

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-NINTH YEAR

1800th

MEETING: 24 OCTOBER 1974

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1800)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Relationship between the United Nations and South Africa:	
(a) Letter dated 30 September 1974 from the President of the General Assembly to the President of the Security Council (S/11525);	
(b) Letter dated 9 October 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11532)	1

20 p

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

EIGHTEEN HUNDREDTH MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 24 October 1974, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Michel NJINÉ
(United Republic of Cameroon).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Austria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Costa Rica, France, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya, Mauritania, Peru, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon and United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1800)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Relationship between the United Nations and South Africa:
 - (a) Letter dated 30 September 1974 from the President of the General Assembly to the President of the Security Council (S/11525);
 - (b) Letter dated 9 October 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11532)

The meeting was called to order at 11.15 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Relationship between the United Nations and South Africa:

- (a) Letter dated 30 September 1974 from the President of the General Assembly to the President of the Security Council (S/11525);
- (b) Letter dated 9 October 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11532)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decisions taken previously [1796th-1798th meetings], under Article 31 of the Charter and in accordance with the pertinent provisions of the provisional rules of procedure, I invite the representatives of Algeria, Bangladesh, Barbados, the Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, India, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritius, Morocco, Nigeria, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, the Syrian Arab Republic,

Tunisia, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, the United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia and Zaire to participate, without the right to vote, in the Council's discussion of the question before it.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Rahal (Algeria), Mr. Karim (Bangladesh), Mr. Waldron-Ramsey (Barbados), Mr. Mondjo (Congo), Mr. Alarcón (Cuba), Mr. Smid (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Adjibadé (Dahomey), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Florin (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Boatén (Ghana), Mrs. Jeanne Martin Cissé (Guinea), Mr. Jackson (Guyana), Mr. Jaipal (India), (Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mr. Traoré (Mali), Mr. Ramphul (Mauritius), Mr. Slaoui (Morocco), Mr. Oghu (Nigeria), Mr. Jamal (Qatar), Mr. Baroody (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Palmer (Sierra Leone), Mr. Hussein (Somalia), Mr. Botha (South Africa), Mr. Kelani (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Driss (Tunisia), Mr. Kinene (Uganda), Mr. Hamaidan (United Arab Emirates), Mr. Salim (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Yaguibou (Upper Volta), Mr. Petrić (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Mutuale (Zaire) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Furthermore, I wish to inform the members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic requesting that his delegation also should be invited, under Article 31 of the Charter and the pertinent provisions of the provisional rules of procedure, to participate, without the right to vote, in the Council's discussion. In accordance with the customary practice, and with the assent of the Council, I propose to invite this representative to participate, without the right to vote, in our discussion.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Maghur (Libyan Arab Republic) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The first speaker is the representative of Uganda. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

4. Mr. KINENE (Uganda): Mr. President, allow me on behalf of my delegation to express to you, and through you to the members of the Council, my gratitude for giving my delegation an opportunity

to participate in the Council's deliberations on the crucial and important item before it. Your presidency confers honour on and earns praise for not only you and your country but also all of Africa, and the more so in that you are presiding over a debate that is so crucial to the very meaning and survival of this Organization and so dear to our hearts and the minds of all peace-loving countries of the world. Your personal qualities as a diplomat make you eminently qualified to guide this debate to its logical and successful end.

5. Allow me, on behalf of my delegation, to express to the delegation of Iraq our deep-felt sorrow at the sudden demise of their distinguished Foreign Minister.

6. It is now over 60 years since the then colonial Power in South Africa, namely the United Kingdom shamelessly sold out the indigenous people of that unfortunate country to a racist white minority composed of fortune-seekers. It is not my intention at this stage to enter into details about what has been taking place ever since. The Security Council and the United Nations, for that matter, has a wealth of documentary evidence about what has been taking place in that country. I only want to remind the members of the Council that at this moment, when the Council is specifically meeting in order to review the relationship between the United Nations and the racist régime of Pretoria, thousands and thousands of innocent people are being subjected to the most inhuman and most cruel treatment that man has ever been subjected to at the hands of the neo-Nazi régime of Pretoria. This is taking place right now in the concentration camps erected by the Vorster régime on Robben Island and elsewhere in South Africa. I shall only mention the names of just a few of those unfortunate victims of the racist régime of Pretoria about whom the world sometimes seems to forget: John Nyati Pokela, Samuel Chibane, John Nkosi, Matthew Mодоena, Isaac Mtimunye, Nelson Mandela, Walter Sisulu, and many others.

7. The Security Council is meeting to re-examine the relationship between on the one hand, the United Nations, the Organization that stands for, among other things, peace and equal rights of men and women and, on the other, the minority racist régime in Pretoria, which preaches and practises hate, degradation and injustice through its inhuman policy of *apartheid*, which has proved beyond any doubt that it is *ultra vires* the very principles that the Organization stands for. It is a historical challenge to this Council and a great test of its ability and authority. It is a serious and high call that demands boldness and courage in the best interests of international peace and security.

8. The question of the inhuman consequences of a repressive policy of *apartheid* practised by the Pretoria racist, minority régime remains the most deplorable

threat to international peace and security to date. It remains the most blatant challenge to the very principles and ideals of the Charter of the United Nations and the future survival and effectiveness of the Organization.

9. The policy of *apartheid* as practised by the racist minority régime in Pretoria is not a new situation. It is almost as old as the United Nations itself. There is no way or method that has not been tried, both within this Organization and elsewhere, to persuade the minority régime to change its inhuman policies of *apartheid*. On the contrary, the régime has intensified its barbaric policies through the most inhuman methods—methods unknown since the Nazi period.

10. While introducing the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*, the Chairman of the Special Committee on *Apartheid*, Mr. Ogebe Ogbu, said:

"For almost a quarter of a century the United Nations and the international community have tried patiently to persuade the racist white minority régime to abandon its inhuman policy of racial discrimination and segregation. Again and again, it was warned to desist from its oppression of the overwhelming majority of the people of South Africa and Namibia. It has not only rejected the appeals and demands, but proceeded to impose the criminal policy of *apartheid* with increasing ruthlessness and brutality. The international community has now been obliged to recognize and affirm that the racist régime is not intransigent but incorrigible. There can be no freedom and no peace in South Africa and southern Africa without more effective action to curb and punish the racists who continue to inflict untold harm on millions of people and subject the leaders of the oppressed people to vengeful persecution."

This was a preamble, so to speak, expressing the international outcry against the tragic events in South Africa. It reflected the seriousness mankind attaches to the evil intentions and consequences of that policy. So deep was the concern of the international community and so blatant and arrogant has been the régime's defiance of that outcry that this very Organization outlawed the policy of *apartheid* and declared it a crime in the said International Convention, adopted by the General Assembly on 30 November 1973 [resolution 3068 (XXV III)].

11. The illegal occupation of Namibia by the Vorster régime in complete defiance of the decisions and the dignity of the International Court of Justice confirms once again the type of régime we are requesting the Council to expel. The blatant violation of all the Council and General Assembly resolutions in regard to Namibia is yet another grave situation that must be borne in mind by the Council in its current

deliberations. It was stated and confirmed by the highest court of the international community that Namibia is the responsibility of the United Nations. Not only has the Pretoria régime occupied Namibia illegally and by the use of force, but it has introduced into that Territory the deplorable bantustan policy.

12. The régime has done this with no regard whatsoever to the aspirations and wishes of the indigenous people of that Territory. The régime has plundered and robbed the natural wealth of the country. As the process of plunder and illegal occupation continues, the African people have been put into a state of complete slavery. As the policy of *apartheid* intensifies, all sorts of repressive laws are enacted including the notorious pass laws that bring back to us bitter memories of the Sharpeville massacres of the 1960s. In Namibia, as in South Africa itself, families have been inhumanly divided, mother from son, husband from wife. This has been made possible by the notorious labour laws. The problem of Namibia must remain a challenge to the capacity, willingness and authority of the Organization.

