

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

MEETING



Tuesday, 17 October 1972,
at 3.40 p.m.

NEW YORK

Chairman: Mr. Hady TOURÉ (Guinea).

AGENDA ITEM 38

The policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa (*continued*) (A/8666 and Corr.1, A/8670, A/8689, A/8703, paras. 501-519):

(a) Reports of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* (A/8722 and Add.1, A/8770);

(b) Reports of the Secretary-General (A/8822)

GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

1. Mr. N'DIAYE (Senegal) paid tribute to Mr. Farah of Somalia, the parting Chairman of the Special Committee on *Apartheid*, for his tireless defence of African causes and congratulated his successor, Mr. Ogbu of Nigeria.

2. The racist *apartheid* régime of South Africa was a constant challenge to the international community, for it was contrary to morality, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the principles of the United Nations Charter. A social and political system based on racial segregation was worse than slavery, since it carried within it the seeds of hatred and violence, which, once unleashed, could not be checked. The imprisonment and torture inflicted on South African and Namibian nationalists, however brutal, would never prevent those who were struggling to regain their rights and their human dignity from pursuing their heroic battle against the forces of oppression. The developed countries allied with South Africa were strengthening their economic and military ties with that country, despite their constant protests of indignation against *apartheid*, and the efforts to isolate the racist, minority régime, on which the world had based its hopes of bringing the South African Government to reason, tended to be viewed merely as a subsidiary weapon in the struggle against *apartheid*.

3. It might be asked whether South Africa and its friends had really been so blinded by their imperialist designs and by the putative requirements for the defence of certain strategic areas that they could ignore the risk that *apartheid*, like nazism, from which it had sprung, might give rise to a devastating war. Unfortunately, the conclusions reached in the report of the Special Committee (A/8722 and Add.1) implied that that was indeed the case. According to annex II to the report, South Africa had enjoyed a favourable balance of trade with its trading partners in 1970 and 1971. More-

over, the volume of South Africa's international trade had grown considerably during that period. That clearly demonstrated that South Africa's trading partners, and particularly those that were members of NATO, continued to provide considerable assistance to the racist Pretoria régime.

4. Still more serious was the fact that those countries, not content merely to sell arms to South Africa, provided it with large quantities of military assistance and continued to help it to produce its own armaments. Those countries, which had joined together in denouncing terror, appeared to have forgotten that the arms they provided were the same ones used to spread terror in South Africa, Namibia, Southern Rhodesia and the Portuguese colonies and, indeed, that they were the very arms used by the Portuguese colonial forces to perpetrate barbarous attacks against neighbouring countries.

5. Nevertheless, despite that assistance and despite its so-called policy of "dialogue", South Africa was currently faced with serious difficulties. World public opinion was becoming increasingly sensitive to the need to combat *apartheid*, and various organizations—religious, trade union and sports organizations, to name only a few categories—had joined together in opposition to that policy. That awakening of the world's conscience and the determination of the African peoples of South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe to oppose the racist régimes by every available means should inspire the world community to redouble its efforts against *apartheid*. With that end in view, careful consideration should be given to the pertinent proposals put forward by Mr. Farah. At the level of the United Nations, if the bodies concerned with *apartheid* and decolonization could not be unified, it should at least be possible to establish a co-ordinating body for all matters concerning southern Africa. In addition, his delegation considered that the establishment of a special unit within the Office of Public Information of the Secretariat could help to provide world public opinion and the mass media with complete and accurate information.

6. His country, where members of all races and religions lived in harmony as one people, strongly condemned South Africa's barbarous policy of oppression and would join in any effort on the part of the international community to compel the racist Pretoria régime to renounce its policy of racial segregation. In keeping with that commitment, it had ratified the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and strictly applied all the sanctions

adopted against South Africa. It would maintain that position as long as *apartheid* held sway in South Africa. Only when the racist minority Government renounced its anachronistic policies and allowed the indigenous inhabitants to participate democratically in their country's life would his country be prepared to engage in a real, sincere dialogue of brotherhood and co-operation.

