

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



Friday, 20 October 1972,  
at 10.55 a.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, A/8833)

### GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

1. Begum SAIFULLAH (Pakistan) noted from the report of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* (A/8722 and Add.1) that the condition of the non-whites in South Africa was continuing to deteriorate, and that instead of being ostracized by other nations, the South African régime was receiving ever-increasing aid from those who professed to deplore *apartheid*.

2. Tens of thousands of Africans had been expelled from the urban areas, nearly 1 million had been arrested under repressive laws, thousands of non-white families had been forced to move out of their homes, and Africans were excluded from a large number of occupations. Such were the proportions that *apartheid* had assumed. Despite propaganda claims, the lot of the Africans in South Africa, far from improving, was becoming worse, and there was no hope for them that it would change. The imagination boggled at the thought that, a generation after Hitlerism had been universally condemned, a Government should be able to apply a racist policy.

3. In view of the scale and iniquitous nature of this policy, the United Nations had not considered it as coming under Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. It had used persuasion and threats to try to change that policy. But instead of heeding the United Nations resolutions, the Government of South Africa had hardened its policy by intensifying repression and terror. Furthermore, *apartheid* had spread from South Africa to other areas in southern Africa—Namibia, Southern Rhodesia and the Portuguese Territories—thereby creating a state of acute tension in the area.

4. One felt compelled to ask why South Africa should be able to defy public opinion and the United Nations. The answer, supplied in the Special Committee's report, was that in spite of the arms embargo instituted by the Security Council, certain Governments and corporations

were providing the Government of South Africa with arms, ammunition, missiles and technical help, and that foreign capital and industrial and commercial companies were strengthening the system of *apartheid* in South Africa.

5. Nevertheless there were grounds for hope. Enlightened people, especially among youth, churchmen and trade unionists, were making concerted efforts to eliminate *apartheid*. Despite the repression, there was growing opposition to *apartheid* in South Africa. However, those who were opposing *apartheid* inevitably exposed themselves to victimization. For that reason it was imperative that the international community should come to their help. The concern felt for the victims had found expression in the establishment of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa. The growth in the number of contributions paid into that Fund and the number of States that had contributed were indeed a cause for satisfaction. Her delegation was convinced that the Fund would continue to grow as the need for help became more urgent.

6. The provisions of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination were neither stringent nor comprehensive enough to cover all aspects of *apartheid*. The Convention should now be made more complete. In that connexion she recalled that at the twenty-eighth session of the Commission on Human Rights, Pakistan, Nigeria and Tanzania had submitted a draft protocol (see A/8768, annex II) to be annexed to the Convention. She hoped that the General Assembly at its current session would be able to progress towards the adoption of such an instrument. However, it must always be remembered that the most effective measures against *apartheid* were political measures, taken through those organs of the United Nations which were empowered to take punitive action against States which defied the resolutions of the United Nations and jeopardized international peace and security.

7. The delegation of Pakistan endorsed the recommendations made by the Special Committee, and her country would fully support all actions and measures aiming at putting an end to *apartheid*. History showed that an end to *apartheid* was inevitable.

8. Mr. MARSCHIK (Austria) expressed disappointment and regret that the international community had been unable to prevail upon the Government of South Africa to abandon its policy of racial discrimination which was contrary to the principles and purposes of the United Nations.

9. However, his delegation had not given up hope that the United Nations would be able, by peaceful means, to help to bring about a change in the policies of South Africa. In that context, special importance should be attached to the information activities of the United Nations, for *apartheid* would have to be overcome by convincing all peoples, including the people of South Africa, of the injustice of that policy.

10. Austria had complied with the decisions of the Security Council by imposing an arms embargo against South Africa, and it would continue to do so. However, it noted with concern in the reports submitted to the Committee that during the past year the production of arms, military vehicles and ammunition had increased in South Africa to such an extent that that country was able to export part of it. That tended to call in question the Security Council's measures.

11. His delegation considered that the human consequences of discriminatory legislation in South Africa should be given serious and continuing attention. Austria supported the efforts to give relief to the victims of *apartheid* and their families, to provide them with legal assistance and to assist in their education. It had contributed to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and would make a further contribution in 1973. It hoped that other Member States would do as much.

12. His delegation approved the organization by OAU of the International Conference for the Support of Victims of Colonialism and *Apartheid* in Southern Africa. It was happy that the Conference was to be held at Oslo in 1973.