13. The Smith clique would have thought twice before unilaterally declaring independence had it not been for the unqualified support and encouragement given to it by the Pretoria régime. The Pretoria régime has continued to support the illegal actions of an illegal régime in Salisbury. The Vorster régime has blatantly refused to observe the mandatory resolutions of the Council imposing economic and diplomatic sanctions on the illegal régime in Salisbury. In so doing the biggest violator has had the audacity to export its criminal policies of *apartheid* and inhuman laws to other areas to prove perhaps the completeness of its ability to defy the authority and dignity of the United Nations. It has continued to give economic and military aid to the rebels in Rhodesia. As if that were not enough, the Vorster régime has sent soldiers to Rhodesia to fight side by side against the innocent and legitimate citizens of Zimbabwe.

14. The practice of *apartheid* in South Africa is a criminal conspiracy involving not only the minority white racist in South Africa but also some big and powerful Western Powers. Its perpetuation is dictated by the economic greed of those Powers. The representatives of those Powers always sit in this Council mockingly pretending that they share our concern over the question of *apartheid* in South Africa. Yet deep down in their hearts they know that they support and will continue to support the policy of *apartheid* in South Africa as the guarantee for their continued plundering of the enormous resources of that unfortunate African country. The system of *apartheid* is therefore a well-organized international criminal syndicate directed at plundering the wealth of South Africa by the cruellest possible machinery.

15. The agony of the suffering millions in South Africa has been so great and the price so high that

the international community must rise up now and defend its rights and live up to its obligations and duties. That duty is the discharge of the sacred responsibility of the Council to pronounce itself without fear or favour on a deplorable situation which has been declared by several resolutions of the Council, the General Assembly and other organs to be a serious threat to international peace and security. It remains an indisputable fact that the situation in South Africa is a threat to international peace and security. This is the strong conviction of my Government, and indeed the unanimous verdict of the Organization of African Unity and all peace-loving peoples.

16. It is because of this situation that we are calling on the indulgence and wisdom of the Council to invoke Article 6 of the Charter and expel the representatives of the Vorster régime from the United Nations. This, in the view of my delegation, is the only option open to the Council, as an initial step towards correcting the obnoxious policy of this régime. This, in the view of my delegation, would be a meaningful and firm warning to a stubborn régime that understands nothing but oppression, degradation and injustice.

17. The Council, in reviewing the relationship between the Organization and the racist minority régime in Pretoria, is being charged with the responsibility of assessing the compatibility of the principle of the universality of the Organization with the practice and execution of the obnoxious policy of *apartheid*. The Uganda Government believes that the magnitude of the issue before this Council must therefore be matched by equally bold and courageous decisions. It is a further contention of my Government that the only initial decision this Council can take is to be bold and magnanimous enough to invoke the provisions of Article 6 of the Charter, which empowers the Security Council to recommend to the General Assembly that a State Member of the Organization which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present Charter to be expelled from the Organization. The Pretoria régime not only has persistently violated the principles contained in the Charter of the Organization but has done so with impunity and alarming ease.

18. It is a sacred duty of the Council to live up to its obligations and dignity and deliver a just and long overdue judgement by removing the seeds of evil that threaten the very existence and usefulness of the Organization.

19. Should such a warning not hasten change, the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 6 should form a basis for more punitive action. This paragraph states clearly that the Organization shall ensure that States which are not Members of the United Nations act in accordance with the principles set out in the preceding paragraphs of the Article, so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international

peace and security. It is the contention of the Uganda Government that the punitive measure open to the Council would be to invoke the weight and meaning of Chapter VII of the Charter, particularly Articles 39 and 42.

20. Invoking those provisions would be adequate and appropriate punitive action against a régime that has violated every provision of the Charter and defied the authority and dignity of the United Nations with impunity for the last 28 years. It would be a victory for the Organization and the dignity of man. We are calling on the Council to discharge its sacred responsibilities without fear or favour and not to betray the noble trust of the international community, as set out in Article 24 of the Charter. That noble trust conferred upon the Council is the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security on behalf of the Members of the Organization.

21. The fact that the policy of *apartheid* has lasted so long and become so ruthless in its methods is the result mainly of economic, military and moral accommodation and direct involvement by colonial, Zionist and imperialist Powers. This very Council, the General Assembly and other organs of the United Nations have been continuously adopting meaningful resolutions, but their application and effects have been undermined and blocked by some big Powers, most of which, as we all know, are founder Members of the Organization and some of which are also permanent members of the Security Council. My delegation does not find it necessary to name those Powers, since they are very well known to all of us. Those Powers have by their actions nursed and petted the Pretoria régime, in complete disregard and violation of the authority and dignity of the Organization.

22. In paragraph 7 of its resolution 3151 G (XXVIII) of 14 December 1973 on the situation in South Africa resulting from the policies of *apartheid*, the General Assembly

“Condemnes the actions of States which, by their continued political, military, economic and other collaboration with the South African régime, encourage it to persist in its inhuman and criminal policies, and calls upon them urgently to cease all such collaboration with South Africa”.

We therefore learned with deep sorrow and indignation that, despite that resolution and many others before it, Her Majesty's forces recently carried out a joint military and naval exercise with Vorster's soldiers.

23. It is that kind of attitude and action by some Member States, especially some permanent members of the Security Council, that gives comfort and strength to the evil forces of *apartheid*, enabling them to flourish and continuously to violate all the

decisions of the Organization. We are deeply disturbed at the contradictions between those Powers' words and their deeds in relation to the elimination of *apartheid*. While they continue to express “abhorrence” for *apartheid*, they go on giving it the material and moral support it needs in order to continue its oppression of the majority of the people in South Africa. It remains a strange phenomenon that those who are protectors of and shareholders in a Fascist régime like Vorster's should also be trusted with the power to deliver a verdict on that very régime. It is ironic to note that they are the same Powers that fought nazism in the Second World War.

24. Finally, on behalf of the Uganda Government, I should like to call for the following measures.

25. First, the members of the Council, and particularly those permanent members which continuously assist the Vorster régime, should stop applying double standards and start matching their words by their deeds. They must live up to the sacred duties demanded of them under Article 24 of the Charter.

26. Secondly, the Council must realize that the policies of *apartheid* are incompatible with all that the Charter stands for and are definitely a threat to international peace. Thus the Council must invoke without delay the provisions of Article 6, following that with the application of Chapter VII, particularly Articles 39 and 42. It is the conviction of my Government that the situation in South Africa and the régime's activities within and outside South Africa are a definite danger to peace, and, with regard to Namibia, are an act of aggression. Thus, after expulsion of that régime, the weight of Article 42 should be applied as the only appropriate punitive action. This, to us, is the only fair step this Council in its wisdom can take—if not for anything else, at least for the survival of our Organization and the suffering millions in South Africa and Namibia. My Government, as we have stated before, believes that there is no other punishment short of military intervention.

27. It will be the greatest hour for the Council, and indeed for the Organization, if for once human considerations can override material considerations and reason can replace prejudices, whether based on race, or other considerations. The Council is being requested to remove evil from good, and this is indeed a test of the Council's ability to carry out the obligations entrusted to it by Member States under Article 24 of the Charter. We in Africa, together with all peace- and freedom-loving peoples all over the world, will continue to use all ways and means at our disposal to assist the liberation struggle in South Africa and Namibia to its just and logical conclusion, no matter whether a veto is exercised in this Council to block the march to freedom and victory.

28. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Yugoslavia.

whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

29. Mr. PETRIĆ (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, I congratulate you on having assumed the functions of President of the Security Council at a moment when the Council is discussing a question of great importance to the United Nations and to the struggle of people for liberation and of man for his rights and dignity. At the same time, I wish to thank the Council for enabling me to set forth the views of my delegation on the important question that is now on its agenda.

30. The Council is now faced with a historic decision. On 30 September 1974, the General Assembly adopted, by an overwhelming majority, resolution 3207 (XXIX) calling upon the Council to review the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa in the light of the constant violation by South Africa of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It is the first time the General Assembly has done so.

31. South Africa violates the basic principles of the Charter and pursues policies that disqualify it in all respects from being a Member of the world Organization. What is involved here is a country that is represented in the United Nations by a racist white minority régime. When referring to South Africa's violations of the Charter of the United Nations and its expulsion from this Organization, we are actually talking about the expulsion of the racist white minority régime. The majority of the people of South Africa are not represented in the United Nations by this régime, but are merely objects of the aggressive system of *apartheid* imposed upon them by the white racists, who have deprived them of the possibility of speaking and acting in the United Nations as true representatives of South Africa.

