



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-NINTH YEAR

1801st

MEETING: 24 OCTOBER 1974

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1801)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Relationship between the United Nations and South Africa:	
(a) Letter dated 30 September 1974 from the President of the General Assembly to the President of the Security Council (S/11525);	
(b) Letter dated 9 October 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11532)	1

NOTE

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

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

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

EIGHTEEN HUNDRED AND FIRST MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 24 October 1974, at 3.30 p.m.

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

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

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1801)

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 4 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Relationship between the United Nations and South Africa:

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

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decisions taken previously [1796th-1798th and 1800th 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, the Libyan Arab Republic, 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. Vejvoda (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. Maghur (Libyan Arab Republic), Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mr. Traoré (Mali), Mr. Ramphul (Mauritius), Mr. Slaoui (Morocco), Mr. Ogbu (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. Humaidan (United Arab Emirates), Mr. Salim (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Yaguibou (Upper Volta), Mr. Petrić (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Mutuale (Zaire) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Furthermore, I wish to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Liberia 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 of the question before it. 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 the discussion.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Harmon (Liberia) 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 Madagascar. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

4. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, it is highly significant

for us that you should be presiding over the Security Council, as it takes up an item which is of crucial importance both for us, who have grievances against South Africa, and for the Organization, whose authority should be reaffirmed as it becomes more aware of its responsibilities. For we can be sure that your qualities as a statesman and a diplomat whose integrity and wisdom we respect will ensure that the Council does succeed, despite the difficulties, in defining, unequivocally and without compromise, what relationship should be maintained between our Organization and a Member State which, despite all appeals and warnings, deliberately and with impunity puts itself outside, if not above, the constraints that other Member States have accepted.

5. On behalf of my delegation I should like to thank you, and through you the members of the Council, for having acceded to our request to participate in this historic debate.

6. The Union of South Africa participated, and we are told, in a decisive fashion, in the United Nations Conference on International Organization. It is a signatory of the Charter; it is a founder Member of our Organization, and so one might have expected that the Government of South Africa, if only out of respect for its formal commitments, would recognize that there can be no meaningful international co-operation without a minimum of good faith. For 28 years we have now been awaiting some sign of such a recognition by it, and despite its intransigence, which has become more and more absolute and outrageous, the General Assembly and the Security Council have made repeated conciliatory gestures towards that Government, gestures which seemed at times to reflect either our acquiescence or our confusion.

7. Thus the United Nations, after equivocating for six years, strove in vain from 1952 on to use the good offices of two committees, to invoke the mediation of two Secretaries-General, to call for direct negotiations, to induce the Government of South Africa to co-operate with the Special Committee, to seek the arbitration of the International Court of Justice, and all of this in order to reach a peaceful settlement of the dispute arising from the policies of *apartheid* and racial discrimination in southern Africa. It should be made clear that this dispute does not involve only India, or Pakistan, or the African States, as some would have us believe in order to justify ambivalent positions. The fact is that once the South African Government had refused the good offices of the Organization, attacked the constitutionality of our resolutions and decisions, rejected the recommendations under Chapters VI and XI of the Charter, and ignored the innumerable appeals for co-operation under Articles 1, 13, 55 and 56 of the Charter, the Organization itself became a party to the dispute, thus creating a situation for which no express provision is made in the Charter. Nevertheless,

the logical consequences of that situation are covered by Article 6, concerning exclusion, and Articles 41 and 42, on sanctions and the use of force, two Articles that are not mutually exclusive.

8. The South African régime may argue that the dispute does not exist because there can be no relinquishing of sovereignty to the United Nations, which, moreover, is not authorized to intervene in affairs which fall essentially within the national jurisdiction of a State; but those who have worked so hard for the international protection of human rights after the depredations of the nazi régime must join us in recognizing that the rule of non-intervention ceases to apply when the treatment accorded by a nation to its population or a part of its population violates the dictates of justice and human conscience.

9. The Pretoria régime also argues that it is essential to preserve the sovereign rights of a State, particularly its natural right of self-defence, thus recognizing that, through its authoritarianism and its excesses, this régime has been reduced to defending itself against what it is still usual to describe as its people. As for sovereign rights, which are defined in capricious and often arbitrary terms, we are among those who believe that those rights should yield to international obligations freely undertaken.

10. These legal quibbles, which nevertheless have their place, must not make us forget the situation at present existing in southern Africa. It has been described so often that one may well hesitate to remind members of the Council of what they know only too well. The more indignant the international community becomes, the more tightly does the South African Government entrench itself in its ridiculous and lunatic world. It might have been left to do so, if it had not also dragged in its train that part of the white population which is opposed to its policies, and the Africans, Asians and Coloureds who are the victims of its aberrations.

