United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION
Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 776th MEETING

Thursday, 11 November 1971, at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

Chairman: Mr. Cornelius C. CREMIN (Ireland).

AGENDA ITEMS 37 AND 12

The policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa *(continued)* (A/8403, A/8422 and Corr.1, A/8467, A/8468, A/SPC/145, A/SPC/L.206/Rev.1, A/SPC/L.208, A/SPC/L.209/Rev.1, A/SPC/L.210, A/SPC/L.211, A/SPC/L.212):

***(a)* Report of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* (A/8422 and Corr.1);**

***(b)* Reports of the Secretary-General (A/8467, A/8468);**

***(c)* Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter XVII (section C)) (A/8403)**

1. Mr. ARIF (India) said that, as part of its programme to disseminate scientific information on race and combat racial prejudice, UNESCO had in 1967 brought together a committee of 18 experts on race and racial prejudice, who had issued a statement stressing that "the school and other instruments for social and economic progress could be one of the most effective agents for the achievement of broadened understanding and the fulfilment of the potentialities of man".[1] They had also advised that teachers should be given special training to enable them to avoid the prejudices which might be current in their society and that school curricula should not make unscientific and invidious distinctions between different races. The Symposium on the Evils of Racial Discrimination, held at Yaoundé from 16 to 29 June 1971, had recommended[2] the preparation of educational programmes stressing racial harmony and exposing the evils of racial discrimination and *apartheid* for use throughout the world.

2. The Special Committee on *Apartheid* had sent a mission to Europe and Africa in June (see A/8422 and Corr.1, sect. H), which had consulted anti-*apartheid* movements and UNESCO on the implementation of the aforementioned recommendations and had found that there was a growing concern among educational experts at the dearth of suitable material for schools on racial discrimination. All parties concerned had been unanimous that the work of preparing an educational kit on racial discrimination should be entrusted to UNESCO. The national commissions of that organization would in turn adapt the kit according to their requirements and distribute it to schools in their areas.

3. Introducing draft resolution A/SPC/L.209/Rev.1, he said that it gave practical shape to the statement of the UNESCO Committee of experts and the recommendations of the Special Committee's mission. The revised draft was the result of wide consultations which had led to a few minor changes. The words "and information" in the fourth preambular paragraph of the original text (A/SPC/L.209) were not applicable and had been deleted. The word "concern" in the last preambular paragraph had been replaced by "interest". There had been one substantive change: an additional, self-explanatory paragraph—operative paragraph 4—had been added. He hoped the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously. Prejudice led to hatred and violence; enlightenment and understanding brought tolerance and peace.

4. Mr. BHATT (Nepal), introducing draft resolution A/SPC/L.210, said that the 1972 programme of work suggested therein followed the well-established pattern of previous years. The report of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* (A/8422 and Corr.1) showed that the situation in South Africa had continued to deteriorate despite the fact that the South African Government maintained that its Bantustan and outward-looking policies would bring about improvements. As a result of the Bantustan policy the African population was being condemned to live in remote and unproductive areas not essential to the white-dominated South African economy. Similarly, the policy of "dialogue" was not leading to any meaningful talks with the country's African population and was not intended to disturb the existing system. The enforcement of unjust laws based on the policy of *apartheid* remained as relentless as ever. Recent developments in the economic and military spheres were also disturbing. South Africa's main trading partners were making record investments in that country and, despite the Security Council resolutions, certain major Powers were supplying South Africa with arms.