13. His Government had consistently rejected the doctrine and policies of *apartheid*, as it did all policies based on concepts of human inequality or discrimination for reasons of race or religion. It was confident that in the end equality and justice would prevail and it pledged its firm and continuing support to achieve that end.

14. Mr. BARTOLOME (Philippines) said that the fact that the question of *apartheid* had been examined for more than 20 years in the United Nations was proof at the same time of the strength of the Organization and of one of its basic weaknesses. The problem had been the subject of numerous debates and had given rise to action on the part of various organs and institutions of the United Nations as well as of non-governmental organizations and courageous individuals. That was a proof of the moral and political authority enjoyed by the Organization, which had shown that it could mobilize public opinion in the name of justice. Action against *apartheid* had assumed many forms: many resolutions had been adopted; the Special Committee, which had played a decisive role, had worked with organizations engaged in the struggle against *apartheid*, had given advice on the subject to various United Nations organs, had granted hearings to victims of *apartheid* and had publicized the evils and dangers of racial discrimination; the Secretariat's Office of Public Infor-

mation and the Unit on *Apartheid* had likewise endeavoured to keep public opinion informed of the scale of the problem and of the possible solutions to it; the specialized agencies, in particular the ILO and UNESCO, had supported the campaigns conducted against racism; most Governments had co-operated in the movement aiming at the isolation of the South African régime; many contributions had been made to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa; finally, non-governmental organizations, the Churches, trade unions and educational institutions had drawn attention to the evil nature of the *apartheid* policies and had endeavoured to apply pressure on the Government of South Africa and on their own Governments. Such action had not been in vain. South Africa now stood condemned by nearly all nations and could not participate normally in international activities. Within the country, the régime was encountering growing opposition on the part of both whites and non-whites, and internal and external pressures had obliged it to take certain measures to give proof of its moderation. Thus the establishment of so-called Bantustans was intended to appear as a first step towards self-determination by the African population, multiracial sports teams were participating in "multinational" competitions, and Pretoria was seeking to engage in a "dialogue" with African countries and had encouraged visits to South Africa by prominent foreign personalities of the black race.

15. Unfortunately that was only a façade and what seemed to be a liberal attitude could not stand up to close scrutiny. The Africans in the Bantustans were exploited, deprived of their most elementary human rights, and subjected to stringent control by the Government, which, it was said, was simply endeavouring to restore the population to a tribal state. Participation by blacks in sports events was limited to sports in which there was no physical contact between the different races, and black teams, which could not compete unless they agreed to represent only the "homelands"—for South Africa could be represented only by exclusively white teams—played before spectators who were subjected to the most stringent segregation. As for the "outward-looking policy", it was obvious that Pretoria's readiness for dialogue with African nations was merely an attempt to play them off one against another. In South Africa itself, the situation had become worse. The Special Committee on *Apartheid*, in its report on the subject (A/8770), had mentioned shocking maltreatment and torture of prisoners, and new laws had been passed to make discrimination and segregation more rigid. Repression was now used against all those who opposed the régime, both black and white, and a few months previously the police had brutally suppressed a demonstration by white students who were demanding equality and justice for their black fellow students. The policy of *apartheid* had crossed South Africa's borders and was being extended into Namibia, over which South Africa had no legal authority.

16. South Africa's defiance of world public opinion and of the resolutions of the United Nations was possible only because some Governments ignored the deci-

sions of the United Nations when they conflicted with their own interests. The isolation of South Africa through sports and cultural boycotts, condemnation of its policies by Member States and by religious and other organizations did hurt the South African régime, but not enough to make it abandon, or even moderate, its *apartheid* policies. It would not do so unless its vital economic and military interests were threatened through a universal boycott. At the same time, as annex II to the report of the Special Committee showed, South Africa's total trade had increased from 1970 to 1971 and all but one of her major trading partners were developed countries whose companies, most of them subsidiaries or affiliates of United States corporations, did not hesitate to help strengthen the régime for the sake of profit and thus perpetuate the misery of its victims. Arms sales to South Africa and other forms of military co-operation, notably on the part of the United Kingdom, France and Portugal, also strengthened the position of the Government.

