Territory of Namibia, my delegation sees this matter much more clearly in the light of the substantial background material available to us.

39. We all know that in resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, the General Assembly decided to terminate South Africa's Mandate over the Territory, which later came to be known as Namibia, and to assume direct responsibility for that Territory until it became independent. In accordance with that decision the General Assembly later on, in accordance with resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967, decided to create the United Nations Council for South West Africa, which was later called the United Nations Council for Namibia.

40. Once the General Assembly had terminated South Africa's Mandate, both the Assembly and the Security Council, in numerous subsequent resolutions, called on that country to withdraw from Namibia. Among the many resolutions of the Security that declared illegal the occupation of the Territory of Namibia by South Africa I would refer to resolution 264 (1969), resolution 269 (1969), resolution 276 (1970), resolution 283 (1970) and resolution 284 (1970).

41. To strengthen its declaration on the unlawful occupation of Namibia, the Security Council, in its most recent resolution 284 (1970), called for an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, which handed down a ruling on 21 June 1971,<sup>5</sup> part of which reads as follows:

“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”.

<sup>5</sup> *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinions I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 16.*

<sup>4</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings, 2195th meeting, para. 98.*

The Court also put forward considerations relating to the fact that the application of *apartheid* in Namibia constituted a flagrant violation of the purposes and the principles of the Charter. The Court also confirmed, in its advisory opinion, that the United Nations Council for Namibia is the *de jure* government of Namibia.

42. For all these reasons it is clear that South Africa's reluctance to abandon its illegal occupation has prevented the United Nations, which has direct responsibility for the Territory of Namibia, from exercising its obligation to support and promote the rights of the people of Namibia until they achieve complete independence. In the circumstances, my delegation cannot ignore South Africa's recalcitrant attitude, since it persists in performing unlawful acts in the Territory of Namibia, and thereby fails to abide by its international obligations.

43. My delegation has been strongly in favour of the broadest representation of States in this Organization. We have been in favour of increasing the membership of this Organization whenever we have spoken on the subject in the Council or in the General Assembly. We are in favour of expanding the membership of this Organization because that is a move towards the universality of the Organization. But this liberal attitude to accepting new Members who might add something to an Organization made up of a great variety of States cannot, because of the very nature of the principle involved, be applied when considering an item which, as the tone of the statements we have heard clearly shows, involves the expulsion of a Member.

44. Furthermore, my delegation is very much concerned over the failure to respect the principles of the Charter because, if we continue to permit that, we shall be eroding the power of the Organization. Furthermore, this is a defiance of the Security Council's resolutions, and thus also undermines the authority of this august body.

45. Because of our loyalty to our own principles, and to the Organization of which we are a Member, we cannot fail to recognize that South Africa deserves some form of action because of its reluctance to act in accordance with the principles of the Charter, the express desire of the General Assembly, and the decisions of the Security Council.

46. We have now stated our views on the item proposed by the General Assembly in its resolution 3207 (XXIX). The basic question which needs to be settled is what type and degree of sanctions should be applied to South Africa and what type do we wish to become involved in. We believe that expelling a Member State is a very grave decision which should be taken only after all other means provided in the Charter have been exhausted. There should be a gradual application of a régime of

sanctions, and that, we believe, has not taken place in this case. That forces our delegation to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution which has been circulated in document S/11543.

47. In accordance with the foregoing, my delegation is prepared to support decisively and firmly any draft resolution recommending the immediate suspension of South Africa, such suspension to be maintained for as long as that country persists in its policies of *apartheid* and refuses to abide by the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council regarding the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia.

48. Mr. SCALI (United States of America): Mr. President, as I begin my remarks, allow me to pay a tribute to you for the skilful and fair-minded way in which you have led the Council during this busy month, and particularly during this important debate.

49. Permit me also to express my delegation's sincere condolences to our colleague from Iraq on the untimely death of his Foreign Minister, Shadhel Taqa. I hope he will transmit this message of sympathy to his Government.

50. Over the past two weeks, Members of the Organization and individual petitioners to the Council have expressed their opposition to the South African Government's practice of *apartheid*. In virtually all cases their arguments were predicated on the abhorrence of the unequal treatment of peoples within a society and a minority rule which discriminates against the majority on the basis of colour.

51. Let there be no doubt or confusion, despite the efforts of some, about the attitude of the United States concerning *apartheid*. In simplest terms, the Government of the United States opposes it categorically and absolutely. It is evil. It is ugly. The United States shares the indignation of those who during this debate have decried South Africa's persistence in holding on to the iniquitous and callous policy of *apartheid*. The system of legislated racial discrimination and associated repressive legislation that prevails in South Africa is an indefensible affront to the spirit and principles of the Charter and to human dignity around the world. It denies what the United Nations Charter proclaims: the dignity and worth of every person and the equal rights of all men and women. It is a matter of profound concern to the United States that the Government of South Africa has ignored calls in the Security Council and in the General Assembly to put an end to its inhumane, outmoded and short-sighted policies.

52. Despite all warnings and admonitions, the South African Government continues to practise *apartheid*. It continues to uproot non-whites and consign them to often barren homelands in order to preserve the supremacy of the fifth of the population which is



white. It maintains Draconian restrictions on the movement of non-whites. It persists in providing to non-whites inferior education, keeping them in a disadvantageous position. Segregation and inequality in all areas of life are pervasive. Non-whites are not represented in the Governemnet that dominates and intrudes into almost every aspect of their lives.

53. South Africa's denial of basic human rights is compounded in Namibia by its illegal occupation of that Territory. The United States finds it reprehensible that South Africa has failed to honour its obligations under international law to withdraw from Namibia in accordance with General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and the 1971 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice. South Africa's continuing illegal occupation of Namibia is made all the more outrageous by the manner in which it administers the Territory. The repression of peaceful political activity, the flogging of dissidents by the South African administration's surrogates and the division of the Territory into so-called homelands are indefensible and inconsistent with the responsibilities South Africa had assumed as administrator of a Mandated Territory.

54. But I am obliged to point out that even in this grievous case the United States continues strongly to adhere to the view that resort to force and other forms of violence are not acceptable means to induce change. This is our view with regard to other serious problems throughout the world and it is our view with respect to South Africa. Armed confrontation is no substitute for communication.