5. Those were some of the aspects of the situation with which the international community had to contend. Draft resolution A/SPC/L.210 recognized the need for further efforts to intensify the international campaign against *apartheid* and endorsed the programme of work of the Special Committee, as set forth in its report. Only effective economic and other measures would have an appreciable influence on the racist régime since foreign economic collaboration and trade were vital to the survival of the South African economy. It was therefore necessary, as the Special Committee had emphasized, to intensify the worldwide campaign against the multinational and principal national corporations and to encourage groups which supported the economic boycott of South Africa. The United Nations should engage in consultations with churches and religious bodies, which had played a very important role in combating the injustice of *apartheid* and in aiding its victims. The international community should also make efforts to improve the situation of political

1 See *Four statements on the race question* (UNESCO document COM.69/II.27 *a*/A), sect. IV, para. 14.

2 See document ST/TAO/HR.42, chapt. IV.

prisoners in South Africa. Such consultations as those authorized in the draft resolution had proved valuable in the past and the sponsors felt that continued consultations would further the cause of the international campaign against *apartheid*. The draft resolution was concise and straightforward and he hoped that it would be adopted unanimously.

6. Mr. PEJIC (Yugoslavia), introducing draft resolution A/SPC/L.212, considered it probably one of the most important drafts suggested for adoption by the Committee, since it dealt with the problem of the Bantustans, which were one of the basic elements of the policy of *apartheid*. The unjust and evil Bantustan scheme had already been condemned by the United Nations. The Bantustans were designed to isolate Africans from the mainstream of life in the country by deporting them to unproductive areas where they were denied political, economic and other rights. The plan was thus solely for the benefit of the white minority. By dividing the African population into small entities which supposedly enjoyed self-determination, the white minority was better able to control the Africans and to perpetuate their domination over them. In addition, the plan was the product of a policy of racial superiority similar to that seen in the Second World War. The scheme would not work, however, since the majority of the population was rejecting it. Although the text of the draft resolution was very clear, he felt he should draw particular attention to the fourth, fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs, which introduced a new element into the consideration of the evil policy of the Bantustans. Those paragraphs had been included since many representatives who had spoken during the debate had noticed a great deal of similarity between nazi and *apartheid* practices. He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously and announced that the Philippines had decided to become one of its sponsors.

7. Mr. DASHTSEREN (Mongolia) said that his Government's position on *apartheid* was well known: the Government and people of Mongolia condemned the inhuman policies of *apartheid* as a crime against humanity. His country stood firmly on the side of the oppressed people of South Africa, gave them moral and material support in their just struggle for their legitimate rights and did not maintain any relations whatsoever with the South African régime.

8. Representing one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.208, his delegation fully shared the ideas and purposes thereof. It was the continued military aid given to South Africa by its imperialist partners that enabled it to maintain and extend the inhuman policies of *apartheid* and to perpetrate more and more crimes against neighbouring African States. Thanks to generous contributions from the United Kingdom, the United States of America, the Federal Republic of Germany, France and others, the Pretoria régime was ever increasing its military capacity. South Africa's military strength played a major role in the "Unholy Alliance" it had formed with the Portuguese colonialists and the white minority racist régime of Southern Rhodesia.

9. The continued presence and interventions of the South African police force in Southern Rhodesia and the participation of its troops in the atrocities perpetrated by the Portuguese colonialists against the patriots of Angola and Mozambique, as well as the recent violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Zambia, all indicated the real threat posed by South Africa to the security and sovereignty of independent African States and to international peace and security. It was therefore essential to ensure the strict implementation of the arms embargo. In that connexion, his delegation strongly deplored the decisions of the United Kingdom Government to resume the supply of arms to South Africa. Those States which continued to collaborate with the racist authorities were not only obstructing the efforts of the United Nations to eliminate racism but were also flagrantly disregarding their obligation under Article 25 of the Charter. He hoped that the draft resolution would be widely supported by the Committee.

10. With regard to draft resolution A/SPC/L.206/Rev.1, he pointed out that his country had been contributing to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and would continue to do so. Consequently his delegation had not difficulty in supporting the draft.