32. The white racist régime in South Africa pursues, institutionalizes, constitutionally and juridically legalizes and, by coercion and punitive measures, maintains the system of *apartheid*, this most brutal form of racial discrimination against the vast majority of the non-white population, that is, against more than 17 million people. It is a socio-economic system that wholly negates all the fundamental human rights and freedoms enunciated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and is based on the enslavement of peoples and human beings. Such a system is in direct contradiction to the principles of the Charter embodied in the Preamble as well as in contravention of Article 1, which emphasizes that one of the basic objectives of the United Nations is to achieve international co-operation in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion; further, it is in contravention of Article 55 of the Charter, which stresses that the United Nations shall promote universal respect for, and observance of, human

rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion, and, consequently, in contradiction of Article 56, dealing with the obligations of Member States, which all pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in co-operation with the Organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in Article 55.

33. The racist régime in South Africa, which represents that country in the United Nations, has persistently ignored the numerous resolutions adopted by the Security Council in which the Council has called upon it to put an end forthwith to racial discrimination, which is in contravention of the Charter, of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and of South Africa's obligations as a Member State.

34. Following the same policy of an arrogant attitude towards the United Nations, South Africa has also completely ignored the numerous resolutions whereby the General Assembly has condemned the policy of *apartheid* that South Africa has been pursuing in violation of its obligations as a Member State, and proclaimed *apartheid* to be a "crime against humanity".

35. In response to the actions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, the Pretoria régime continues to strengthen the legal, economic, social and repressive bases of the system of *apartheid*. By its massive military build-up—with direct or indirect assistance from well-known quarters abroad, which are thereby assuming the gravest possible responsibility for the consequences of continued *apartheid* rule and of this régime's activities—it clearly reveals its intention to defend *apartheid* and the enslavement of millions of non-white people against the will of the people concerned and against the will of the United Nations and the international community as a whole. In addition, South Africa has brazenly imposed *apartheid* on Namibia.

36. By all these actions South Africa has, for a number of years, been violating one of the basic principles of the Charter and one of the pillars on which the United Nations is founded, namely, the principle of equality and equal rights for all without distinction as to sex, race or religion.

37. Furthermore, for many years South Africa has been violating yet another of the Charter's fundamental principles on which the United Nations is based and from which contemporary international law proceeds, namely, the obligation of the Member States, enshrined in Article 2 of the Charter, to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity of any State.

38. South Africa constantly threatens and endangers the territorial integrity of independent African States because these countries assist the struggle against

apartheid, which they are doing in keeping with the numerous resolutions that the Security Council and the General Assembly have adopted to that end.

39. South Africa continues the illegal occupation of Namibia, ignoring all Security Council and General Assembly resolutions condemning its illegal occupation and demanding that South Africa withdraw its forces from the Territory and enable the people of Namibia to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence.

40. At the same time, contrary to the decision of the United Nations, South Africa has sent troops to Southern Rhodesia to support the illegal racist régime of Ian Smith in its efforts to ensure its continued oppression of the majority of the African population of Zimbabwe.

41. South Africa has directly, openly, and in a wholesale manner violated the sanctions imposed by the Security Council against the illegal racist régime of the white minority in Southern Rhodesia. South Africa is thereby infringing one of the fundamental principles of the Charter embodied in Article 2, paragraph 5—namely, that every Member State shall refrain from giving assistance to any State against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action.

42. In opposing the decisions of the Security Council, South Africa has violated its obligations under Article 25 of the Charter, which demands from all the Member States to agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Council in accordance with the Charter. And the racist régime of South Africa has done all this consciously, publicly and deliberately in the face of the Council and the General Assembly which have, in their numerous resolutions and decisions, called it to order and demanded that it should fulfil its obligations as a Member State.

43. By its racist policy, illegal occupation of Namibia, intervention in Southern Rhodesia and violation of United Nations sanctions, its constant threat to the security and independence of neighbouring African States, South Africa constitutes a serious threat to peace and security in the region, and even beyond.

44. Consequently, we have before us the case of a State that fails to accept the provisions of the Charter and to fulfil the obligations arising therefrom. Precisely for these reasons, South Africa was forced to leave, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the International Labour Organisation and other specialized agencies.

45. In accordance with our policy of non-alignment, based on the decisions of the Conference of the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held in Algiers from 5 to 9 September

1973 we fully support all actions leading to the eradication of *apartheid*, this most sinister form of negation of the human person and his dignity.

46. The Security Council bears a great moral and political responsibility in taking a decision in this case, a decision in order to defend the principles on which the Charter is based. Such a decision by the Council would contribute to the strengthening of the Charter and of the United Nations. By expelling the South Africa of today from the Organization, we would, in fact expel its racist régime. We fully support the position of the Organization of African Unity to that effect. We believe that, in the not-too-distant future, the people of South Africa will achieve their right to full freedom and, enjoying full equal rights, will take their seat in the United Nations and their rightful place in the international community.

47. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of South Africa. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

48. Mr. BOTHA (South Africa): Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity given to me to participate in the Security Council. I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the current month. It is a fitting mark of distinction for yourself, for your country and for Africa.

49. Our position in regard to Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter is well known. It is on record and I need therefore say no more than that our participation in these proceedings, insofar as they relate to the internal affairs of South Africa, should not be construed to mean that we have changed our position in regard to that Article, but should be seen as flowing from our willingness to discuss our differences with other countries which are genuinely interested in a constructive solution of them and are prepared to talk with us openly and objectively.

50. It is particularly to these countries that we address ourselves today, and more especially to the States of Africa. For we are an African State. It is in Africa, where we live and where we belong, that our destiny lies. We have an important identity of interest with the other States of Africa. It is with them that we must talk and we firmly believe that all of us in Africa can only gain by communication with one another.

51. Let us not beat about the bush. The only choice we have before us is either to continue on the present sterile course of confrontation and recrimination, or to make a sincere endeavour to get together, to listen to the other man's point of view with an open mind, and to try to break through the suspicions, the misunderstandings and the misconceptions which have for so long divided us. Communication or

confrontation? Harmony or the escalation of strife? That is our choice—our only choice.

52. I shall speak frankly here today. And I do so in the belief that the African and other members of the Council and Organization will appreciate frankness from me in the same way that I appreciate it from them. In that spirit, I believe, we may yet come together even if we do not agree. Let us not delude ourselves—there are no easy solutions. But my Government stands ready to explore all avenues which may bring about an understanding amongst us.

53. The Council has been asked to review the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa in the light of our alleged violation of the principles of the Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

54. What valid reason can be advanced for singling out South Africa's relations with the United Nations for review by the Security Council? There is none. This is really just a political move in the vendetta being conducted by certain Members of the United Nations against my Government.

55. I ask you to consider briefly some of the developments in the world in the period since the United Nations has been concerning itself with South Africa's affairs. Several wars have been fought on four continents; numerous governments have been forced from office by unconstitutional means, frequently involving violence and bloodshed; countries have been occupied by the armed forces of foreign Powers; population groups in a number of countries have turned on each other with ferocity, and so on. In the most important spheres of human life the world is faced with a number of crises: underdevelopment, illiteracy, famine, pollution, and many related socio-economic problems to which the world's most responsible and best qualified commentators foresee no immediate solution. Many think we may be on the brink of a world economic catastrophe of unprecedented proportions and incalculable consequences, political as well as socio-economic.

56. It is towards such situations and matters that one, in all seriousness, would expect the Council to turn its urgent attention, not towards South Africa, which in no way constitutes a threat to international peace, and where, although we have our problems, we are well on our way to solving them in a peaceful manner.

57. It is said that we have disregarded resolutions of the United Nations organs. But next to nothing is said of the nature and quality of the information and documentation upon which those resolutions were based. Closer analysis will show that the material in question is unbelievably one-sided, that it is uniformly hostile to South Africa, that it is often com-

pletely unsubstantiated and that much of it emanated from persons and bodies known for their biased opposition to South Africa's policies. On the other hand, information favourable to South Africa was simply ignored.

58. In consequence, the resolutions in question were based on inadequate, prejudiced and often grossly distorted information—information which was certainly not tested and objectively weighed in order to separate facts from ignorant or malicious misrepresentations. To say this is not to suggest that conditions in South Africa cannot be improved, or that we have not made mistakes, or that there is no need for change there; but it does point up the complete one-sidedness of the virulent attacks made upon us in the Organization.