55. The description of South Africa's transgressions I have just presented is not new. Observers have agreed about the essential facts of *apartheid* for many years. Some of the words I have just used are borrowed. Members of the Council may be familiar with the statement made on the issue of *apartheid* in the Special Political Committee on 17 October by my co-representative Mr. Joseph Segel.<sup>6</sup> That was a personal statement, as well as an official one, delivered from the heart by a man now serving as a "public member"—I repeat, a public member—of the United States delegation. It is also a statement to which I subscribe and to which the United States Government subscribes.

56. We are heartened, indeed, by some encouraging words in this chamber voiced by the representative of South Africa. On 24 October [1800th meeting], he himself implied that the South African Government was responding not in a vacuum but in reaction to world events, not the least of which has been the condemnation of South Africa's *apartheid* and Namibian and Rhodesian policies within this international Organization. I have noted with special interest that a distinguished African leader, whose

bitter experiences in the past make him an impressive witness today, has also found hopeful aspects in the new South African voices which are being heard.

57. We believe that a just solution of South Africa's racial dilemma indeed lies within South Africa itself. Taking practical steps towards improving the condition of non-whites and seeking changes through communication seem to us more likely to have impact than some other measures suggested. American firms in South Africa, for example, have had notable success in improving the pay and working conditions of their non-white workers. They do this as a matter of enlightened policy—with the support of the United States Government. The United States also believes that through its current cultural exchange programme prominent South Africans of all races have gained a new, more accurate, perspective of their country's problems and standing, as well as a determination to seek a solution to them.

58. At the same time, the United States continues to bar the sale of military equipment to South Africa. In this regard, I would like to state flatly that the United States has not collaborated with South Africa on military or naval matters for over a decade and has no intention of beginning such co-operation in the future.

59. The situation in southern Africa is significantly different now from what it was six months ago. South Africa has no alternative but to reassess its position in the light of recent events. The United States urges that, in doing so, the South African Government look at the realities of the future.

60. We call on South Africa to make good the assurances it gave the Secretary-General in April last year, to allow the people of Namibia to determine the future of the Territory by exercising their right of self-determination, and to withdraw from Namibia. We urge that South Africa simultaneously begin to bring an end to its *apartheid* policies and establish the basis for a just society and government where all are equal. We believe that after a quarter of a century of warnings, it is time for the South African Government to adopt the measures that will lead to a society of equal opportunity, equal rewards, and equal justice for all. We call on South Africa to fulfil its obligations under Article 25 of the Charter and to comply with Security Council resolutions on Southern Rhodesia.

61. Some speakers have argued that the best way to bring the Government of South Africa to accomplish these objectives—to bring the South African Government to heel—is for this Council to recommend to the General Assembly that South Africa be expelled from membership in the United Nations. My Government believes that this kind of all-or-nothing approach would be a major strategic mistake, especially at a time when we are hearing what may

<sup>6</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Special Political Committee, 915th meeting.*

be new voices of conciliation out of South Africa. These new voices should be tested. We must not be discouraged, as we were last December when we instructed the Secretary-General to abandon his contacts with the South Africans on Namibia.

62. Many of our colleagues during the past weeks have cited time and time again the poetic reference to "winds of change". With the fresh winds of change blowing from an enlightened Portuguese policy towards Angola and Mozambique effecting important and progressive changes in southern Africa, the United States believes that it is incumbent upon the Organization not to deflect those very winds as they rush toward South Africa. By doing so we confess that the Organization is powerless to influence change there. My Government does not accept the view that the United Nations is powerless; rather, we strongly believe that it is through both increased bilateral contacts and the strong will of a determined United Nations that peaceful change will occur in South Africa.

63. The United Nations was not founded to be simply a league of the just. Rather, in our view, it is a unique international forum for exchanging ideas, where those practising obnoxious doctrines and policies may be made to feel the full weight of world opinion. There is, therefore, a clear, positive and indispensable role for the United Nations in bringing change to South Africa.

64. My delegation believes that South Africa should continue to be exposed, over and over again, to the blunt expressions of the abhorrence of mankind for *apartheid*. South Africans should not hear of that abhorrence only from afar, from beyond the range of our voices, where we would be casting them by expulsion from our ranks. Our analysis is that expulsion would say to the most hardened racist elements in South Africa that their indifference to our words and resolutions has been justified. We think it would say to the South Africans that we have not heard, or do not wish to encourage, the new voices—the voices that augur hope of change. We believe that the United Nations must continue its pressure upon South Africa, moving step by step until right has triumphed. It is self-defeating to fire a single, last, dramatic, salvo with only silence to follow. History holds no example of a pariah State that reformed itself in exile. The pariah is by definition an outlaw, free of restraint. There is no record of good citizenship in the land of Nod, east of Eden, where Cain, the first pariah, was banished.

65. My delegation has another grave concern about the wisdom of expelling South Africa. Even if this would help thwart the crime of *apartheid*, expulsion would set a shattering precedent which could gravely damage the United Nations structure. It would bring into question one of the most fundamental concepts on which the Charter is based: the concept of a forum

in which ideas and ideals are voiced and revoiced along with conflicting views until elements of injustice and oppression are forced to give way to reason.

66. This, in sum, is the appeal of my delegation. Let us continue to hold the evils of *apartheid* under the light of world opinion until all our fellow human beings have seen it for what it is. Let us continue to press South Africa, in this forum and others, to move rapidly towards an era of equality and justice.

67. Mr. de GUIRINGAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): I should like, first of all, to observe that the major debate that has been taking place in this hall for almost two weeks is one of the most important and most exhaustive that we have had the opportunity of hearing in a long time. Its interest and the quality of the arguments advanced by so many speakers have struck the French delegation; and I should like to say this here to those who have helped to remind us of the scope of the subject we are dealing with; for is that subject not simply, in a way, that of human dignity?

68. Moreover, Mr. President, the circumstances that placed under your authority and entrusted to your wisdom as a great African the problem that concerns and provokes indignation on the continent you represent, have prompted my country and its representative to follow this debate all the more closely. My delegation could only listen with understanding to what friendly countries had to say about the deplorable situation still prevailing in southern Africa. Thus, because it is a matter of our concept of the human race, and because it is the human race in Africa which is concerned, France has many reasons to participate in a debate of such significance.

69. It is the particular significance of our subject which prompts me, first and foremost and essentially, to evoke the ideals that we wish to defend but which we see despised in South Africa. I should like resolutely to reiterate the unwavering opposition of France and of all Frenchmen to the policy of *apartheid*. Discrimination, segregation, and the separation of people have always run counter to the ideals of both Christian France and revolutionary France, neither of which has ever accepted that a system of laws should force people, who should be born free and equal before the law, to live in isolation from one another and to behave as strangers; or that a system should measure fundamental freedoms by the colour of one's skin. Such a policy is in itself inadmissible and only deserving of condemnation. *Apartheid*, in theory as in practice, is inspired by an ideology completely alien to the spirit of our times; it is a counter-democracy.