11. His delegation also agreed with the aims of draft resolution A/SPC/L.210. In order to isolate the racist régime and thus compel it to honour its obligations under the Charter and comply with the relevant decisions of the United Nations, it would be necessary for all those opposed to *apartheid* and racial discrimination to take concerted action against the evil practice of *apartheid*. In the past year the Special Committee had done useful work in that field; it had carried out broad consultations with the specialized agencies, regional organizations and governmental and non-governmental organizations with a view to mobilizing world public opinion and intensifying the international campaign against *apartheid*. His delegation would support the draft resolution although it might involve certain financial implications.

12. Mr. SPAČIL (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation attached great importance to the idea expressed in draft resolution A/SPC/L.209/Rev.1. Its meaning would, however, be strengthened if the word "Member" were deleted in operative paragraph 4. Other resolutions on the same subject called upon all States, without specifying whether or not they were Members of the United Nations, to implement the resolution. Moreover, it would be illogical to call on States Members of the United Nations to co-operate with UNESCO, which had a somewhat different membership.

13. Mr. ABADA (Algeria) supported that suggestion. The invitation to co-operate should be extended to all States, including those which, although not Members of the United Nations, shared its aims.

14. The CHAIRMAN said that in the corrigendum to the French text of draft resolution A/SPC/L.206/Rev.1 which had just been circulated (A/SPC/L.206/Rev.1/Corr.1*), the amendment should be made not only to the paragraph mentioned in the correction but also to the third preambular paragraph and to operative paragraph 5.

15. Mr. TEYMOUR (Egypt), Mr. DIOP (Guinea), Mr. TARCICI (Yemen), Mrs. REID (Jamaica), Mr. EL AWAD (Sudan), Mr. HABYALIMANA (Rwanda)

* French only.

and Mr. THOMPSON FLÔRES (Brazil) requested that their countries' names should be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.206/Rev.1.

16. Mr. TARCICI (Yemen) requested that his country's name should also be added to the list of sponsors of all the other draft resolutions on *apartheid* (A/SPC/L.208 to A/SPC/L.212, inclusive).

17. Mr. PAMBOU (People's Republic of the Congo) requested that his country's name should be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.209/Rev.1.

18. Mr. BABAR (Pakistan) and Mr. EDREMODA (Nigeria) pointed out that their countries' names had been omitted from the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.212.

19. Mr. KIILU (Kenya) requested that his country's name should be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolutions A/SPC/L.211 and A/SPC/L.212.

20. Mr. TEYMOUR (Egypt) requested that his country's name should be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolutions A/SPC/L.208, A/SPC/L.209/Rev.1 and A/SPC/L.211.

21. Mr. CAMPS (Uruguay) and Mr. EDREMODA (Nigeria) pointed out that their countries' names had been omitted from the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.211.

22. Mr. BACKES (Austria) said that his country had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.206/Rev.1 because it considered the establishment of the Trust Fund to be a constructive step taken by the United Nations for a purely human purpose. His country had contributed to the Fund during past years and intended to increase its contribution in 1972, subject to parliamentary approval.

23. Mr. TANKOUA (Cameroon) and Miss DINCER (Turkey) said that although their delegations had indicated their wish that their countries' names should be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.206/Rev.1, they had inadvertently been omitted on the corrigendum.

24. Mr. KUSUMASMORO (Indonesia) said that draft resolution A/SPC/L.206/Rev.1 expressed the concern of the international community for the victims of *apartheid.* The least that opponents of *apartheid* could do was to provide those victims with humanitarian assistance and material aid. The recent attack by the South African Government on the providers of such assistance showed the importance that Government attached to the assistance. The Indonesian Government was about to make its first contribution to the Trust Fund–the sum of $1,000 which, although small, would show its solidarity with the victims of *apartheid.*

25. Mr. ZENKYAVICHYUS (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) welcomed the amendments made to the text of the draft resolution in its revised version and the Swedish representative's explanation at the preceding meeting that those amendments would mean that the proposal would have no financial implications for the United Nations.