7. Mr. MICAJKOV (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation endorsed the conclusions contained in the reports of the Special Committee (A/8722 and Add.1 and A/8770) and the statements by its Chairman and Rapporteur (809th meeting), as well as the specific proposals which had been made with a view to intensifying the struggle for the eradication of *apartheid*. Much had already been said about the continued existence of South Africa's policies of *apartheid*, as well as about the reaction of the world community to that grave threat to the national existence of the peoples of southern Africa and to the peace of the region and the world. For its part, his delegation would address itself to some primary aspects of current and possible future developments.

8. It was true that some successes had been scored, both inside and outside South Africa, in the common struggle against *apartheid*. The political struggle by the freedom fighters of South Africa had been significantly intensified. The level of the struggle against *apartheid*, colonial and racist terror and oppression in the area surrounding South Africa, together with the volume of assistance provided in that connexion by African States, had increased. Important new advances had been registered in international support for the anti-*apartheid* cause, including a greater readiness on the part of the international trade union movement to contribute to the common effort.

9. However, the picture was far from bright. Serious and disturbing developments led one to the inescapable conclusion that if the existing situation was not brought under control, the racist régime of South Africa would continue to find new sources of strength in its open defiance of the conscience of the world. The South African Government had been pursuing its policy of Bantustans, police terror and ruthless exploitation with increasing vigour. *Apartheid* had become a system of modern slavery aimed not only at the enrichment of the racist minority but also at the destruction of the national identity of the majority of the population. The volume of trade with and foreign investment in South Africa, as well as the supply of arms to that country, was growing in violation of the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. That disturbing development indicated that South Africa's major trading partners had decided that the evil of *apartheid* and the common obligation to put an end to it were merely secondary considerations. Their narrow interests in the so-called balance of power and military rivalries, combined with their exploitative economic interests, had taken precedence over the basic rights of a whole continent. From their point of view, selfish, short-term considerations outweighed the long-term interests of common security and peace.

The presence of South Africa's military forces in Southern Rhodesia, the Portuguese Territories and elsewhere, its continued application of the Bantustan policies in Namibia and its blatant and systematic violation, together with Portugal, of the sanctions against the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia proved once again that South Africa was engaged in an aggressive and calculated effort to subjugate all of southern Africa, thus creating a direct threat to peace in the continent and the world. He had become personally acquainted with that distressing situation a few months earlier as a member of the delegation of the Yugoslav Parliament to the Republic of Zambia, where he had had extensive talks with officials of the Government of that country and with representatives of liberation movements.

10. His country's policy with regard to *apartheid* and related questions was well known. It had joined in sponsoring the most recent Security Council resolution on *apartheid*, adopted at Addis Ababa on 4 February 1972 (resolution 311 (1972)), which recognized, *inter alia*, the legitimacy of the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa and called upon all States to observe strictly the arms embargo against that country. It had taken an active part in the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries held at Georgetown, Guyana, in August 1972, which had endorsed the resolutions on colonialism and *apartheid* adopted by the Organization of African Unity at its session in June 1972 at Rabat, Morocco, requesting all members to assume an urgent and firm commitment to provide financial, military and material assistance to the liberation movements and recommending that the next summit conference of non-aligned States should review the situation with regard to the flow of assistance to liberation movements. Since it had emerged from its own war of national liberation, his country had been steadfastly providing direct assistance to liberation movements. He was particularly pleased to inform members that an official delegation of the Socialist Alliance of Working People of Yugoslavia had recently become the first foreign delegation to visit the liberated part of Angola and had carried with it a message pledging his country's determination to continue to assist the African liberation movements.