70. It is this very policy of *apartheid* which unfortunately leads the Government of South Africa to manifest its solidarity with its twin neighbouring

régime, the illegal rebel régime of Rhodesia. And since the subject before us concerns the entire relationship between South Africa and the United Nations, I would also deplore the political, economic and military support that the South African Government openly accords to the Salisbury Government, despite the mandatory sanctions adopted by the Security Council in its resolution 253 (1968). My delegation considers that the Government of South Africa should forthwith withdraw the police forces and military personnel stationed in Rhodesia. That Government should also undertake a commitment to respect the economic sanctions, in order to put an end to the abnormal situation resulting from Southern Rhodesia's unilateral declaration of independence.

71. France can only regret the tardiness of the Pretoria authorities in settling the Namibia problem in the way the course of history demands. As we have said and repeated for three years, a new régime should be negotiated. The French Foreign Minister quite recently had occasion to deplore the fact that the efforts undertaken by the Secretary-General to establish a dialogue with the Pretoria Government in order to lead Namibia to self-determination and independence have so far been in vain. We have, of course, noted that South Africa, after having envisaged a 10-year period for the Namibian people to prepare itself to exercise its right to self-determination, now believes that that "stage may be reached considerably sooner". However, that statement seems inadequate to us, not only because it is vague, but also because it does not dispel certain ambiguities concerning the right of the Namibian people as such to independence and territorial integrity.

72. Thus there are three most serious complaints directed by the entire international community against the policy of the South African Government: the first concerns human dignity; the second concerns the non-implementation of the mandatory measures adopted by the Security Council; the third relates to the duty of decolonization. We all agree on those three points; none of us seeks to find excuses for conduct that everyone would like to see changed as soon as possible. All of us, then, wonder what course to adopt and what means to use.

73. Despite the high regard I feel and wish to express for the sponsors of the draft resolution that has been submitted, I cannot conceal my Government's opinion that the expulsion of South Africa is not the appropriate solution. The frankness which my delegation owes to those who have endeavoured here to justify the application of Article 6 of the Charter obliges me to put forward a number of thoughts and reasons which, it seems to me, merit attentive consideration.

74. I will not enter into legal arguments, although jurists could adduce a most convincing rationale on the matter. The main problem, in our view, lies

elsewhere. We should consider in its entirety the essentially political issue raised by the attitude of a given country—that is, the attitude that the community of nations should adopt vis-à-vis one of its members. It has taken 25 years for the United Nations to become a more or less exact mirror of the composition of our world. We have almost succeeded, and it is not without reason that the United Nations has been laudably stubborn over the admission here of all States of the world. Doubtless we were thinking of the grave consequences of the decline of an all too brief experiment, of an all too disrupted organization—the League of Nations. Under these circumstances, I wonder whether we shall achieve the appropriate results by drawing a blank on our map. I very much doubt that we shall be able to admit Namibia to United Nations membership any sooner if we exclude from our ranks the country which, whether we like it or not, holds the material power there, and in which those circles most opposed to any progress will feel all the more free to perpetuate subjugation in that they will be more isolated. My delegation believes, generally speaking, that even the radical differences that divide us should not kill any hope of bringing back to the true path those who have strayed from it in error. Doubtless, the developments to which I have referred are sometimes slow, too slow, and this leads us to wonder as to the effectiveness of the United Nations. We should not, however, despair of ourselves; we should, on the contrary, realize that the United Nations has brought about spectacular transformations and that it can still do so.

75. In saying this I am not asking anybody to live on hope alone. The evolution of the world, as indeed its revolution, does not come about without forces exerting pressure and convincing those who do not understand or do not wish to understand the needs of the hour. I note simply that the United Nations, which is called upon to represent everyone's conscience, has been the instrument of a series of real advances resulting from the constancy of its policy, the continuity of its views and its resolutions, its perseverance, but also the patience of our Governments. It is certain that these have played a not insignificant role in the process that has led to recent changes in Africa itself.

76. Because the United Nations is the place where each can influence the other, where the smallest can make themselves heard by the largest, and the youngest by the oldest, because it is one of the centres of universal policy, it should retain within its ranks those who, for better or for worse, hold the reins of government. It is in this sense that the argument drawn from universality seems to me the most pertinent. We must, furthermore, mention the very serious dangers which such a precedent could create for our Organization. There are, as you know, many degrees in the definition of evil, many differences of opinion in the assessment of the wrongs and distortions of which each country, or even a majority

of countries, may accuse another. A drastic measure can call for others in an endless chain reaction which we should not encourage. The present international community, it is true, includes States whose behaviour, sometimes in flagrant contradiction with our Charter, we have not liked. Are we all beyond reproach? Who will unhesitatingly pass final judgement?

77. These are the basic comments I wished to submit to the Council. They do not mean that the French delegation does not condemn South Africa's policies or that it is not mindful of the three legitimate complaints that I have mentioned. On the contrary, it is to make these complaints more valid, to enable pressures to be exerted and to invite negotiations, taking into account the just cause of the United Nations and of Africa that France wants to avoid granting the Pretoria régime the facilities and pretexts which exclusion would provide.

78. I now come to the draft resolution which we have before us and which proposes to our Council the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations. I have just referred to the reasons which lead us to disapprove of such a drastic step, one which, we believe, will not solve the problem. My delegation will, for these reasons, be compelled to oppose the draft. We should like to express our regret at seeing other ideas discarded which have been discussed during numerous negotiations with authorized representatives of the African Group, outside our debates. These ideas were set out in a preliminary draft which my delegation and the United Kingdom delegation submitted to various spokesmen. It would have seemed preferable to us to take them into consideration in the political spirit that I advocated a moment ago.

79. The guidelines that could have been followed were centred on a few simple ideas. They consisted, first and foremost, of the express condemnation of acts on the part of the South African régime which are worthy of condemnation, and which can neither be justified nor permitted. It would have been possible to request that three types of negotiations should be conducted forthwith with Pretoria and to provide that, within a given time-limit, our Council would define its approach to the question in the light of the progress made. Finally, we could have entrusted these negotiations to the Secretary-General, since we are all well aware that he faithfully represents the collective thinking of our States. Perhaps we could have exerted the necessary pressure and thus achieved the progress that we all desire.