17. Turning to the question of sports, his delegation regretted that a number of countries, including the United States of America, the United Kingdom and Australia, refused to apply the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2775 D (XXVI), claiming that their Governments did not have control over their sports organizations. His own country's sports organizations were also autonomous, but the Philippine Government honoured its commitment to the United Nations and to the people of South Africa by denying visas to South African citizens who did not renounce in writing their Government's policies of *apartheid*. Needless to say, that had effectively prevented South African sportsmen from participating in any sports competition in the Philippines. Unless all countries decided to sever their economic and military links with the Pretoria régime, its isolation would not be complete and would, therefore, have little effect. As the Special Committee had observed, economic and other sanctions are the only alternative to force and the most effective means of persuading South Africa to respond to the voice of international public opinion. The anti-*apartheid* movement would succeed only if popular pressure was exerted on Governments and corporations maintaining trade, economic and military ties with South Africa. It was particularly important that anti-*apartheid* movements should be established in those countries, and his delegation reiterated its support for the General Assembly's call made in 1967 (resolution 2307 (XXII)) and for the similar recommendations made in the Special Committee's report. It endorsed the Special Committee's suggestion that non-governmental organizations should spotlight the activities of the offending corporations. It urged trade unions to oppose all trade with and investment in South Africa, and supported the idea of convening a conference of international trade union organizations on *apartheid* to coincide with the General Conference of the ILO in 1973. It also urged a more intensive information campaign, as suggested by the Special Committee, in the countries which were South Africa's trade partners. Then, perhaps, the companies and Governments concerned would listen to the voice of international public opinion

and contribute to the complete isolation of South Africa, which was the only way of ensuring that *apartheid* would be destroyed and its unfortunate victims liberated at last.

18. Mr. BUVIK (Norway) expressed regret that the United Nations had not yet been able to make South Africa abide by the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council on the abolition of *apartheid*. The international community should increase its efforts.

19. His Government had already declared its opposition to all forms of racial discrimination and to any ideology based on discrimination. Since the illusion of racial superiority thrived on prejudice and ignorance, it was most important that the United Nations should enlighten public opinion and co-ordinate national efforts in that direction.

20. His country regarded the OAU International Conference of Experts for the Support of Victims of Colonialism and *Apartheid*, to be held in Norway in 1973, as being of the utmost importance. The main purpose of the Conference would be to formulate policies intended to hasten the process of decolonization and the elimination of *apartheid* in Southern Africa. His delegation hoped that the conclusions reached by the Conference would be followed up by Governments, the United Nations, international and non-governmental organizations through a further commitment to the international campaign for the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination, and especially through the dissemination of information on the evils of the policy of *apartheid*.

21. At the previous session his delegation had given its full support to General Assembly resolution 2775 H (XXVI), concerning an international conference of trade unions on *apartheid*, and also to resolution 2775 D (XXVI) on *apartheid* in sports. As the report of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* stated, it was essential for every Member State to take some action in implementation of that resolution, if it were not to be defeated by inaction. Although the freedom of action of private organizations was guaranteed in the Norwegian Constitution, and the Government had thus only limited opportunities to influence such organizations, they had been fully informed of the resolutions relating to their activities. He noted with satisfaction that such a conference would be held during the ILO Conference in 1973 at Geneva. Since the Chairman of the International Organization of Employers had stated that the fight against all forms of racial discrimination was one of that organization's objectives, it was encouraging to note that the views of workers and employers on the question of *apartheid* seemed to have drawn closer together.

22. Turning to the question of trade and military relations between South Africa and other countries, he recalled that it was Norway which, in 1963, had initiated Security Council resolution 182 (1963), calling for an arms embargo against South Africa. Norway

was implementing that resolution and thought it regrettable that not all countries were doing so. He welcomed the fact that the Special Committee on *Apartheid* during its meetings in 1973 was to study collaboration with and assistance to South Africa by Governments and private enterprises. He also welcomed the Security Council's decision, in its resolution 311 (1972), to examine methods of resolving the situation arising out of the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa.

23. In that connexion, student demonstrations in a number of South African cities and the position taken by trade unions and some church groups were hopeful signs. His delegation was pleased that the Special Committee had been discussing with church organizations the role of churches in the international campaign against *apartheid*.

24. His delegation fully supported the appeal made by the Chairman of the Committee of Trustees of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa (809th meeting) for contributions to the Fund from all Member States in 1973. Not all the States which had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 2774 (XXVI) had contributed to the Fund. Contributions were undoubtedly within the financial capabilities of many more countries, including all the permanent members of the Security Council, and several countries could also increase their voluntary contributions.