59. Members of the Council will better appreciate my point if I illustrate it. If one's only source of information is the reports of the Special Committee on *Apartheid*, and those other United Nations bodies which are continually discussing South African affairs, one must inevitably be left with the impression of an absolute tyranny by whites over blacks in South Africa; of white South Africans dedicatedly pursuing policies of genocide, slavery, torture, terror, persecution, hatred, forced labour, unmitigated racism, starvation and inhumanity against black South Africans; the impression that everything the South African Government does is inherently evil; that the policy of the Government is an international crime and a threat to peace; that it degrades the black man and consigns him to a destiny of poverty, want and illiteracy; that it holds out no prospect of improvement, no political rights; that it has no regard for human rights of any kind; that the whole system is cruelly enforced by a secret police force and a powerful army; and that it has as its object the perpetual entrenchment of white superiority. It is no exaggeration to say that that is the picture which emerges from the sources to which I have referred.

60. But surely not even the most prejudiced Members of the United Nations can believe that a picture of such unmitigated terror and oppression can really be true, for how can such a picture possibly be reconciled with the observable conditions prevailing in South Africa, with readily available and indisputable facts and figures, many of which emanate from technical and statistical documentation of the Organization itself?

61. Why is it, if the position of the blacks in South Africa is really so intolerable, that hundreds of thousands of black workers from other countries of Africa voluntarily come to South Africa for employment—many of them entering the country illegally for that purpose? Why is it that according to figures as at 1 January 1972, released by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees,

there were a mere 300 refugees from South Africa out of a total of almost 1 million refugees in Africa?

62. Can it be denied that the wage gap between black and white is being continually narrowed and that it is the Government itself which is taking an active lead in the matter? The figures will prove it. Is it denied that black leaders, chosen by majorities of their own people, freely and often criticize the South African Government, in public and in private, on many aspects of its policies? The Organization seizes upon such criticism. But let such a leader come to the General Assembly as a member of the South African delegation and he suddenly becomes a "stooge" or a "puppet".

63. Is it not manifest that millions and millions of rand are spent in South Africa to provide free or virtually free medical services to the blacks? In the financial year 1972/73, \$282 million was expended by public undertakings on health services for the black, Coloured and Indian peoples. Need it be recorded that South Africa has never experienced famine? South Africa is virtually self-sufficient in food-stuffs of a quality comparable with the world's best.

64. The school enrolment figures for black pupils more than doubled from 1950 to 1960 and more than doubled again from 1960 to 1973, so that even in a period of rapidly increasing population the percentage of children of school-going age increased from 45 per cent in 1954 to 75 per cent in 1974. The combined rate of population growth of the black peoples of South Africa is 3.23 per cent, which is among the highest in Africa.

65. We are accused of defying the United Nations and world opinion, of paying no heed whatsoever to resolutions of the Organization—indeed, of adopting a provocative and challenging attitude towards the world body. This is just not so. We are receptive to constructive criticism or suggestions from any country or body in the world which is genuinely interested in the welfare of the peoples of South Africa—and that includes the United Nations. But would any Government anywhere react positively to the flood of accusations and condemnatory resolutions of the nature that I have mentioned, when it must be realized, even by circles in the Organization itself, that the allegations on which they are based are exaggerated, untrue and even wilfully misrepresented?

66. Not for a moment do I wish to pretend that everything in our country is right but to accuse us of the most evil designs and practices when we have improved the living conditions of all our peoples to the extent that we have, when my Government is making sincere and positive attempts to improve and develop the economic, social and political conditions of all these peoples, not just some of them, and to safeguard their future, engenders the strongest suspicion that what some Members of this Organization aim at is not so much the advancement

of the peoples of our region as the pursuance of their own selfish political ends. It is in regard to these very real efforts of ours that we consider that Members of the Organization, and in particular many of our fellow African States, have displayed towards us an unjustified antagonism and a lack of tolerance, of interest in and understanding of our ultimate objectives. They have, we feel, not responded to, nor given us any credit or recognition at all for what we are trying to do in order to give to every person in our country, black and white, a fair deal from life. On the contrary, many of these Members simply ignore the important changes which have occurred and are occurring in South Africa. Information about them seems sometimes to be deliberately suppressed.

67. It would be naive to pretend that I do not know why it is that Members of the Organization, especially the African Members, display towards us this antagonism, this lack of good will. It is basically because these Members think that the whites of South Africa have some inborn hatred of and prejudice against the blacks, that they consider themselves to be superior to or in some way better than the blacks, and that on these grounds they discriminate against them in order to deny them fundamental rights and freedoms.

68. I shall return to that point. For the moment let me just state categorically that whatever the attitude of the white man to the black man in the past might have been, that is not the attitude of the vast majority of white South Africans today.

69. I should first like to outline how our policy of multinational development came about and on what it is based. I do so in order to put our policies in proper perspective.

70. Towards the middle of the seventeenth century the white and black peoples of southern Africa converged in what was then an almost uninhabited part of the continent. On the whole the tendency was for the white people as well as the various black peoples to settle in distinct parts of the country. They were at different stages of development; all had their own institutions of government, land settlement and land ownership, traditions, cultures, languages and economies; and for almost 150 years there was virtually no contact between black and white.

71. During the nineteenth century, when the Cape of Good Hope had become a British colony, the black areas of the eastern Cape were annexed by the British authorities and the nations concerned were henceforth administered separately and not as integral portions of the Cape Colony. This basic position remained virtually unchanged until these nations were given more and more powers of self-government by the South African Government. One of these nations,

the Transkei, has recently formally requested the South African Government to set in motion the constitutional machinery to bring that country to full independence within five years and that has been done.

72. A historic movement called the Great Trek started in 1836 when white farmers of the Cape Colony moved northwards, passing around the southernmost black peoples and crossing the Orange and Vaal Rivers until they reached the Limpopo River in the north, the Kalahari desert in the west and Natal in the east. The areas through which they trekked were for the most part completely uninhabited. These are historical facts. This was due to what the blacks of South Africa still call the "mfekane", which means "the crushing". Over a period of 15 years, from approximately 1820, terrible devastation of these areas had taken place as a result of wars between the various black peoples, not between black and white. Mzilikazi, a lieutenant of the Zulu king, Shaka, who had fled from his former master, subsequently completed this devastation and annihilated the African tribes living there.

73. The Trekkers did not by force or otherwise drive blacks away from land occupied by them except in the case of Mzilikazi and his Matabeles, who fled to and settled in the present Rhodesia. In cases in which there was any doubt as to claims to land, the Trekkers, and later the Governments of the Orange Free State and the Transvaal Republics, negotiated with the peoples concerned.

74. Thus, the foundations were laid for future political developments. In the Transvaal a Convention was signed in 1852 between the British and Boer leaders acknowledging the latter's independence. A Convention of 1854 granted independence to the Republic of the Orange Free State.

75. In 1899, war broke out between Britain and the two Boer Republics. For almost three years South Africa became the scene of one of the fiercest struggles ever waged on the African continent. When peace came in 1902, the two Republics had lost their independence. Almost 35,000 Boer men, women and children died in that war while Britain suffered 98,000 casualties. The two Republics were in ruins; the cost of the war to friend and foe was immense. This is not the sort of conflagration we ever want to see repeated.

76. Thus, at the beginning of the twentieth century the whole of the southern part of the African continent came under the jurisdiction of one Power. It comprised the Cape and Natal colonies, the two conquered Boer Republics of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, as well as three black protectorates: Swaziland, Bechuanaland, and Basutoland. British South Africa, as it was called, spread over the whole subcontinent. This huge area was then the home of a number of

peoples differing in ethnic composition, language, culture and history. The total surface area was over 1.8 million square kilometres, which is larger than the United Kingdom, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Portugal, Switzerland, Austria, Denmark, the Netherlands, and Belgium combined.

77. In 1910 the Union of South Africa was created when an Act of the British Parliament united the four colonies of Natal, the Transvaal, the Orange Free State and the Cape. The British Act noted the fact that the three protectorates of Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland formed an economic and geographic whole with the Union. Constitutionally, this Union was to a large extent an artificial creation. Excluded were the three protectorates, but included were nine other black peoples and their territories, as well as the whites.