80. I have said this before and I shall conclude by stressing this point again: our world is developing and the situation of Africa is developing. It has changed since last year in the immediate vicinity of southern Africa. There are new factors appearing and those who are stubbornly opposed to change must take them into account. Perhaps they are doing so

already, and perhaps they may be led to do so through our unanimous impatience. Ours is a healthy Organization. It is not the Organization which we must save by amputating one of its members. To prefer medical treatment to surgery, to accept the possibility of a long and maybe useful negotiation with what is wrong is not proof of indulgence or forbearance but, I think, of wisdom and common sense.

81. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): Mr. President, at the outset of what I have to say, might I congratulate you upon the skill and the competence with which you have guided our deliberations throughout this difficult debate. We are all grateful to you.

82. No one who has listened to the debate which opened in the Council on 18 October and which has continued without interruption since then can have failed to recognize the gravity of the issue which the General Assembly has called upon the Council to consider. No one can have failed to be impressed by the passionate conviction with which the United Nations condemns the policy of *apartheid* practised by the Government of South Africa. No member of this Council, no member of the Organization, no African—above all, no South African—can have been left in any doubt of the degree to which South Africa is isolated from the mainstream of international opinion.

83. Lest there be any misunderstanding of where my Government stands, lest there be any more loose talk about certain Governments defending the system of *apartheid*, I must make my Government's views absolutely clear. Speaking only five days ago about South Africa, Mr. James Callaghan, M. P., Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, said:

"The Labour Party, and Labour Governments from 1945 onwards, have a long historical record in the cause of anti-colonialism and anti-racialism. We repudiate both colonialism and racialism. The British Government has nothing in common with the policies of *apartheid* and racialism, which are repugnant to us and which cause particular strain in our relations with South Africa."

84. We regard *apartheid* as an evil system, as one that is repugnant in morality and unacceptable in practice. It is a degrading policy, more so for those who impose it than for those on whom it is imposed. With respect to the representative of South Africa, the distinction he sought to draw between discrimination—to which he admitted—and racial discrimination—which he repudiated—is in practice a distinction without a difference.

85. We are quite convinced that the Government of South Africa must change its policies of racial discrimination. We have worked for that change and we will continue to work for it. We will use whatever

influence we have to that end. And it is our firm belief that not only we, but the United Nations as a whole, have a joint obligation to bring influence to bear on South Africa to change its policies.

86. Most of those who have addressed the Council have done so with great sincerity in advocating action now to expel South Africa from the United Nations. This is indeed the recommendation of the draft resolution before us. I ask you to believe that my Government speaks with no less sincerity when it declares that our objectives are identical with those of the advocates of expulsion. With no less sincerity do we hold that the particular course they advocate is not the right one. We do not think it is right for the people of South Africa and we do not think it is right for the United Nations.

87. The advocates of expulsion have, over the past 12 days, if I have understood them correctly, advanced three main lines of argument which must be considered with the utmost seriousness. First, it is argued that South Africa has so breached the Charter that it is deserving of expulsion. A sort of international punishment is merited and should now be meted out. Secondly, it is contended that, somehow or other, expulsion has become the most effective, indeed the only way of bringing pressure to bear on South Africa, which is so intransigent that nothing short of complete international isolation will have any effect. And the third argument seems to be that it is in the wider interests of the United Nations Organization that South Africa should be expelled. Each of these three arguments is formidable and each deserves to be answered by those who oppose expulsion.

88. There is, however, a quasi-constitutional argument which has crept in, namely, that it is somehow the function of the Security Council to recommend expulsion because that course is assumed to be the will of the vast majority of the General Assembly. But the Council cannot be absolved from reaching its own decision. Indeed, that is precisely what the General Assembly has asked it to do. Moreover, that is what the Charter specifically provides for.

89. Nor does my delegation accept the contention that some permanent members of the Council should, in this particular matter, cease to behave as such. The argument seems to be that, in some unspecified way, the Western permanent members of the Council are disqualified from exercising the functions conferred on them by the Charter itself. That seems to reduce itself to the proposition that those who can be guaranteed to vote in favour of expulsion are by definition behaving objectively and with wisdom, but those who might actually dare to disagree should remove themselves from the arena. To state the argument is to defeat it. It cannot in any case be taken seriously, since it has become quite evident

that the belief that one or more permanent members of the Council would vote against expulsion has enabled others to express attitudes they might not necessarily have adopted had the basic responsibility been theirs. In consequence, I must say that this debate has become more of an exercise in condemning South Africa than a review of the relationship between South Africa and the United Nations. It has not been a serious examination of the pros and cons of expulsion as an effective means of pressure.

90. I undertook to review the arguments in favour of expulsion and to explain why my Government did not accept them. But first I would like to deal with yet another misrepresentation which has been frequent in this debate. It is in no way legitimate—in no way—to present the refusal of a Government to endorse the expulsion of South Africa as if it was an endorsement of *apartheid*. Britain believes in, and practises, freedom and equality for all citizens under the law. We have fought for those beliefs. I hope we shall always uphold them. They are indeed the beliefs on which this United Nations is founded.

91. But we also believe in the rule of law, and respect for the rule of law must, in this context, entail respect for the Charter. We also attach cardinal importance to the process of conciliation, to the application of peaceful persuasion, in short, to those peaceful means for the solution of problems which are set out and recommended to Members of the Organization in the Charter itself. It was for this reason—because we believe in maintaining contacts and communication—that my delegation became involved in an attempt to find an alternative to the proposals advanced by the African members of the Council.

92. We wished to try and find a constructive outcome to this debate, moved as we were by the justified call for action by the African delegations which have spoken in the debate. We reject the contention that those Governments which do not endorse each new call for particular measures against South Africa, for the adoption of particular tactics in the battle against *apartheid*, are to be dubbed supporters of *apartheid*.

93. We do not question for one moment the deep seriousness of these issues. We do not doubt for one moment the sincerity of those African countries which have taken the lead in advocating South Africa's expulsion. But I must say we are less impressed by some of those who, to borrow a metaphor one of our colleagues here is wont to use, have come here to fish in troubled waters. I remain unmoved by criticism directed at the United Kingdom by the representatives of countries which preach one thing and practise another, either because of their own trade with South Africa or their own record on human rights.

94. Why then do we object to the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations at this time? My Government's broad view of the situation was expressed by the Foreign Secretary speaking in Parliament shortly after the Labour Government took office early this year. He said:

"It is our view that the prosperity and the stability of the African continent depend in the long run on removing the sources of racial and other frictions between its different parts. We shall play our part in the international community in seeking to end discrimination and injustice in southern Africa in conformity with the wishes of its inhabitants."