26. Mr. MOUSSA (Tunisia) said that his country had decided to contribute $3,000 to the Trust Fund.

27. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the Secretary-General had stated that in view of the amendments made to the draft resolution in its revised version, the costs referred to in paragraph 2 of the Secretary-General's note (A/SPC/L.207), were no longer applicable and there would be no financial implications.

28. In view of the large measure of support which had already been expressed for the draft resolution, he wondered if it could be adopted by consensus.

29. Mr. GOULART DE AVILA (Portugal) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote.

30. The CHAIRMAN put the draft resolution A/SPC/L.206/Rev.1 to the vote.

The draft resolution was adopted by 102 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

31. Mr. GRIGG (United States of America) said that in view of the statement that the draft resolution would have no financial implications, his delegation had been able to vote in favour of it. The United States would support any peaceful and practicable ways of putting an end to *apartheid* and in the meantime agreed that assistance should be provided for its victims. It therefore supported the activities of the Trust Fund and hoped that it would continue its efforts to help the victims of *apartheid.* His affirmative vote should not, however, be interpreted as a commitment to contribute to the Fund.

32. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it was in keeping with his coutry's firm opposition to racial discrimination and in particular *apartheid.* It had not asked to be included among the sponsors because it had felt that to sponsor the resolution might be tantamount to a direct commitment to contribute to the Fund. He had had no instructions from his Government in the matter but would transmit the appeal made in the draft resolution to the appropriate authority.

33. His delegation considered that it would be clearer and less time-consuming if, instead of each delegation announcing individually that its country wished to be included among the sponsors of a draft resolution, it were to give that information to the spokesman for the sponsors, or to the Chairman, who would make a general statement on the subject.

34. Mr. BERNSTROM (Sweden) expressed his gratification that there had been virtual unanimity in favour of the draft resolution. On behalf of the Committee of Trustees of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, he wished to thank the delegations of Brazil, Indonesia and Tunisia who had just announced that their Governments would contribute to the Fund. He hoped that their attitude would inspire other countries to pledge contributions.

35. Mr. BASSETTE (Belgium) regretted that he had been absent when the vote had been taken. Had he been present, he would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

36. Mr. GROOS (Canada), turning to draft resolution A/SPC/L.209/Rev.1, said his delegation would vote in

favour of that draft; however, he hoped that the sponsors would consider amending the draft slightly to make it perfectly clear that the United Nations General Assembly was not attempting to usurp the authority of UNESCO. That could be done by inserting the words "within the budgetary limitations established by UNESCO for that purpose" after the word "prepare" in operative paragraph 2 and at the end of operative paragraph 3.

37. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) said that if the amendment suggested by the representative of Canada was accepted by the sponsors, his delegation would vote in favour of the amended draft. However, he wished to point out that the General Assembly had the right to address to UNESCO the requests made in operative paragraphs 2 and 3. It should be borne in mind that UNESCO might decide to review its budgetary allocations in the light of the draft resolution and the debate preceding the adoption. He therefore hoped that the representative of Canada would not insist on his amendment.

38. Mr. GROOS (Canada) thought that the representative of Lebanon might have misunderstood the wording of his suggested amendment. He therefore repeated it.

39. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) apologized to the representative of Canada for having misquoted his amendment to operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.209/Rev.1. The original wording of the amendment further confirmed his position. If UNESCO had already set budgetary limits for the preparation of educational kits and the production of films and audio-visual material on *apartheid,* as the amendment implied, operative paragraphs 2 and 3 would be superfluous. In fact, no such decision had been taken, as was evident from paragraphs 280 and 281 of the Special Committee's report (A/8422 and Corr.1). The draft resolution recommended that the General Assembly should request UNESCO to set aside funds for that purpose.

40. Mr. AHMAD (India) said that he had asked for the floor prior to the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.206/Rev.1, but had not been recognized by the Chairman. He had intended to point out that the word "consensus" did not mean "unanimity". Since that draft resolution had been accepted by consensus, there had really been no need to hold a vote on it.