78. In regard to the remaining black territories within the Union, an Act was passed in 1913 to define and schedule some 8.9 million hectares of land in the four provinces as inalienable black areas. This was the recognition of an historical fact; it was not done for ideological reasons, just as Lesotho, Botswana and Swaziland were not created for ideological reasons. In 1936, a further 6.3 million hectares of land were earmarked for addition to the black territories.

79. It is true that the black territories consist of only about 13 per cent of the land area of the present South Africa, but it is also true that this area includes nearly half of the country's most fertile soil. And it is further true that if the total area of the former British South Africa is taken into consideration, black territories comprise almost 50 per cent of that area. The black Africans, furthermore, never occupied the more than 250,000 square kilometres of arid and semi-desert areas known as the Karoo. The Karoo contrasts strikingly with, for example, the Tugela River basin and system, which flows for a considerable distance through the areas of South Africa's largest nation, the Zulus. It has been estimated that this river system has sufficient water to supply 14 cities the size of Johannesburg, leaving enough at the river's mouth to meet the needs of a city the size of Greater London. For a country like South Africa, whose water is scarce, this is considerable.

80. Large areas of the black territories fall within the rich mineral belt ranging from the northern Transvaal to the north-western Cape. In fact, most of the black territories are reasonably well endowed with a wide range of valuable mineral resources. Though the Xhosa areas of the eastern Cape are less fortunate in this respect, they have considerable agricultural potential.

81. On the basis of rainfall and climate, 100 hectares of land in the black territories have on average the

potential of 147 hectares in the white part of South Africa.

82. In the light of these facts of history and geography—not of Government fiat or policy—how, I ask, do Members of the Organization reconcile the charges against my Government that the South African Government has driven the black peoples into barren and desolate reservations in pursuit of a policy of racial oppression?

83. I mention these facts in bare outline. To really grasp South African circumstances would require a far longer exposition of history. I mention these facts merely to indicate something of the historical background to our problems.

84. The divisions which exist in South Africa today thus came about naturally and historically, through sociological affinities and not as a result of an ideology. We believe that the objective of self-determination for all our peoples will not be best achieved by attempting to force all of them into an artificial unity. Too often has the world seen the tragic consequences of attempts to force unity upon two or more divergent peoples, and we see it still today.

85. A policy such as ours, which is designed to avoid disaster, to eliminate friction and confrontation between different peoples, to eliminate domination of one group by another, and to give to every man his due, can surely not be said to run counter to civilized concepts of human dignity and freedom.

86. Our policy is not based on any concepts of superiority or inferiority but on the historical fact that different peoples differ in their loyalties, cultures, outlook and modes of life and that they wish to retain them.

87. Nor is our policy inflexible; it postulates a certain broad direction the end of which is sovereign independence for the peoples concerned. There is no question whatsoever of forcing together peoples who do not wish to be joined. Equally, there is no question of keeping apart people who wish to come together. The real point at issue is, therefore, not one of objective but of method: the best practical way of ensuring self-determination and human development. We believe, particularly in the light of events elsewhere in the world, that our approach is better calculated to achieve the common objective than the alternative of forcing the various peoples of South Africa into an artificial entity which will lead to friction and strife not only between white and black but also between black and black.

88. Let me put it very clearly: the whites of South Africa as well as the Government of South Africa are as much concerned about the implementation of human rights, human freedoms, human dignity and

justice as any other nation or Government of the world. We fully realize that the well-being of the black man is as essential to the stability of southern Africa as that of the white man.

89. We are constantly charged with a callous disregard for the feelings and the welfare of the people—even a hatred of them. As I have shown, South Africa is presented in the Organization as a racial cauldron where the whites are obsessed with animosity towards the blacks and where the whites dehumanize and degrade and illtreat the blacks.

90. I do not deny what unsavoury and reprehensible incidents between black and white do occur in South Africa, incidents which no civilized man can defend, incidents which I cannot condemn too strongly. These incidents receive prominent attention in the South African press and, through the South African press, in the outside world, and they are often seized upon by this Organization to further its campaign against my Government.

91. I leave aside the ironical fact that this refutes another popular accusation against my Government, namely, that it does not allow freedom of expression. There are not many countries in the Organization where the press comments on and criticizes local conditions and government as freely as it does in South Africa.

92. Be that as it may, the picture presented in the Organization of racial relations in South Africa is distorted out of all proportion. Of the real position we read and hear nothing in the United Nations.

93. Our detractors purposely seek to conceal the goodwill which exists between black and white in South Africa in their day-to-day contact. They never mention the numerous incidents which attest to this goodwill. They never mention the appeals made by my Government and my Prime Minister for harmonious human relations between the black and white peoples of South Africa. The Prime Minister has frequently and forcibly condemned incidents between black and white which involve bad manners or humiliating treatment and has appealed to all South Africans to respect the dignity of every person irrespective of his race or colour.

94. And for every unsavoury incident which may occur, there are many more which negate the accusation that the whites of South Africa have a callous disregard for the dignity and feelings of the blacks. Had anyone here heard the spontaneous and resounding ovations which black athletes received from thousands of white spectators at the last South African Games, or the cheers for black South African boxers fighting white opponents from overseas, then that person would at once have known that allegations that the whites in South Africa hated the blacks were just so much rubbish.

95. Let me get away for a few moments from political matters—let me talk on the level of ordinary human relationships. I shall mention just a few incidents which speak for themselves. I do not say there is anything unusual about them, nor do I in any way exaggerate their importance. On the contrary—they are ordinary manifestations of the goodwill between blacks and whites which may be freely seen in our country—and even beyond our borders.

96. I wonder how many members of the Council are aware of the many instances where whites have risked their lives to save the lives of blacks and vice versa? I could give members many examples. Instead, I merely ask: Do you really risk your life for somebody you despise or hate?

97. In 1968, 82 white South African farmers, in a voluntary human gesture, loaned 230 tractors to plough the lands of nine border villages in Lesotho shortly before the maize season. And South Africa has on several occasions come to the help of its neighbouring countries when famine has threatened them. Newspaper reports of a person in need of help or a victim of disaster often bring forth a flood of generous and sympathetic assistance—and it matters not at all whether the person is black or white.

98. White South African businessmen some years ago already introduced to Swaziland and Lesotho visiting health services which operate by air from various centres of South Africa. The services were recently extended to the Transkei. Under these schemes white medical practitioners, specialists, surgeons and nurses voluntarily give up their weekends and work extra-long hours treating and operating on the peoples of these countries. All travelling and subsistence allowances were paid by the businessmen concerned.

99. In our largest province, the Transvaal, it was decided to introduce an African language as a compulsory subject in white primary schools, in the belief that this would contribute to better understanding and co-operation between white and black in South Africa.

100. These are only a very few isolated examples, but I think they show clearly that it is very far removed from the truth to say the whites of South Africa hate the blacks, that they are devoid of feelings of common humanity towards them, or that they are brutal—as is so often alleged here. The fact of the matter is that we are all human beings and, with the exception of certain elements which one will find in any country, white South Africans have the same feelings of humanity towards a black person as they do to any other person.

101. Despite this, I know very well that many Members of the Organization will say to us: "Well, that all sounds very fine, but if you really feel as you

say you do, why is it that the policies of your Government are discriminatory? Why is it that your legislation, or some of it anyway, distinguishes between persons on the grounds of colour and race?"

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

103. But that discrimination must not be equated with racialism. If we have that discrimination, it is not because the whites in South Africa have any *Herrenvolk* complex. We are not better than the black people, we are not cleverer than they are. What we can achieve, so can they. Those laws and practices are part of the historical evolution of our country—they were introduced to avoid friction, and to promote and protect the interests and the development of every group—not only those of the whites.

104. But I want to state here today very clearly and categorically: my Government does not condone discrimination purely on the grounds of race or colour. Discrimination based solely on the colour of a man's skin cannot be defended. We shall do everything in our power to move away from discrimination based on race or colour. May I refer to just one example, the field of sport. To use the words of my Minister of Sport a few days ago, he said: "If by *apartheid* in sport is meant discrimination on grounds of colour or race, then *apartheid* is disappearing and will disappear from sport in South Africa."