25. In 1972 Norway had contributed \$54,000 to the Trust Fund. Subject to final approval by the Norwegian Parliament, his country's contribution would be increased in 1973.

26. Mr. CHUANG (China) pointed out that the militant unity of African countries and peoples in their just struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racism had won active support from the justice-upholding countries and peoples of Asia, Latin America and other regions, and his delegation considered that encouraging. From its very inception, the *apartheid* policy of the white colonialist authorities in southern Africa had aroused the people to righteous resistance which had never ceased, and which in the past year had produced general strikes involving half of the total working population of Namibia and a total stoppage of production at six of the eight major mines. In addition, tens of thousands of students, including white students, had organized protest meetings and demonstrations in defiance of bans imposed by the reactionary authorities and wanton repression by the police. The upsurge of the mass movement of South African workers and students marked a further awakening of the broad masses of the people in that region.

27. At the Security Council meetings in Africa, at the ninth ordinary session of the OAU Assembly, at the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, and at the eighth summit conference of East and Central African States, the policy of *apartheid* had been indignantly denounced and a series of resolutions had been adopted in support of the struggle of

the peoples of southern Africa. In that connexion, the peoples of Africa had registered a new victory in their struggle against neo-colonialism, colonialism and racism when the International Olympic Committee had decided to withdraw its invitation to Rhodesia to participate in the XXth Olympic Games. Those facts showed that the African peoples and the other peoples of the world were daily intensifying their struggle against imperialism and colonialism and against racial discrimination and *apartheid*, while the handful of racists in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia had met with increasingly wider condemnation and opposition and were in utter isolation.

28. In order to stamp out the liberation struggles and prolong their colonial and racist domination, reactionary forces invariably used the dual tactic of violent repression and political deception against revolutionary peoples. In recent years, the racist authorities in South Africa, while intensifying their internal repression, had undertaken, at the United Nations and on the international scene, deceptive propaganda and activities, as shown by the statement to the General Assembly by Mr. Muller, Minister for Foreign Affairs of that country. Political history and the current situation in South Africa proved that the so-called policy of "dialogue" with African countries, "internal dialogue" and "dialogue" with the United Nations was a sheer lie, a tactic to reinstate the old colonial policy of "divide and rule" and to end the isolation in which South Africa had now found itself. That policy was aimed at undermining the unity and struggle of the peoples and the countries of southern Africa against colonialism and racism, but a great many countries were not deceived.

29. By declaring that South Africa could not and would not compromise on the issue of terrorism and would fight it with all means at its disposal, as it had done in the past, Mr. Muller had barefacedly revealed that the colonialist authorities of that country were resorting to violent repression while talking about a sham "dialogue". China had never favoured the adventurist acts of terrorism by individuals, or a group of people, dissociated from the masses, because they were harmful to the cause of national liberation and people's revolution. But it firmly opposed the attempts to repress the people and to attack the just struggle of the oppressed nations for liberation under the guise of opposing terrorism. It was by terrorism that the South African racists had seized power and it was by terrorism that they were maintaining it. The European colonialists had succeeded in occupying that country by the sword and by fire and through innumerable sanguinary slaughters. The South African authorities had formulated a series of reactionary laws and decrees and had set up the most brutal and barbarous repressive organs to enforce a terrorist rule and to suppress the revolutionary struggle of the African people. A typical example was the tragic incident at Sharpeville, during which the South African police had killed 69 and wounded 178 people who were demonstrating against the pass laws. Obviously, the South African authorities' opposition to terrorism was, in essence, aimed at allowing the white colonialist authorities alone to use

violence against the revolutionaries in order to suppress the African people, while prohibiting them from resisting and from destroying the colonialist yoke by revolutionary violence. The fact was that they feared the awakening of the broad masses of the people who, once united, could resort to revolutionary violence. Countries and peoples that upheld justice could not allow South Africa, by crying out against terrorism, to camouflage its increasing repression in order to suppress the revolutionary struggle of the peoples of southern Africa and to perpetuate its colonial rule.