41. He entirely agreed with the representative of Lebanon that the existing procedure of announcing sponsorship of draft resolutions wasted a great deal of time and that it would be better for delegations to inform either the original sponsors or the Chairman of their wish to have their countries included among the sponsors of a draft.

42. Two amendments to draft resolution A/SPC/L.209/Rev.1 had just been proposed, one by the representative of Czechoslovakia, supported by the representative of Algeria, and one by the representative of Canada. His delegation would consult with representatives of the other sponsors of the draft and hoped to be able to inform the Committee of their decision the following day.

43. The CHAIRMAN apologized to the representative of India for having failed to recognize him. He did not agree with the Indian representative's definition of the word "consensus". As he understood it, consensus implied absolute unanimity.

44. He agreed with the representatives of Lebanon and India that representatives of countries wishing to join in sponsoring draft resolutions should so inform the original sponsors or the Chairman. Accordingly, he called upon the representative of Yugoslavia to announce the names of the new sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.212.

45. Mr. PEJIC apologized to the delegations of Pakistan and Singapore for the fact that the names of their countries did not appear in document A/SPC/L.212, although they had been among the original sponsors of that draft resolution. The names of Guinea, Hungary, India, the Libyan Arab Republic and Rwanda should also be added.

46. Mr. BHATT (Nepal) reminded the Committee that the Special Committee on *Apartheid* was to submit a special report on the proposed international trade union conference against *apartheid.* It was expected that that report would be submitted the following day. Since delegations might wish to submit draft resolutions based on the report, he proposed that the Committee should agree that such drafts might be introduced after the established deadline so that delegations would have an opportunity to study the report.

It was so decided.

47. Mr. BHATT (Nepal) said that the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.210 comprised the following countries: Afghanistan, Algeria, Cameroon, Egypt, the Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the People's Republic of the Congo, the Philippines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen and Zambia.

48. Mr. ABDILLEH (Somalia) said that in view of the almost unanimous support given to draft resolution A/SPC/L.206/Rev.1, the Chairman might consider conveying the thanks and appreciation of the Committee to the members of the Committee of Trustees of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa for their excellent work.

49. The CHAIRMAN said that he would follow the suggestion just made by the representative of Somalia.

50. Mr. AHMAD (India), referring to draft resolution A/SPC/L.209/Rev.1, announced that Jamaica, Liberia, Rwanda and Singapore wished to join the sponsors of that draft.

51. Mr. PAMBOU (People's Republic of the Congo), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said his delegation felt that the intervention by the representative of the Ivory Coast at the 774th meeting, on 9 November 1971, had sown doubt and confusion in the minds of representatives

as to the position of the African countries with regard to the problem of a dialogue with the racist régime of South Africa. In implying that African countries supporting the idea of a dialogue were not in the minority, the representative of the Ivory Coast had wronged those African peoples who had decided not to enter into a dialogue with the Smith and Vorster régimes and had obscured the fact that the majority of African countries wished to come to grips with the problem of *apartheid* in a way that would be most advantageous to Africa as a whole. In any case, to deny that Africa had shown a willingness to solve the problem of *apartheid* by peaceful means had been an act of bad faith.

52. He reminded the Committee that at the twenty-fourth session the President of the Federal Republic of Cameroon had, on behalf of the OAU, outlined the Lusaka Manifesto (Manifesto on Southern Africa[3]) to the General Assembly. That document had laid the foundations for a settlement of the problem of *apartheid* and had acknowledged the possibility of a dialogue with the South African and Portuguese racists and colonialists. While the Manifesto had been approved in letter and spirit by the international community, it had unfortunately been categorically rejected by the South Africans and the Portuguese. The OAU had therefore been obliged to reconsider its position to bring it into accordance with the spirit of the Lusaka Manifesto. Almost all the participants at the eighth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU, in June 1971, had rejected the idea of a dialogue with the South African racists and had issued a declaration to that effect referring back to the Lusaka Manifesto, which had been endorsed by the General Assembly (resolution 2505 (XXIV)).