It follows that we would support expulsion if we believed that such action would remedy, or even help to remedy, the situation in South Africa itself, and if we thought that the well-being of the Organization would thereby be served. But would either of those objectives be promoted? In the opinion of my delegation, they would not.

95. The expulsion of South Africa would solve nothing in itself. It would not, in our view, encourage the South African Government to alter its attitude or alter its policies. It would make it difficult, if not impossible, for the Organization to explore and exploit the recent statements made both here and in South Africa which hold out some hope of change in the right direction. On the contrary, expulsion would be all too likely to encourage the most illiberal elements in South Africa to take refuge in their famous *laager* of earlier times, to wrap themselves round with a cloak of self-righteous obstinacy, to remove themselves, and with them the unfortunate majority of South Africa's people, still further away from the real world around them.

96. Expulsion would do nothing to improve the condition of the Africans, of the Coloured, or of the Indians in South Africa. It would not restore their dignity. It has been argued that it would restore the dignity of the United Nations. My delegation is prepared to risk that, if it benefits the people of South Africa. One representative told us during the debate that:

"The expulsion of that régime may not improve the situation in South Africa, but I think it will certainly improve the situation in the Organization."

In our view, that is utterly the wrong approach. The objective is not to purge the United Nations. The object is to persuade the South African Government to change its policies.

97. Expulsion would therefore, in our view, amount not to a measure for progress and reconstruction but, at best, to a punishment: sending South Africa to a sort of international purgatory—in our view a gesture of despair. To remove a country or a

Government from the pressures of civilized international opinion inside the Organization would be a terrible confession of failure by us all. My Government is opposed to such a course. It is the easy option. We believe there are more difficult but infinitely more worth-while possibilities.

98. The United Nations is now, to all intents and purposes, a universal Organization. It reflects the realities of the world of 1974 and it is the stronger and the healthier for this fact. Yet it is argued that universality should not be an overriding consideration; Article 6 of the Charter was purposely inserted and was intended for use. It was indeed, but it was intended for use only in the most hopeless circumstances; it should be used when the Member is beyond redemption, when the influence of the Organization to remedy the situation is totally exhausted. In our view, that is not the case here.

99. The use of Article 6 to expel a Member in circumstances other than those I have just described would not only be a counsel of despair but a most dangerous precedent. This argument has been brushed aside from time to time in this debate by some of those who have spoken. But I doubt whether any Israeli student of the records of our meetings over the past 12 days would so readily exclude the possibility.

100. Are all Members of the United Nations who persistently violate the principles of the Charter and who constantly violate the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to be expelled? The fact is that this has not been the practice of the Organization under Article 6 of the Charter. Since the Organization has to deal with the real problems of the world as they exist and does not operate in a semi-Utopia, it does not and it should not use Article 6 except as a very last resort, when all hope of remedying the situation has been abandoned.

101. The principle of universality is not one which my delegation will lightly sacrifice. We will certainly not sacrifice it for no sure return.

102. It will be said—and indeed it has been said—that no other course offers a sure hope of any return, that the end of a 30-year journey has been reached, that the time for the ultimate measure of expulsion has come. But perhaps there are viable alternatives.

103. In the statement we heard from the representative of South Africa on 24 October [1800th meeting], we were told of progress towards ending racial discrimination. We were given to expect more progress. We were given hints—perhaps half-promises—with regard to Namibia and Southern Rhodesia: the two territories of particular interest to the Organization over which the South African Government stands condemned by the United Nations. Let those promises be redeemed; let the hopes then aroused be fulfilled; let South Africa fit its actions to

its words. The time is very late; but in our view, it is not too late.

104. We have noted too that others who could by no stretch of the imagination be accused of befriending the South African Government have been prepared to take a similar view of recent statements. If this is the voice of reason for which Africa and the world have waited for many years, it must surely not now be ignored.

105. My delegation in consequence thought it right to discuss with other parties whether we could find a more promising alternative to the single operative paragraph of the draft resolution recommending the immediate expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations.

106. Members of the Council will have seen the paper which my French colleague and I circulated and which contained the proposals which my delegation could have supported had it been the desire of the Council as a whole to take that course in preference to what I have called the counsel of despair. We saw in it the opportunity to bring South Africa further towards United Nations policy over Namibia. We saw the opportunity to bring the Government of South Africa to a proper respect for its international obligations with regard to Southern Rhodesia. We saw in it the opportunity of securing progress towards easing and eventually eradicating the policies of racial discrimination practised within South Africa.

107. These are honourable objectives. Their attainment, even their partial attainment, would alleviate the suffering of Africans in southern Africa. It would be worth a thousand expulsions. My Government remains ready to exploit every opportunity to secure genuine progress over these matters. We are not prepared to give up yet. For there is here a clear choice. If one believes that all hope for peaceful progress in South Africa has gone, if one believes that the Government and people—and let us not forget that it is people we are talking about, and people are capable of being persuaded—are past all possibility of redemption, then it would be right to vote to expel South Africa now. It would be right to cut the cord and to do it cleanly and quickly, recognizing that, if we do, our power to influence is diminished thereby. I see the force of that argument. But it is precisely because I do not hold those views that I cannot follow this course. I do not reject the way of peaceful progress and compromise, and, may I say, nor do many who have called for expulsion in the course of this debate.

108. This has not been an easy debate. Nor has the decision over how to vote on the draft resolution been an easy one. The debate has resulted in the public exposure and examination of the affairs of a Member State which has no precedent. The weight of condemnation has been overwhelming.

109. My Government's aims—and may I set them out briefly—are to secure South Africa's compliance with its international obligations over Namibia and Southern Rhodesia, and to secure early progress towards righting the undoubted wrongs done to the majority of South Africa's people. Our honest judgement is that to expel South Africa would not help to achieve those aims. On the contrary, we believe it would hinder their accomplishment.

110. We believe that the alternative offered by France and the United Kingdom would have proved a far better way forward. Expulsion is too easy and in our view it would be quite ineffective as a means of bringing international pressure and influence to bear on South Africa and on its rulers.

111. With reluctance we have therefore decided to vote against this draft resolution. In so doing we are giving South Africa a further opportunity of putting its affairs in order. I hope it will recognize the weight of international opinion that is opposed to its policies. I hope it will heed the voices we have all heard in this chamber. I trust it will act accordingly.

112. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like now to speak in my capacity as representative of the UNITED REPUBLIC OF CAMEROON.