30. To defend the purposes and principles of the Charter, the United Nations should give active political, moral and material support to the people of southern Africa in their just struggle against colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism and for national liberation; the United Nations must severely condemn the white South African authorities and the imperialist Powers which were supporting them and it should strengthen the world-wide sanctions against the South African authorities. China regretted that most of the resolutions adopted by the United Nations had not been implemented owing to obstructions and sabotage by imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism. Through their struggle, the South African people had come to realize that the battle would be prolonged and difficult. However, as long as the masses were truly organized and mobilized and as long as they persevered in unity and in the struggle, the system of *apartheid* and colonial domination would inevitably be eliminated. The Chinese Government and people had consistently given their deep sympathy and firm support to the peoples of southern Africa in their just struggle against imperialism and colonialism and against racial discrimination and *apartheid*, and would continue to do so.

31. Mr. KIILU (Kenya) said that, despite the efforts of the international community to end the policy of the racist régime in South Africa, *apartheid* had grown stronger each year and had become a threat to international peace and security. He recalled the description of the explosive situation obtaining in South Africa given to the General Assembly at its 2038th plenary meeting, on 25 September 1972, by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kenya that the situation was analogous to the situation prevailing in Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Namibia and Guinea (Bissau).

32. He hoped that the report of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* (A/8722 and Add.1) would serve as an eye-opener to those nations that had continuously defied the efforts of the world community by supplying, despite the arms embargo called for by the Security Council, arms and military equipment, including aircraft. Most of that supply of arms originated from NATO countries, and his delegation viewed the re-activation of the naval base at Simonstown as a forward post of the NATO defences. He noted with grave concern, in annex II to the report, that most of South Africa's trading partners had increased their trade with that country, in 1970 and 1971, at a time when the opposite should have been the case.

33. On the other hand, it was encouraging to note the gallant measures taken by the Churches, trade unions and student organizations in spite of the oppressive measures taken by the régime; that régime was systematically victimizing, and employing torture measures against the opponents of *apartheid*. The report of the Special Committee on the maltreatment and torture of prisoners in South Africa (A/8770) was a catalogue of indiscriminate arrests, solitary confinement and cruel tortures inflicted on people whose only crime was a yearning for justice and fair play in a country that belonged to them.

34. Every year since the establishment of the Special Committee, pious resolutions had been adopted condemning the racist Pretoria régime. It was time for the United Nations to take positive action against South Africa and for South Africa's trading partners and sympathizers to realize that history would not forgive them for helping a ruthless régime which was oppressing millions of innocent people. While enjoying the profits derived from slave labour, South Africa's trading partners should not forget that they had been gained as a result of increasingly repressive measures. At the conclusion of the debate on the question of *apartheid*, the same Member States which were thwarting the efforts of the international community would join hands with others to adopt resolutions which they would flout with impunity. The only conclusion to be drawn from their action was that they had a double standard in discharging their international responsibilities. They were insensitive to human misery and were a party to a policy pursued by South Africa whose primary goal was to deny human rights to fellow human beings. *Apartheid* was triumphing in South Africa because some nations were unable to sacrifice their immediate economic interests when it was a question of human rights.

35. The South African régime contended that the purpose of establishing so-called Bantustans was to grant Africans independence at a later date. However, the Bantustans which had already achieved internal self-government were not in a better position than those being prepared for independence. South Africa understood the word "independence" to be synonymous with dependence. The Bantustans, which were located in arid lands, were not economically viable and only served to strengthen further the policy of *apartheid*. Their leaders had no say in the affairs of their areas and were directly under the Vorster régime. His country condemned the creation of the Bantustans, which served no useful purpose for the Africans, as well as the extension of *apartheid* to Rhodesia and the territory of Namibia.

36. The delegation of Kenya did not share the view of those which felt that to repeat suggestions made in the past concerning methods of combating *apartheid* served no useful purpose in view of the negative results obtained so far. So long as *apartheid* existed in South Africa, his delegation would never tire of making suggestions or repeating them, since the world at large

needed to be constantly reminded of the existence of that evil doctrine.

37. Since the racist régime was itself spending millions of dollars to spread its sick propaganda, his delegation would like to see the United Nations, which had a duty to safeguard human dignity, undertake a broad information programme—even if it proved expensive—to counteract that propaganda. There was a need to enlist the services of national radio broadcasting stations in the east and central African States neighbouring on South Africa, and similar programmes should be set up in Europe and Asia.