53. Thus not only Africa as a whole but the entire international community was opposed to the proposal of holding a dialogue with South Africa, which was just one more imperialistic manoeuvre in South Africa's over-all strategy to dominate Africa. Any defence of the idea of dialogue was apt to create more doubt and confusion in the minds of the majority of representatives who had already decided in favour of more concrete action with regard to southern Africa. Furthermore, to affirm that the OAU and the international community were being unrealistic and demagogic by opposing the idea of a dialogue and to qualify the approach taken by the international community as being Utopian was a betrayal and an open violation of the principles contained in the Charter of the United Nations and that of the OAU. His delegation, for its part, continued to believe that the idea of a dialogue sprang from an idealistic view of history. History in fact showed that inevitably in any society where there was oppression, there was also resistance. The strong had always sought to become stronger at the expense of the weak and peaceful coexistence and dialogue could exist only between two powers of equal strength. The history of the struggle of peoples for justice, freedom and independence also showed that the necessary balance could be struck only at the price of a bitter struggle. A people drew the strength to re-establish its dignity from the blood of its martyrs and heroes. The people of southern Africa would have to follow the same course. It was on that premise that Africans struggling for their dignity and legitimate rights based their formal and categorical rejection of the idea of a dialogue.

54. Mr. GANDA (Sierra Leone) expressed his delegation's support of the statement made by the representative of the People's Republic of the Congo in exercise of the right of reply to the representative of the Ivory Coast. It was only fair that the records of debates should be set straight. In the general debate, the Reverend E. Lockwood had spoken (774th meeting) of the evils of the régime of *apartheid,* in a statement which had immediately followed that of the representative of the Ivory Coast. Yet that representative had said then that South Africa could not remain insensitive to the idea of a dialogue. He wished to remind the representative of the Ivory Coast that Sharpeville could not be forgotten. Although South Africa had been called to account by the international community at that time,[4] there had been no change in its Government's policy, in fact the situation in South Africa was even worse. The representative of the Ivory Coast had said that South Africa could not turn a deaf ear to such an approach to the idea of a dialogue: why then, was the South African delegation absent from the meetings of the Committee?

55. The representative of the Ivory Coast had said further that the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions had had no effect and that the United Nations approach had failed because the resolutions had not been implemented. But it had to be remembered that they had not been implemented because of selfish national materialistic interests. The representative of the Ivory Coast had suggested that all African countries should build a fraternity. The OAU was a good example of a fraternal Africa. Yet the rules in the Lusaka Manifesto for joining the OAU had been rejected by South Africa. It was his delegation's opinion that South Africa was using the so-called dialogue attitude to reduce international pressure upon itself. The South African régime did not want to become internationally ostracized, because that would force it to take up the challenge of a dialogue, and it was trying to avoid that by confusing the issue. As the representative of Saudi Arabia had frequently said, the international community had no weapons, only words. He hoped that those words would reach the right quarters and that, as a result, South Africa would be brought into alignment with the civilized world.

56. Mr. MWANZA (Zambia) said that he was not one of those who had learned about *apartheid* through hearsay or in books. He had experienced it in person. He therefore associated himself with those who felt that a dialogue with the Government of South Africa would defeat all that African nationalism stood for. His delegation and Government could not accept the idea of a dialogue, first of all because of the stubborn and arrogant attitude of the South African Government and its white minority towards world public opinion. That attitude was apparent in its reaction to criticism of the *apartheid* policy. It took no notice whatsoever; in fact, it did not regard any Member State, individually or collectively, as a Power to be reckoned with or as a Power whose political sovereignty and territorial integrity should be observed and respected. The

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

[4] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fifteenth Year,* 851st to 856th meetings.