105. I would mislead members if I implied that this would happen overnight. There are schools of thought, traditions and practices which cannot be changed overnight. But we are moving in that direction. We shall continue to do so.

106. South Africa and the United Nations have for a long time been at odds on the question of South West Africa. The United Nations has sought to create the impression that South Africa has adopted an obdurate and intransigent attitude to this question. Let us look at the facts.

107. In 1951, South Africa proposed a new agreement in place of the Mandate, with the remaining principal allied and associated Powers. This was rejected by the General Assembly.

108. Despite this, South Africa reconfirmed its willingness to arrive at an amicable arrangement; and towards the end of 1952, a United Nations Committee could report agreement in principle on five points.¹ The Committee itself expressed its appreciation of South Africa's efforts, but regarded itself bound by its terms of reference to the extent that it could

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighth Session, Annexes, agenda item 36, document A/2261, para. 23.*

accept nothing less than South Africa's unconditional accountability to the United Nations.

109. Still South Africa did not close the door to finding a basis for negotiations. In 1958 we invited the members of the Good Offices Committee on South West Africa to visit South Africa and South West Africa. The Committee expressed its appreciation towards South Africa for its frankness, friendliness and desire to find a mutually acceptable basis of agreement. Its suggestions in its subsequent report² were, however, also rejected by the United Nations.

110. Although a deadlock appeared to have been reached, South Africa remained willing to find a basis for discussions and received the Carpio-Martínez de Alva mission in 1962.³ That history is still in our memories and I need not go into details. We all know how the United Nations reacted to the joint communiqué issued at the conclusion of their visit, which refuted charges, often heard in the United Nations in those days, concerning a threat to international peace, genocide and militarization in the Territory. The communiqué was not to the liking of the majority of the Members and, therefore, was received with shock and disbelief.

111. The Judgment of 1966 of the International Court of Justice,⁴ which was generally in South Africa's favour, was simply relegated to the wastepaper basket. Instead, the majority in the Assembly, again ignoring the wealth of fact and legal argument presented to the Court, proceeded to take the law into its own hands.

112. More recently, there were the contacts with the Secretary-General. They held promise. More was achieved in the 14 months of the contacts than had been achieved in all the years that this issue has been on the Organization's agenda.

113. But it seemed that South Africa was required by certain Members to do all the compromising, that South Africa was expected to abandon its position completely without the United Nations conceding anything. Some progress was made. That is apparent from the Secretary-General's three reports on the contacts [S/10738 of 17 July 1972, S/10832 of 15 November 1972 and S/10921 of 30 April 1973]. But the attitude of a majority was uncompromising, and even before the Security Council met in December last year calls were being made to terminate the contacts.

114. Nevertheless, as a result of those contacts, an Advisory Board of representatives of all groups in the Territory, under the chairmanship of my Prime

² *Ibid.*, Thirteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 39, document A/3900.

³ *Ibid.*, Seventeenth Session, Supplement No. 12, part II.

⁴ *South West Africa, Second Phase, Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 1966*, p. 6.

Minister, was established to advise the Government on matters of concern to the whole Territory. And recently, the Executive of the ruling National Party in South West Africa took a further initiative by deciding that the whites of South West Africa should now take more positive action to hold discussions with representatives of all other groups in the Territory with the aim, first, to promote, in a spirit of voluntary co-operation, a better mutual understanding of one another's views on the political future of the Territory, and, flowing from this, to conduct more positive discussions with a view to the future. It is hoped that these discussions will progress to the point where a final agreement can be reached between all the population groups.

115. The South African Government welcomes this development, which is fully in accord with its view that it is for the inhabitants of South West Africa themselves to decide their own future. Those who have left the Territory and wish to return in order to participate in elections or gain positions of leadership with a view to participating in the discussions will have the right to do so, provided they do so in peace. It does not matter to what group or party they belong. They will have the right to propagate any constitutional changes they like, provided only that they do so within the requirements of law and order.

116. It is on record that during the contacts with the Secretary-General the South African Government had anticipated that on the basis of developments at that time it might not take longer than 10 years for the population of South West Africa to reach the stage where it would be ready to exercise its right to self-determination. In the light of the new developments in the Territory, the Government now believes that this stage may be reached considerably sooner.

117. The South African Government has always recognized that South West Africa has a distinct international status. We have no designs on it. The administration of the Territory has been directed towards achieving the greatest good for the greatest number of the Territory's peoples. And they are exceedingly disparate as to their cultures and development. May I just give a few figures to illustrate this.

118. An investment corporation for blacks has drawn up an economic programme with the object of creating 5,000 employment opportunities for the blacks of South West Africa during the period 1972-1977, entailing a capital investment of over 22 million rand.

119. A total of R 139 million has so far been spent on 177 domestic water supply schemes constructed and operated by the State throughout the Territory.

120. The number of schools for blacks and Coloureds has increased from 313 in 1966 to 592 in 1973; the

number of teachers from 1,310 in 1960 to 3,453 in 1973; the number of pupils from 43,000 in 1960 to 140,000 in 1973.

121. There are 1,550 Coloured and black nurses in the Territory.

122. Total investment in respect of fixed and movable assets of the South African Railways amounted in 1973 to R 170 million. Total expenditure on roads from 1953 to 1973 amounted to R 243 million. The value of telephone, telegraph and radio installations in the Territory amounted to R 35 million in 1973. The total cost of running the Territory now amounts to R 341 million per annum. In evaluating these figures, it should be remembered that the total present population is only 850,000.

123. It is not for South Africa nor for the United Nations but for the peoples of the Territory themselves to decide upon their political future. And all options are open to them in this regard.

124. It is unfortunate that, for obviously political reasons, few, if any, of South Africa's critics in the United Nations have ever given it credit for its administration of South West Africa. It is also a matter of regret that all of South Africa's efforts towards a solution of this hitherto intractable problem have been thwarted by those elements among the membership of the United Nations which are intent upon casting doubt on South Africa's *bona fides*. Each new attempt on the part of the South African Government to reach an accommodation has been thwarted in turn. In the circumstances, charges that South Africa has adopted an intransigent attitude are quite unjustifiable.

125. A development of considerable importance to southern Africa was the change of Government in Portugal on 25 April 1974 and the resultant change of Portuguese policy towards its African Territories, particularly Mozambique and Angola. This has been wrongly represented in some quarters as a setback and a threat to South Africa, partly on the basis of a theory that South Africa has hitherto relied for its own security upon a so-called "buffer zone" of States around its borders—a zone which, they say, is now disintegrating.

126. Besides this, a number of irresponsible allegations have been made about South African intentions and activities—for example, that we were fomenting unrest or supporting factions in Mozambique.

127. This line of thought betrays a lack of understanding of some of the most basic elements of South Africa's policies. In the first place, South Africa has never identified itself with, and holds no brief for, colonialism in any shape or form. Indeed, as already indicated, South Africans of an earlier

generation were, at the end of the last century, the first in Africa to struggle against colonialism. The eventual success of that struggle, after initial setbacks, has been the inspiration for our present policies of self-determination and independence for all the black nations of South Africa. We understand the drive in Africa for freedom from colonial rule. We were among the first to recognize the new Government of Portugal. A black Government as such in Mozambique holds no fear for us.

128. We are surrounded by black Governments, and we are ourselves in the process of creating more, by leading our black Territories to independence. As my Prime Minister has said:

"We are not interested in the personnel of the Government of Mozambique. All we are interested in is that, for their sake and ours, they form a stable government."

And expressing concern about the incidence of unrest in the former Portuguese Territories, he said:

"Whoever takes over in Mozambique has a tough task ahead of him. It will require exceptional leadership. They have my sympathy and I wish them well."

129. The Prime Minister also made it clear that South Africa was prepared to help financially and in other ways in the development of Mozambique, just as we are prepared to assist other African countries to the best of our ability. South Africa and the people of Mozambique have co-operated to the advantage of both, in the use of the port of Lourenço Marques and of the railway line linking it to South Africa since the last century. Over the years, thousands of Mozambicans have worked in or visited South Africa and, conversely, many thousands of South Africans regularly enjoy Mozambique's outstanding holiday facilities. More recently, co-operation between us has permitted the realization of the enormous Cabora Bassa power and irrigation project, which will open up a vast area of Mozambique for development. South Africa's willingness to buy power to be generated at the dam has contributed to the scheme's feasibility. A co-operative project of a similar order is the Cunene dam in Angola.