38. His delegation supported the suggestion made by the representative of Iraq (814th meeting) regarding comprehensive identification of all States that had diplomatic and other relations with South Africa. It deeply deplored the decision to reinstate the racist régime among the Davis Cup competitors. Kenya, for its part, had categorically refused to take part in any sports events in which South Africa participated. In that connexion, he noted that some of the States which had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 2775 D (XXVI) on *apartheid* in sports, or had not opposed it, had recently flouted it. So long as South Africa practised *apartheid*, it should be excluded from any international or national sports meetings.

39. His country had fully complied with all United Nations resolutions on southern Africa; if Kenya, a developing country, could curtail its trade with South Africa, why were the developed countries unable to do likewise? He appealed once again to those countries which were aiding the South African régime to review their position.

40. Mr. OULD SIDI (Mauritania) said that he wished to draw attention to three key elements in the excellent report of the Special Committee: first, the Special Committee's activities and the efforts it was making in the world to make it clearly understood that the abominable system of *apartheid* was a crime; secondly, international action against *apartheid*, which was constantly growing in scope; and, thirdly, in the absence of any progress towards a peaceful solution of the problem, the conclusions and recommendations which the Committee would like to see adopted. The information gathered by the Special Committee indicated that the application of repressive measures in South Africa had been intensified, and the General Assembly, at its twenty-sixth session, had expressed the indignation which it felt at the maltreatment inflicted on opponents of *apartheid* in South Africa. Only the tribulations of the courageous Palestinian people could be compared to the sufferings of the South African blacks: the two brother peoples, whose destiny could not be dissociated, were subjected to oppression and deprived of the most elementary rights. The Pretoria régime had been able to strengthen its military machine thanks to the collaboration of the Western Powers, which were ignoring the arms embargo proclaimed by the Security Council, expanding their trade with South Africa and investing capital in that country; in so doing, they were forgetting

that by assisting the powerful, one often helped to intensify the servitude of the poor.

41. In order to eliminate once and for all a policy which was a crime against humanity and a threat to world peace, it was the duty of all to unite, to increase aid to the resistance movements within and outside South Africa and to co-ordinate international action to combat the *apartheid* system. Within the framework of such international action, the Special Committee was increasing its consultations with experts and its contacts with the representatives of the oppressed population of South Africa as well as with anti-*apartheid* movements and those non-governmental organizations which were concerned with the campaign against *apartheid*. In the nine-point programme adopted in connexion with the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, the Special Committee had indicated what it hoped to obtain from the co-operation of Member States, specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations (see A/8722, para. 26).

42. The African countries expected much from that international solidarity, which they felt they were entitled to demand, considering it inconceivable that privileges of another era acquired under the fallacious pretext of an alleged racial superiority could be perpetuated in the present day. His delegation earnestly hoped that the repeated appeals of the United Nations and the Special Committee for the strengthening of international solidarity in favour of the anti-*apartheid* struggle would be heeded, so that, as the President of Mauritania had said in the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session (1938th plenary meeting), men might look forward to the fulfilment of the generous hope which remained the most decisive asset for the attainment of a better world and which, in any event, the Africans were determined to promote through the force of their co-operation, their labour and their sacrifices, but also through the assistance that other men would be able to give them.

43. Mr. BILNEY (Australia) wished to clarify a point raised the previous meeting by the Cuban representative, who—assuming that the English interpretation was correct—had referred to a projected alliance in which South Africa, Australia and other countries would allegedly participate. In order to remove any possible doubt in the matter, he reaffirmed, as the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Australia had already had occasion to do, that Australia, which had always scrupulously observed the provisions of the Security Council arms embargo resolutions, did not have any defence agreement whatever with South Africa and had no intention of negotiating any such agreement.

44. Mr. ZOHRAB (New Zealand) referred to the comments made at the preceding meeting by the Cuban representative who had spoken of a project for a military alliance with South Africa in which New Zealand would allegedly participate. His delegation wished to make it clear that no such project existed and that his country had never contemplated an alliance of that

kind. New Zealand intended to continue to comply with the provisions of the Security Council resolutions on the arms embargo.

45. Mrs. GONZÁLEZ (Cuba) said that at the previous meeting her delegation had expressed concern at the possible conclusion of a South Atlantic military pact which would have the effect of strengthening the

racist Pretoria régime. She regarded the clarifications offered by the representatives of Australia and New Zealand as a pledge that their countries would not promote the maintenance of the economic and military order established in southern Africa.

*The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.*