11. In applying its long-standing policy of maintaining no relations whatever with South Africa and of compliance with the mandatory sanctions against the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia, his country had to face the fact that any assistance to South Africa strengthened its role in the systematic violation of the sanctions, which, in turn, contributed to the alliance of racist and colonial régimes in southern Africa. That was why his Government strongly advocated the application of sanctions against South Africa and Portugal. In addition to legislation for the observance of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, his country had adopted regulations which effectively prevented any trade with South Africa or Portugal. It would continue to contribute to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, and the Socialist Alliance of Working People of Yugoslavia had established a special fund for assistance to liberation movements.

12. His country would support all measures for increased direct assistance to the liberation movements in South Africa, the condemnation of torture and ill-treatment of prisoners and detainees in South Africa and effective assistance to all victims of *apartheid* police terror. It supported the adoption of an international legal instrument for the suppression and punishment of the crime of *apartheid*, which could be useful in the elaboration of a legal basis for widening the international campaign against *apartheid*. It was in favour of the mandatory application of the arms embargo and the cessation of all military collaboration with South Africa, as well as of all activities by foreign economic interests which encouraged the South African régime in its imposition of *apartheid*. It considered that all emigration to South Africa, especially of skilled labour, should be discontinued. In addition, it believed that the proposals for the suspension of South Africa from the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and for the reconsideration of the International Monetary Fund's decision concerning gold were quite pertinent. It was important to mobilize world public opinion and governmental and non-governmental efforts against *apartheid*. During the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly his country was one of the sponsors of a draft resolution in the Third Committee on the launching of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (resolution 2784 (XXVI)), and it supported the holding of international trade union conferences in that connexion. His delegation was in favour of a complete boycott of South Africa in sports and in cultural and other fields and believed that the decision of the Davis Cup Nations committee to readmit South Africa should be rescinded.

13. The question was often asked whether, in the face of the continuation and intensification of the policies of *apartheid* inside and outside South Africa, the peoples of the world had lost the capacity to be shocked and to do what was necessary to remove that blot from the conscience of the world. In his delegation's view, there was sufficient proof that, given a fair chance, the right example and good leadership, the peoples of the world still had that capacity. He hoped that the Committee's decisions would help to provide the peoples of the world with that chance.

14. Mr. DORJI (Bhutan) said that, although little could be added to what had already been said about *apartheid*, he wished to express his delegation's support for all action taken by the United Nations against that policy. Bhutan had consistently condemned the policy, which it believed constituted a grave threat to international security. The people of the world had suffered enough under racist régimes and would be driven to resort to desperate means. In that case, States Members of the United Nations would be held responsible, because they had failed in their duty to uphold the Charter. Rather than sending more fact-finding missions to investigate atrocities committed by the South African Government, the Organization, which had already passed judgement on *apartheid*, should take definite action to combat it.

15. His delegation had noted with regret that the statements on the subject by so many delegations and the voice of world public opinion were of no avail and that the resolutions passed by the General Assembly and the Security Council went unheeded. It therefore urged all countries to support those resolutions and other action taken by the United Nations and to join together to establish human dignity, international peace and security and to uphold the principles of the Charter.

16. Mr. DORON (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Committee had again been witness to the practice adopted by some delegations and in particular the Arab delegations of abusing the Committee's time by repeating their baseless allegations against Israel. To give only one example of their incessant propaganda campaign, his delegation had listened with wonder to the statement at the previous meeting by the representative of Iraq concerning an Israeli sub-machine-gun manufactured in South Africa under licence granted by Belgium and the alleged sale of arms by Israel to Portugal and South Africa. Of course, the representative of Iraq might be speaking in total ignorance of the whole situation; on the other hand, he might know the truth but prefer to disregard it and continue to utter the usual untruths and to make innuendoes. In fact, those allegations had been repudiated by the Israeli representative before the Committee at the twenty-sixth session (774th meeting), and his statement had been corroborated by the Chairman of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* himself and by the Belgian representative. Members of the Committee would therefore know what value could be attached to such allegations.

17. Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that had his statement been irrelevant to the item under discussion, the Israeli representative would certainly have raised many points of order while he was making it. He had in fact been speaking to the point since the report of the Special Committee had said that collaboration between other countries and Portugal and South Africa was one of the main reasons for the continued success of *apartheid* and had urged all freedom-loving countries to investigate examples of such collaboration. His reference to the Uzi machine-gun was a quotation from an article in *The New York Times* on 30 April 1971 by C. L. Sulzberger, which had quoted reports from African liberation movements on capturing such a machine-gun from the Portuguese forces. Perhaps the Committee might like to ask the opinion of Mr. Luis Cabral, since he was present. He would in any case leave it to the Committee to draw the proper conclusions.

18. Mr. DORON (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, reminded the Committee that although the Iraqi representative had quoted from an article written in April 1971, the Israeli representative had explained to the Committee in November 1971 (*ibid.*) that licence to manufacture that sub-machine-gun had been granted by Israel to a third country long before

the United Nations had decided to decree an arms embargo. The Chairman of the Committee had said that he was in correspondence with the Governments concerned, and Belgium's final explanation that the licence in question had in fact expired long before the date of the embargo had been published in the Special Committee's report.¹ Those statements must have been known to the representative of Iraq.

19. Mr. TEYMOUR (Egypt), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that it was Israel and not the Arabs that was abusing the time of the Committee. The relationship between Israel and South Africa was well known, since that country maintained a consul-general in South Africa. References to Israeli arms used by the Portuguese were not slanders but statements confirmed by United Nations documents. For example, the report of the Special Mission dispatched to Guinea which appeared as annex I to chapter X of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, included the Uzi MP 2 A1 9 mm sub-machine-gun and 120 mm mortar shells originating in Israel among the items in the list provided by the Partido Africano da Independência da Guinea e Cabo Verde (PAIGC) (see A/8723/Add.3, annex I, appendix VI, sect. 4) concerning arms supplied to Portugal.

20. Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that if the licence had in fact expired, then the arms must have been supplied directly by Israel, which was in fact what the spokesmen of the liberation movements had said. A report by the Protestant World Council of Churches concerning arms transported in unnumbered aircraft piloted by Israelis and delivered to the Sudanese rebels showed that Israel was also extending the Middle East conflict into Africa.

21. Mr. DORON (Israel) replied that he would reiterate the statement he made whenever such allegations were put forward by Arab representatives. Israel had not sold any arms to South Africa or Portugal or granted

those countries licences to manufacture Israeli arms, nor had it supplied arms to any rebel movement on the African continent. The allegations made by the representative of Iraq and used for the usual purposes were therefore based on rumour rather than fact.

Request for a hearing

22. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee of a request for a hearing by Mr. Pearce L. Gqobose, Acting National Treasurer of the Pan-Africanist Congress of Azania (South Africa), and asked if the Committee wished to grant that request.

23. Mr. BEAVOGUI (Guinea) supported the request, since all clarification of the problem of *apartheid* was welcome.

24. Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) also warmly supported the granting of that request, which he considered timely, because the stage had now been reached where valuable information could be obtained from statements by all members of movements working against the policy of *apartheid*. World public opinion was still largely unaware of the depth of that evil and even some States Members of the United Nations refused to believe the evidence and to recognize it as a crime against humanity. The representative of the Pan-Africanist Congress, an organization that had suffered from the atrocities committed by the Pretoria régime, would speak convincingly of the treatment of the non-white population in South Africa. Hearings in the Special Political Committee of members of organizations such as the Pan-Africanist Congress were one of the best means of publicizing the evils of *apartheid* and of obtaining public involvement in combating it.

25. The CHAIRMAN said, that in view of those two statements, and in the absence of any objection, he would therefore take it that the Committee wished to grant a hearing to the representative of the Pan-Africanist Congress.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.35 p.m.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 22*, para. 87.