130. I should like to turn now to the subject of Rhodesia. As far as Rhodesia is concerned, my Prime Minister only yesterday stated in the South African Senate:

"I have no brief whatsoever to argue this case on behalf of Rhodesia or anybody else. It must also be fully understood that I do not want to interfere in any way in the internal affairs of Rhodesia. Nothing that I might say this afternoon must be so construed. I believe that, with goodwill, this matter can be settled, and I believe that an

honourable solution can be found. What is more, I believe it is in the interests of all parties to find such a solution. I know that attempts have recently been made by Mr. Smith and his Government, but unfortunately these attempts, judging from reports, have failed. But I do know that as far as the Rhodesian Government is concerned, this matter is of the highest order on their priority list.

"However, I must also say that I know it is being said in some quarters, on the one side, that South Africa is holding the Rhodesian Government back. In fact, this accusation has been made, and will be made more and more, and I want to say that this is not so, as anybody in Rhodesia, or elsewhere, who knows anything about this position, will be able to tell. On the other hand, there are ZANU [Zimbabwe African National Union] and ZAPU [Zimbabwe African People's Union] leaders outside Rhodesia who are suspected—I am not putting it higher than that for the purposes of my argument—of exerting influence on black Rhodesians not to come to terms.

"I believe that now is the time for all who have influence to bring it to bear upon all parties concerned to find a durable, just and honourable solution so that internal and external relations can be normalized. Africa, and for that matter southern Africa, must not become a trouble-torn continent or a subcontinent. It must, if it can be avoided I sincerely believe that it can be avoided—not become an area of conflict."

131. Calls have been made in the Council for the expulsion of South Africa from the Organization. In other organs of the Organization attempts have been made to prevent South Africa from exercising its rights and privileges of membership, something which is not only manifestly illegal but which sets a dangerous precedent.

132. But more than that, what, may I ask, is to be gained by courses of action of this nature? The short answer, Sir, is certainly "absolutely nothing". It will get us nowhere. Who will benefit thereby? Perhaps one or two countries remote from the region who pursue political grand designs on a global or regional scale for purposes of their own; certainly not anyone in South Africa itself and least of all the people in whose name and supposed interests this totally negative action is urged. Both black and white South Africans emphatically reject it.

133. As I have shown, the situation in South Africa is changing; moreover, it is changing in a peaceful and orderly way. And if the United Nations genuinely wants to see these changes take place, the way to do it is to encourage them by communication, by discussion and understanding, not by threats and a

course of confrontation. We believe that every effort should be made to keep open the channels of communication. And if we cannot do it through this Organization, which was created primarily for the maintenance of international peace and security, then that is a very poor reflection on this Organization. No country will respond to threats or to a confrontation carrying with it overtones of serious conflict.

134. Being an African country, we are very much aware of the problems of our region and of our continent. We know, as most African countries would know, that there is hard work ahead for all of us. We are facing severe problems. We share many problems, many interests. Above all, the security of Africa certainly is a matter which demands the common concern of all of us, irrespective of whether we are white, black, Coloured or Arab. The South African Government has clearly indicated its willingness to conclude a non-aggression pact with any African Government. We have in many ways indicated that we consider stability on our continent as a most important factor in achieving development and prosperity for all Africans.

135. Physical territorial security and stability are of course not the only aspects of the concept of security, but certainly without that there can be no progress at all. Security cannot end there, however. Peace and political stability must be translated into development aimed at increasing our standards of living. We in South Africa are deeply concerned about the many problems facing Africa in this regard. As my Prime Minister said yesterday:

"South Africa is prepared, to the extent to which this is asked of it, and to which it is its duty, to play its part in and contribute its share towards bringing and giving order, development and technical and monetary aid, as far as this is within our means, to countries in Africa and particularly to those countries which are our close neighbours."

With specific reference to southern Africa the Prime Minister stated:

"It is clear to all of us that for a decade or more southern Africa has unfortunately been characterized by violence and strife. Violence and strife do not necessarily bring development and progress in their wake. On the contrary. In most cases they have precisely the opposite effect. The best example, I think, which we can find in this regard is Mozambique. Therefore, I believe that southern Africa has come to the cross-roads. I think that southern Africa has to make a choice. I think that that choice lies between peace on the one hand or an escalation of strife on the other. The consequences of an escalation are easily foreseeable. The toll of major confrontation will be high. I would go so far as to say that it will be too high for southern Africa to pay. If one adds to that the

threatening economic problems which could assume major proportions, then Africa and southern Africa should guard against this possible chaos.

"However, this is not necessary for there is an alternative, there is a way. That way is the way of peace, the way of normalizing our relations, the way of sound understanding and normal association. I believe that southern Africa can take that way. I have reason to believe that it is prepared to prefer to take that way, and I believe that it will do so in the end. In fact, as far as I am concerned, I have never been more optimistic that the climate and the will to do so is there, in spite of what is being done and said, in spite of everything that has happened."

136. I shall conclude. Are we or are we not conscious of the intractability and gigantic dimensions of the problems with which our world is confronted and which will have to be solved if mankind is to have a future at all—not to speak even of a future free, or relatively free, from poverty, disease, famine and despair?

137. Can we afford the time to dissipate our energies in the pursuit of controversial political objectives when the problems of the world are so pressing as to threaten untold misery in the remaining decades of this century? And, may I ask sincerely and seriously, if my country is expelled from the Organization, what exactly will have been achieved? Will the Organization then be one step nearer a solution of the world's problems? No. I say it will not. It will merely have made it more difficult for a country equipped and prepared to play a positive role in the development of southern Africa to do so.

138. South Africa can certainly be expelled from the Organization, but not from the planet. Those who advocate this course serve the interests of neither the blacks nor the whites of South Africa.

139. In the light of the realities of the world today and of the substantial progress we have made in South Africa in the field of human upliftment, and in the light of the objectives of my Government's policies, the record of South Africa can be measured honourably against the ideals set out in the Charter. We have not violated them. We have not waged war against black Africa or against anyone. We were in fact the first African nationalists. Black Africans need not conduct a freedom struggle against my Government. Being an African country, we understand African aspirations. We have stolen land from nobody. We have conquered no people. We threaten no one. We have absolutely no designs of aggrandizement.

140. We wish to live in peace. And in peace we shall solve our problems.

141. An African bishop, a wise man, once compared the blacks and whites in South Africa to a zebra. If the zebra were shot it would not matter whether the bullet penetrated a white stripe or a black stripe: the whole animal would die.

142. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Cuba. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make a statement.

143. Mr. ALARCON (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): First of all I should like to thank you, Mr. President, and through you the members of the Council for having given us this opportunity to participate in the discussions being held on the important question of the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa. I should like also to express the profound satisfaction of my delegation at attending the Council under your presidency, because between our peoples there are, and there have been traditionally deep bonds of friendship and solidarity, which attained their most complete expression recently with the decision of the two Governments to establish full diplomatic relations.

144. Cuba comes to the Council as a socialist, non-aligned country which attaches great importance to the development and strengthening of international solidarity, and to support for the struggle for emancipation of the peoples of the third world; hence we consider it to be our most elementary duty to associate ourselves completely with the claims of the African countries, and in particular with their demand for the expulsion of the South African régime from the United Nations.

145. We also come here with our inherited convictions as a Caribbean country situated at what was a cross-roads in history, where people from all parts of the earth converged and mingled in the melting-pot of centuries of fighting for freedom, thus forming a mixed race of which we are proud, and which leads us to abhor any form of racial discrimination or subordination.

146. The Council is meeting as a result of an initiative taken by the General Assembly in its historic resolution of 30 September last, an initiative which, as every one knows, was the climax of a long process of discussions and decisions of the General Assembly, always adopted by the affirmative vote of the immense majority of its members, which repudiated the practices of the racist Government of South Africa, its repressive policy towards the African peoples beyond its frontiers, and its illegal occupation of the international Territory of Namibia. That repudiation took a more specific form in the past four years, when the General Assembly decided, again by an overwhelming majority, to reject the credentials of the South African delegation.

147. This means that the Council is meeting in full awareness of the feeling and well-considered judgement, arrived at over the decades by the international community after long and patient reflection. The statements made by the African States must be viewed as the culmination of that process, and the Council must therefore discharge its responsibilities in a manner in line with the consideration that the international community has already given to the item we are discussing.