South African Government had repeatedly violated the United Nations Charter in its treatment of its African, Coloured and Asian communities, and of some white philanthropists who were opposed to the régime. It had even banned some, if not all, United Nations publications. It would be impossible to hold a dialogue with such a Government.

57. The South African Government would not give a hearing to any country that wished to discuss the political régime in South Africa. It would only welcome talks with another country for the negotiation and signing of a trade agreement or the establishment of a political diplomatic mission. The recent visit of the President of Malawi, Dr. Hastings Banda, would never have materialized had he not had a diplomatic mission in Pretoria. Dr. Banda should never have set foot on South African soil. The proposal of a fact-finding Uganda delegation to South Africa had been turned down by Mr. Vorster himself on the grounds that it would interfere in the internal affairs of his country.

58. The second reason for his delegation's rejection of a dialogue was that it was contrary to the recommendations[5] of the Group of Experts on South Africa appointed by the Secretary-General in 1964 in pursuance of a request contained in resolution 182 (1963) of the Security Council. They had been of the opinion that a dialogue between the other African coutries and South Africa would produce no fruitful results. They had said that the future of South Africa should be settled by the people of South Africa–all the people of South Africa–in free discussion, and that there could be no settlement and no peace while the great majority of the people were denied the fundamental freedom to participate in decisions on the future of their countries.

59. The third reason was that the South African nationals themselves were strongly opposed to the idea of a dialogue. They felt that they alone should negotiate with South Africa for their political independence and self-determination, and that the motive behind any dialogue with the South African Government was, first and foremost, that they should be granted political power in order to rule themselves as the rightful owners of the land. Their attitude had been borne out by three officials of the external department of the African National Congress of South Africa who had protested against the state visit of Dr. Banda to South Africa and said that they would rather have a dialogue through the barrel of a gun.

60. The representative of the Netherlands had advocated a dialogue (771st meeting), suggesting that it could result in South Africa's taking its rightful place in the Committee to oppose or accept the allegations made against it. He had not explained, however, that the constant absence of the representative of South Africa from the Committee was yet another manifestation of South Africa's stubborn attitude towards that world body.

61. His delegation was, therefore, opposed to any dialogue with the South African régime, because it considered that a dialogue would defeat African political aspirations towards the attainment of independence and self-determination.

62. Mr. DIOP (Guinea) supported the statements made by the representatives of the People's Republic of the Congo, Sierra Leone and Zambia. He condemned all efforts towards a dialogue with South Africa. It was well known that the policies of the South African régime were based on racial discrimination. The OAU and all freedom-loving countries had rejected the idea of a dialogue. It was disappointing that the friends of Mr. Smith, Mr. Vorster and other exploiters had allowed them to continue their oppression.

63. Mr. KACOU (Ivory Coast) said that he did not wish to enter into polemics with previous speakers at the current stage. He did not think that the position of their countries was very different from that of his own. However, he wished to reserve the right of reply after studying the summary record of the meeting.

64. Mr. KANE (Mauritania) said that the representative of the People's Republic of the Congo had echoed the will of the people of Africa as expressed in the Lusaka Manifesto. Those who wanted a dialogue were an insignificant minority, the majority had condemned the idea. It was therefore not necessary for African representatives to prolong the debate with further statements on that question. He appealed to the representatives of African countries to avoid argument among themselves.

65. Mr. GANDA (Sierra Leone) said that he appreciated the efforts of the representative of Mauritania to shorten the debate; his implication had been that the African countries should not wash their dirty linen in public. He expressed complete agreement with the advice given by the representative of Mauritania, though he felt that the issues in question had to be discussed.

66. Mr. TANKOUA (Cameroon) felt that there was no need to prolong the discussion. His country's attitude was the same as that of the OAU and the United Nations and was well known. Quarrels should be avoided and he hoped that the African Member States would not allow any quibbling among themselves to prejudice the Committee's discussions.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

[5] *Ibid., Nineteenth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1964,* document S/5658, annex.