113. In adopting, by an overwhelming majority of its members, resolution 3207 (XXIX) requesting 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, the General Assembly has given the Council the opportunity to open an exhaustive debate on the policy of *apartheid* which will be a landmark in the history of the Organization, since it is the first time, I believe, that a Member State has been made the subject of a procedure that is so fraught with consequences.

114. It is not surprising that the South African racist régime stands here accused. Indeed, *apartheid*, the expression of the official policy of that régime, has been repugnant to the international conscience for more than a quarter of a century. It is the most ruthless form of racial oppression, the denial of human rights, the adamant political and economic domination by a white racist minority of the majority of the African population. No one, no State, can remain indifferent to this criminal system which makes a mockery of the lofty values of our civilization.

115. Pope Paul VI, in the message he addressed to the Organization on the occasion of the commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on Human Rights on 10 December 1973, clearly stated:

“There can be no peace where there is no respect for, no defence and no promotion of human rights...

“The fundamental rights of man represent a common good for the whole of mankind on its path towards the conquest of peace.”<sup>7</sup>

116. During this debate the crimes of *apartheid* have been depicted very brilliantly by many speakers and particularly by the representatives of the liberation movements of South Africa, who are the genuine spokesmen for the majority of the population of that country. At this stage I will confine myself to recalling briefly certain striking aspects of the situation in South Africa which could not be passed over in silence.

117. Indeed it is a veritable tragedy for the African peoples to see a white minority, representing less than 20 per cent of the population of the country, a minority that has come from distant lands, arrogating to itself, without sharing, the political and economic power in South Africa, expelling by force thousands of Africans from their ancestral lands so that the whites might profit, confining the majority of the population of the country to bantustans, veritable concentration camps where they languish in terrifying misery, deprived of all political, trade union and press rights, freedom of movement and so on.

118. Through an arsenal of racially discriminatory laws, unceasingly reinforced, the Pretoria régime has since 1946 deprived the blacks of the right to vote; anti-*apartheid* political parties have been prohibited and their leaders gaoled, in pursuance particularly of Law No. 44 of 1950 on the repression of communism. Laws on sabotage, on terrorism and public security and on Bantu labour are all aimed at intimidating, humiliating and muzzling Africans and stifling their legitimate aspirations to freedom and equality, while perpetuating in the country a system of colonial-type exploitation profitable to the whites alone.

119. Worse, the racists practise calculated genocide, systematically eliminating the African élite and cadres through assassinations, police repression or exile. The memory of Sharpeville, where racists cynically massacred peaceful African demonstrators, and that of the miners killed in the mines of Carletonville will never be erased from the minds of peace-loving men.

120. These sad South African realities have once more during this debate been beliberately falsified by the racists to misuse the good faith of peoples to which they believe themselves linked by ideological or racial ties.

121. The advocates of *apartheid* claim to be defending Western Christian civilization against the communist

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, Twenty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings, 2195th meeting, para. 26.

threat in Africa, and their policies purport to be dictated by historical and geographical determinism.

122. Such alibis sadly recall the cold war of the 1950s but they do not deceive anybody when international détente makes for understanding and tolerance among peoples.

123. The high spiritual authorities of the West are not hoodwinked and they have always condemned the *apartheid* régime as making a mockery of the moral principles underlying Christian morality. His Holiness Pope Paul VI reasserted the firm opposition of the Church to racial discrimination during the private audience he granted to the members of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* on 27 May last. The Most Reverend Arthur Michael Ramsey, then Archbishop of Canterbury, on 1 December 1970, after a visit to South Africa, unequivocally condemned the *apartheid* régime and invited the international community to imagine in that country a vast racial confrontation which could be fraught with the most frightening and tragic consequences. Moreover, the World Council of Churches and trade unions and popular forces in the world support the just struggle of the liberation movements, thus strikingly thwarting the manoeuvres of the racists who would identify *apartheid* with Western civilization.

124. Furthermore, the allegations of the racists that the African peoples are attempting to throw the whites into the sea, though they also are Africans, is a gross distortion of the facts, because indeed what was advocated by the Lusaka Manifesto but a reconciliation among all the inhabitants of South Africa whatever the colour of their skin, and respect for the fundamental rights of all? Paragraph 8 of the Manifesto reads:

“We believe that all the peoples who have made their homes in the countries of southern Africa are Africans, regardless of the colour of their skins; and we would oppose a racist majority government which adopted a philosophy of deliberate and permanent discrimination between its citizens on grounds of racial origin.”<sup>2</sup>

It is regrettable that the Manifesto, adopted enthusiastically by the Organization, was ignored as recently as 24 October by the representative of Pretoria when he addressed the Council.

125. The truth is that it is the white racists who intend to seize ownership of the country, who deprive the Africans of their status as men and who cannot imagine a Republic of South Africa which would be really multiracial and democratic. One Mr. Botha, then Minister of the racist régime in charge of the administration and development of the Bantus, was clear on this point when, in a statement made to Parliament on 21 May 1973 he said:

“The Bantus who come to work in white areas, in our factories, our homes, our shops or wherever



they work are not authorized, under our policies, to attain economically or professionally the same status as whites or a status equal to that of whites ... Those among them who are authorized to come to white Africa are permitted to do so in conditions of non-integration."

126. The distress caused by the aggressiveness of *apartheid* has led the Security Council more than once objectively to condemn the criminal acts of the South African racist régime. Thus, at its session in Addis Ababa in 1972, in resolution 311 (1972), it condemned the Government of South Africa for continuing its policies of *apartheid* in violation of its obligations under the Charter; it reiterated its opposition to *apartheid*; and it recognized the legitimacy of the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa. It should be noted that there were 14 votes, including those of the United States and the United Kingdom.

127. More explicitly, the General Assembly has repeatedly demonstrated its basic opposition to the policy of *apartheid*. Thus, in its resolution 2671 F (XXV) of 8 December 1970, it declared 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". In its resolution 2646 (XXV), adopted the same year, the Assembly declared also that "any State whose official policy or practice is based on racial discrimination, such as *apartheid*, contravenes the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and should therefore have no place in the United Nations".

128. The racists, who do not understand the language of dialogue and conciliation, have rejected with insolent scorn those various warnings of the international community. If there have been changes recently in South Africa, as the envoy of the racists claimed here on 24 October, we must regretfully note that their sole effect has been to strengthen the structures of *apartheid* through the repression and exploitation of the blacks, as the Special Committee on *Apartheid* indicates in its report.<sup>8</sup>

129. All the acts of the racist régime in flagrant violation of the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and in constant contravention of the relevant resolutions of the main bodies of our Organization, undeniably indicate, on the one hand, that the Pretoria régime itself has chosen to be a régime for the whites and not for all the inhabitants of South Africa and, on the other, that it intends to remain outside our Organization, the centre for harmonizing the efforts of nations in the maintenance of peace, in international co-operation, and in respect for the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all.