148. In our opinion, despite everything just said by the Pretoria representative, South Africa has violated and continues to violate the Charter of the United Nations. That violation did not just start; it did not start when South Africa illegally seized Namibia; it did not start with its illegal behaviour in recent times: South Africa has been violating the Charter from the very moment it subscribed to that instrument. In fact, the South African régime has always been beyond the pale of the United Nations; it should never have been part of the Organization. Above all, we must bear in mind that the Charter, in its very Preamble, refers to the peoples of the United Nations and that all the Member States have in one way or another condemned the policy of *apartheid*, which essentially is a policy under which the South African régime claims that it can govern only on behalf of a minority, explicitly excluding the will and the right to representation of 83 per cent of the population.

149. It seems to us obvious that it was not the intention of the drafters of the Charter and those who approved it to refer to us the peoples of the United Nations, with the exception of the people of South Africa. Rather, they had in mind that among all the peoples that would sign that important document there was one represented by the South African State in respect of which it was understood that it must exist, from the moment that State signed the Charter, as an African South Africa—that is, as Azania—in conformity with the purposes and principles of that Charter. Any other interpretation would make us accomplices of *apartheid* and of the notion that when the Charter was adopted in San Francisco one of the peoples of the United Nations was being excluded from the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

150. South Africa continues to violate the Charter and, moreover, to jeopardize international peace and security by its constant, decades-old defiance of the decisions of this Organization and the International Court of Justice with regard to Namibia. Specifically, it violates the decisions of this very Security Council establishing mandatory sanctions against the Rhodesian régime.

151. The representative of South Africa, insulting the intelligence and reason of those listening to him, went so far as to state that his régime had been

the first to fight colonialism in Africa, apparently suggesting that the Council—far from recommending the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations—should pay a tribute to the racist minority of South Africa for its anti-colonialist policy, as though anyone in this chamber were unaware that South Africa does indeed occupy first place in connexion with colonialism and self-determination, but in the sense that its racial policy has been considered by our Organization since the very first session of the General Assembly and in the sense that South Africa holds first place in the number of condemnatory resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, the Security Council and many other bodies of the Organization.

152. The representative of South Africa stated that his Government was not concerned about the existence of a black Government in Mozambique. Obviously, however, it is concerned about the existence of a black Government in South Africa. And what is at stake is precisely that. The international community has categorically stated and reiterated year after year its opinion that South Africa must be African and that the United Nations must provide the means to guarantee the right of the African population of that territory to self-determination and to be represented in the international community, not by those who are exploiting that population, denying its rights and excluding it, but by its legitimate representatives.

153. The representative of South Africa referred also to the situation in Rhodesia. He tried to convince us by quoting a statement by Mr. Vorster that his Government had no interest in intervening in the affairs of that country, and he suggested that he was in favour of a search for a peaceful solution to the Rhodesian problem. There is no need to repeat that the Pretoria régime is the only one which officially and formally advocates the violation of the sanctions voted by the Council. Moreover, recently we have read in the United States press that the South African authorities have imposed censorship on all information relating to the repressive activities by South African military units on Rhodesian territory. That means that what South Africa wants is not that it should not intervene in Rhodesia but that the United Nations should not intervene in regard to South Africa's violations of the decisions taken on Rhodesia. Strictly speaking, what South Africa wants is that the United Nations should give it a free hand to continue and even expand its repressive policy against the African people, including even those living beyond its frontiers. But obviously the duty of the Security Council is precisely this: to take appropriate measures to enforce the cessation of the systematic violation of its decisions and the recommendations of the General Assembly.

154. My delegation will not dwell on the arguments for the proposal presented by the African States; the speakers who have preceded me at this and other

meetings have set forth those arguments eloquently and with an abundance of proof. However, we should like to state some opinions on some of the arguments that might be advanced in opposition to the African position. I shall start with the allegation that the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations could be contrary to the principle of the universality of the Organization.

155. In this connexion, we emphatically wish to affirm that, precisely in order for that principle to be implemented in regard to South Africa, it is necessary to exclude from the Organization the minority group whose very presence in the United Nations implies the exclusion of 83 per cent of the population of that country. Precisely in order to ensure the universality of this Organization in regard to South Africa, the only solution which seems to us to be logical and acceptable would be the expulsion of the régime that denies the population of the territory its right to express itself freely and an invitation for its place to be taken by the legitimate representatives of the majority of the African population.

156. It might perhaps be alleged—and the representative of South Africa himself has suggested it—that expulsion of that régime from the United Nations would affect the role that the Organization should play in order to secure, through conciliation and negotiation, peaceful solutions to international disputes. We wish to affirm, however, that if one thing has been proved by the lengthy debate we have had on South Africa, which is as old as our Organization itself, it has been the example of patience, maturity and desire for peace which the African States have shown. Until when, we wonder, should we have to continue the process of reiterating resolutions, reaffirming principles and making appeals to a régime which constantly, here in this Chamber and outside it, proclaims its refusal to accept the unanimous view of the international community? How many resolutions of the Council, the General Assembly and other bodies would be necessary to persuade those who are not convinced that South Africa is not going to alter its attitude graciously?

157. On the contrary, for the Organization to be able to exercise an effective role in the quest for peaceful solutions, it must, above all, strengthen its moral authority, it must affirm its principles, it must defend them firmly; it must clearly indicate that it is not prepared to remain impassive towards a Member which persistently and openly, ever since it signed the Charter, has ignored it and violated it and intends to continue to do so.

158. At this time, when the threat of fascism and of the imposition of reactionary and repressive régimes is taking dramatic shape in many parts of the world, effective measures are required from the Organization so as at least to make it clear to the

world that the United Nations is and will be intransigent in the defence of the principles and purposes of the Charter and in the defence of the freedom and rights of peoples.

159. I should like to make a final comment in regard to something which has been present in this debate since the time when the Council started consideration of the situation in South Africa: that is, the possibility that the African position would not lead to a favourable response from the Council because one of several Powers that have the ability to do so would exercise the veto. In this connexion, I should like to point out that it is obvious that the Powers which have that privilege also bear a special responsibility which should compel them to exercise that power cautiously and with wisdom. A veto cannot be a weapon to impose situations which are in violation of the Charter. It should not be an instrument against the will of the immense majority of the Member States. The position of the overwhelming majority has been manifested not in a circumstantial or casual manner but with patience and equanimity throughout the years. The veto, if cast in these circumstances, would be morally null. If we reach the point where the only thing that can keep South Africa in this Organization, despite its express repudiation by the immense majority of its Members, is the veto, this would place the one that cast the veto in a position which might be described as that of a party to the dispute. That, morally at the very least, should compel that Power or Powers to refrain from participating in such a Security Council decision.

160. The procedure of expulsion as provided for in the Charter confers on the General Assembly the ultimate decision by a special two-thirds majority on the basis of the recommendation of the Security Council. In this case—and I come back to my initial words—when the Council meets it can already forecast quite clearly the feeling of the General Assembly, which was reiterated on 30 September last, as it has been doing for the past four years.

161. Let us imagine that, in spite of this, the Council were not able to take the appropriate decision and recommend the expulsion of South Africa. We might enter into a stage where that régime would remain here in this Organization and would thus be imposed by the will of only the one or the ones that vetoed a majority decision of the Council. In that case, it would be obvious that the main political and diplomatic support of the South African régime would from that time on be the Power or Powers which by its veto prevented the Council from taking a just decision and would, as I said earlier, place them in the position of being parties to the dispute between the United Nations and South Africa.

162. My delegation wishes to conclude by reaffirming its complete solidarity with the African States which

took the initiative of requesting this meeting of the Council and of proposing the expulsion of the régime of South Africa from the Organization. In doing so, we wish very particularly to express our support, our sympathy and our endorsement to the South African liberation movement, which is the legitimate voice of the interests of that people and the genuine representative in South Africa of those interests in accordance with the principles and purposes of the

Charter, and whose participation in the United Nations and whose presence as foreseen by the Charter can be achieved only on the day when the usurpers leave this institution, as we hope will occur shortly, with the co-operation of the African States and of all States that are genuinely interested in defending justice and peace.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.