130. Hence, I find it strange, to say the least, to see certain Powers which themselves disapprove of the policy of *apartheid* coming here in force to support a belligerent régime that rejects the idea of equality among men, a régime that for almost 30 years has been trampling the principles of the Charter under foot, a régime that is illegally occupying the international Territory of Namibia and cynically violating the economic sanctions voted by the Security Council against the rebel régime of Rhodesia.

131. The attitude of those Powers that have special responsibilities under the Charter would seem worthy of interest were it not for the fact that these are Governments that have always tried to thwart United Nations action on South Africa and that in fact encourage the Pretoria racists to continue their policy of *apartheid* because those Governments give the racists political assistance, sell them arms and grant them economic and financial aid, in flagrant violation of the many relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

132. My delegation reaffirms its attachment to the principle of the universality of the United Nations, a principle that must be borne in mind in view of the provisions of the Charter. But a State that is not peace loving and does not respect its obligations under that Charter—and that is true of South Africa—has no justification for claiming a place in an organization as respectable as ours.

133. It seems to us that the expulsion of that racist régime from the United Nations would be healthy from every point of view. It would constitute a serious warning to all the States that might be tempted to imitate the barbaric behaviour of the racists; the credibility of the Organization, which must remain a forum of peace and brotherhood, would be strengthened; and, as the representative of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania stressed here [1798th meeting], Pretoria's isolation would move international public opinion to place itself at the side of the democratic forces within the country struggling for freedom.

134. Faithful to its traditions of struggling for the freedom of all men, the people of Cameroon will always condemn régimes, such as those of nazism and *apartheid*, based on racial fanaticism, terror and crime. In presenting the Manifesto on Southern Africa to the General Assembly in 1969, El Hadj Ahmadou Ahidjo, President of the United Republic of Cameroon, and at that time Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, clearly defined the meaning of our opposition to *apartheid*. He said:

"It would be senseless to give racist overtones to our campaign when it is precisely racism that we are fighting; racism, that prejudice which aims to divide humanity into superior and inferior races and to justify the domination of one race by another. Consequently, our campaign implies the

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 22A, part two.

condemnation of all racism and not the establishment of another, reverse, racism. It is based on our unshakeable belief that to deny the human value of a single man is to imperil the dignity of all men."<sup>9</sup>

135. Colonies are made to be lost: they are born with a cross on their foreheads, a great humanist wrote. The present collapse of colonial empires, particularly that of Portugal—which some had thought invulnerable—gives great significance to that statement.

136. My delegation is therefore convinced that South Africa, like the other colonies, will soon be free; it is only a question of time. *Apartheid*, the most hateful form of colonialism, cannot stop the march towards freedom of the oppressed people of South Africa; the popular support given their cause within the country is proof of the justice of that cause, and the active solidarity of the peoples of the world with the oppressed people of South Africa is a striking indication of the legitimacy of their struggle.

137. The Security Council cannot remain isolated from this irreversible development. History will triumph over the attitude of those who, during this debate, preferred to defend selfish and dubious interests instead of more effectively supporting United Nations action to promote respect for human rights, self-determination of peoples and world peace.

138. My delegation strongly believes that the best contribution that this important United Nations body can make at present to the cause of the oppressed people of South Africa, to the cause of peace and to the strengthening of the authority of our Organization, is to recommend to the General Assembly the immediate expulsion of South Africa from the Organization under Article 6 of the Charter, as provided in the draft resolution submitted by Kenya, Mauritania and the United Republic of Cameroon, and now Iraq [S/11543].

139. Mr. MAINA (Kenya): I thank you, Mr. President, for giving me a chance to make a few remarks in connexion with the debate which has been going on this afternoon and for the last two weeks. Kenya is not in the habit of asking for the floor after the debate has been concluded, but I did feel compelled, as the co-sponsor of the draft resolution under discussion, and the one who presented the draft resolution on behalf of the countries that have been listed, to make a few remarks, since apparently all those who have made up their minds to oppose the draft have decided to make their speeches at the very end so that there was no proper chance of answering their remarks.

140. The discussion of the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa has been going on for nearly two weeks. The draft resolution which we

are discussing this afternoon has been on the table since 24 October. There has therefore been a long time for all the members of the Council to conduct the normal negotiations, to conduct the normal consultations, and therefore nobody can claim that all this has been presented in a hurry. Indeed, we have already pointed out in our earlier statement [1806th meeting] that no one can say that anyone is being rushed.

141. Those who have claimed that they have attempted to prepare alternative draft resolutions know very well that not until late yesterday afternoon were any attempts made to present what appeared to most of us as a clear insult to our intelligence. The so-called draft resolutions, which those who opposed the present one presented, contain nothing more than what has been going on for the last 29 years in the United Nations: empty words, contained in resolutions that have no means of enforcement or action. We reject the suggestion that there was anything new, and the draft resolutions are available for anyone who knows what has been going on to verify the truth of what I say.

142. We reject also any attempt to associate the truth with the overriding vote, or the veto. The fact that some may have one vote which can override 14 does not necessarily mean that that one vote carries the truth with it, and no attempt should be made to associate truth or justice with the veto vote. To attempt to do so is equally to insult the intelligence of the entire world Organization here.

143. Indeed, we are pleased that the discussion that has taken place in the last two weeks has confirmed what we have been saying in other forums, in the General Assembly and in all the committees which discuss the question of *apartheid*: that South Africa has powerful supporters, powerful friends, who are prepared to use the machinery of the United Nations to continue discussion, while at the same time giving full support because of the benefits that have been stated very clearly before today.

144. I felt that I should take this opportunity to make these few remarks, lest it be said afterwards that all those who spoke in favour of the draft resolution were irresponsible people. The fact that there is a number of votes against the draft resolution is not a discouragement. The fact that those few votes have the overriding authority over all the others does no more than underline what we have been saying for a long time: that we can continue to discuss the question of South Africa, but so long as there are those who continue to benefit immensely and who make empty statements in condemnation, no result is likely to be seen for a long time in what we are trying to achieve.

145. Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq): My delegation has already expressed its views on the item before us in some detail during the course of the previous meeting. But I refrained from making any comments on draft resolution S/11543 of which my delegation

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, Twenty-fourth Session, Plenary Meetings, 1780th meeting, para. 16.

is a sponsor. Before the Council proceeds to the vote on the draft resolution, we would like with your indulgence, Mr. President, and that of the other members of the Council to make the following brief remarks.

146. Not a single representative has spoken in defence of South Africa's policy of *apartheid*. There has been nothing but denunciation and condemnation of that policy. No one has denied the fact that South Africa has persistently violated the principles of the Charter and of the Declaration of Human Rights. No one has refuted the evidence put before the Council to the effect that South Africa and the policies it pursues constitute a threat to international peace and security. And yet, whenever the Council is called upon to take effective action to put an end to these violations of the Charter and to the threat to peace and security, those efforts are aborted by certain Powers which choose to collaborate with the racist, colonialist minority régime in Pretoria—even when it is done at the expense of international peace and security and in the face of the overwhelming judgement of international public opinion.

147. The medicine to remedy the situation in South Africa prescribed so far has not been effective. Indeed, it was not even properly administered. The failure to do so has led to such an aggravation of the situation that the international community now has no choice but to resort to a surgical operation. If amputation is the last resort in certain hopeless cases, it is undertaken to save the rest of the living organism.

148. What we, the sponsors of the draft resolution before the Council, have recommended is nothing as drastic and irreversible as an amputation. The door would always remain open for the readmission of South Africa to the ranks of the United Nations as soon as it shows its readiness to abide by the resolutions of the United Nations and by the principles of the Charter.

149. Mr. EL HASSEN (Mauritania) (*interpretation from French*): I regret to have to speak at this rather late stage of our debate. I would like to say, however, that the initiative of the African Group, supported by 84 Member States, an initiative which led to the draft resolution that my delegation and other Members have submitted to the Council, was not one that was taken lightly. For 14 years we Africans have accepted the compromises of the Council. We accepted the demands, the solemn warnings addressed to South Africa. We considered that the resolutions adopted by the Council since 1960 were in fact warnings to that régime, lack of respect for which should normally have led to South Africa's expulsion. Thus for 14 years we have hoped that the régime in South Africa would bow to the decisions of the Council and would finally pay attention to world public opinion. For 14 years we have hoped that reason would win out and that our willingness to compromise would be useful, not

only to the régime of South Africa but also to its friends and partners. Throughout that entire period, we have avoided placing the friends of South Africa or the Council in the position of having to make the choice which they have to make today; yet it is a choice that is extraordinarily simple. It is as simple as this: a choice between injustice, the complete denial of the most elementary human rights, domination and colonialism on the one hand, and, on the other, the dignity and freedom of man. Thus that choice eventually had to be made. The time has now come.

150. The members of the Council who support our initiative will be living up to the expectations of the people of South Africa, which has placed the burden of its poverty and indignation on the consciences of all the members of the Council and of all the Members of the United Nations. This people has placed its hopes in the Organization and primarily in the body most competent in the matter, the Council. Instead of responding to those hopes, people are telling us: "Be patient, be patient, perhaps one, perhaps 10 years more; wait until South Africa bows to reason".

151. Another objection has been made. We have been told that we should be rendering a poor service to the cause of the universality of the Organization. But should universality be achieved by flouting the purposes and principles that are the framework, the very essence of the Organization? We can truly say that we do not understand the meaning of that objection or of that universality. As a final irony, we have been told that we are doing the Organization a poor service by asking that South Africa be expelled. Well, that would be much better for those who want to establish or continue relations with South Africa, and who in that way would not have to expose their activities here at the United Nations.

152. The votes in favour of our draft resolution and the support that some members of the Council will give it will be noted by our peoples and by history as an essential and unforgettable contribution to the cause of mankind in general and to the cause of Africans in particular.

153. We know that a veto may be cast. We know that our draft resolution will be rejected. But we are sure that we shall receive the affirmative vote of history. We know that we are doing a great service to freedom and to the cause of mankind. And we are convinced that, very shortly, the people of South Africa will show, by all means, that we have indeed been right.

154. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): No more representatives have indicated their desire to speak in the general debate. It is therefore my intention to put to the vote the draft resolution in document S/11543, sponsored by Iraq, Kenya, Mauritania and the United Republic of Cameroon, unless there are representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

155. Are there any delegations which wish to explain their votes before the vote? Since that is not the case, I put the draft resolution to the vote.

*A vote was taken by show of hands.*

*In favour:* Australia, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya, Mauritania, Peru, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Cameroon.

*Against:* France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Austria, Costa Rica.

*There were 10 votes in favour, 3 against and 2 abstentions.*

*The draft resolution was not adopted, the negative votes being those of permanent members of the Council.*

156. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): As there are no delegations that wish to explain their votes after the vote, and no other speakers on my list, I should like, on behalf of the UNITED REPUBLIC OF CAMEROON, to express my gratitude to all members of the Council whose co-operation and constant understanding have made it possible for me to discharge my difficult task. I should like on this occasion very sincerely to thank the delegations of Australia, Byelorussia, China, Indonesia, the Soviet Union and Peru, all of which have voted in favour of the draft resolution submitted by Iraq, Kenya, Mauritania and the United Republic of Cameroon. The oppressed people of Azania, the other peoples of Africa, all people of African descent and all peace-loving people throughout the world will always remember the great political significance of that support.

157. By calling on the Security Council further to define the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa, the General Assembly assigned to us a task the complexity of which is well understood by all. The Council has just played a most important role. The 51 representatives of Member States and the 3 representatives of the liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity who participated in the debate in the Council have clearly understood what is at issue when reference is made to the problem of *apartheid*. It is a matter of conscience at the individual level and a matter of faithful adherence to the Charter of the United Nations at the level of Member States.

158. Historians will later say whether the vote today was merely a response to the needs of the moment, or whether it was in fact a reflection of the profound feelings of all peoples represented here with regard to racism, justice and fraternity among all mankind. In the opinion of my delegation, the status of South Africa in the Organization is quite clear, inasmuch as it is a Member now only because of the veto power. All peace-loving forces throughout the world that are opposed to the criminal policies of *apartheid* may consider that they have earned a moral victory from this important debate, which is but the prelude to other fights and a great source of comfort to the oppressed people of Azania.

159. With the inevitable deterioration of the political situation in South Africa, public opinion in our various countries and world public opinion in general will surely understand who bears the overwhelming responsibility for the defeat of the draft resolution recommending the immediate expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations.

*The meeting rose at 6 p.m.*