11. Before the Second World War the world was vaguely aware that somewhere in Africa and Asia certain forms of segregation and discrimination existed, but since those forms of segregation and discrimination did not create any particular disturbance in the world social and economic order, and since they were applied only to "subjects" recognized as having only residual rights, it could be left to a few charitable souls to try to denounce such practices.

12. Later, when the South African Government tried to introduce a semblance of coherence into its discrimination and racial segregation in order to effect the political subordination and economic domination of its indigenous and other subjects, indifference became all the more acceptable since South Africa was posing as an advanced outpost of civilization and of the so-called free world.

13. When the Asian and African Members of the United Nations drew the Organization's attention to the fact that the South African Government was attempting not only to control and regulate the non-white population with a view to preserving the economic privileges of an oligarchy dedicated to authoritarianism, but also to institute a racist ideology which would be the very negation of the Charter, some people began to feel that the limit had been reached.

14. However, the most difficult thing yet remained to be done. How could an ally be made to understand, an ally which had for decades enjoyed open or tacit support from various quarters? How, for that matter, could such an ally accept a change of attitude towards itself which was not based on a change of policy by an alliance in which it still claimed membership? There was disarray on the one hand and incomprehension on the other, which merely strengthened the tendency towards gradualism and temporizing, while at the same time people were only too happy to accuse us of being unreasonable extremists, too easily carried away by words and out of touch with reality.

15. Meanwhile the situation is deteriorating. South Africa is hastening to make its *apartheid* policies irreversible, to rationalize the irrational, to justify the unjustifiable, as it attempted to do this morning, and to set up a police state for the purpose of ensuring for ever for the greater good of the so-called free world, white privilege, and white domination in the country's affairs.

16. The awakening of nationalism and the emergence of independent nations, particularly in that part of the world, made it no longer possible to consider *apartheid* as a mere series of violations of human rights, or as a legal dispute, in the sense that South Africa was called upon to act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter and to discharge its obligations thereunder.

17. It cannot be denied that in South Africa we are confronted with the oppression, repression and suppression of the majority, or the confiscation of political and economic power by a minority to the detriment of groups whose progress, according to the Charter, it is their duty to assist in all fields. It is not surprising, therefore, that nations which love justice, freedom and independence are prepared to defy the Pretoria régime, a régime which has for long defied the international community and continues to do so with impunity.

18. What, in sum, do we expect of South Africa? We expect that the principles of equality and non-discrimination will be respected, pursuant to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the articles of which specify the obligations undertaken in accordance with the Charter. We expect South Africa

to discharge its obligations under the Charter, and towards those for whom it assumes a certain responsibility. We expect it to co-operate with the international community in all matters concerning the exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms, as well as the rights of peoples. We expect it accordingly to apply the decisions of the Security Council and to implement the resolutions of the General Assembly.

19. There has been no positive reaction from the Pretoria régime. On the contrary, it is strengthening its battery of laws intended to perpetuate and strengthen the policies of *apartheid*; it is becoming more and more oppressive towards those who denounce the injustice of those laws; it is denying the most elementary rights of the populations of South Africa; it is defying the Organization by opposing, if necessary by force, the arrangements adopted concerning Namibia; it is circumventing the Security Council's decisions on Rhodesia; it is threatening to use force against neighbouring States and it is refusing to co-operate with the international community.

20. It would be superfluous to develop further these grave breaches of the spirit and letter of the Charter, these multiple transgressions of the purposes and principles of the Charter, these challenges to the authority of the Organization. We have before us a cause where the legal arguments coincide with the facts, a situation where it is no longer possible to ignore the provisions of the Charter whose application, no matter how difficult it may be, can in no circumstances be made dependent on the situation.

21. In the case of South Africa, the provisions of the pertinent Articles of Chapter VI had already been applied when the Organization set up good offices committees, called for mediation and ordered inquiries conducted by a group of experts of the Council. Article 40 was invoked when the Council decided to institute an arms embargo. That would leave Article 41 or Article 42 with its immediate corollary, Article 5, but matters need not stop there if we agree that—and there is ample evidence of this—for 28 years the Organization has seen South Africa persistently infringe the principles of the Charter, thus incurring the possible application to itself of Article 6.

22. The Security Council is responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, and some may argue that the possible exclusion of South Africa might affect peace and security in the region, because South Africa would be deliberately placing itself outside international law, in which case it would be much more difficult to bring pressure to bear on it. But is this not tantamount to saying that we have little faith in the Charter and in our capacity to ensure that all States act in conformity with its

principles? To that I might add what has been said in General Assembly resolution 377 A (V):

"a genuine and lasting peace depends also upon the observance of all the principles and purposes established in the Charter of the United Nations, upon the implementation of the resolutions of the Security Council, the General Assembly and other principal organs of the United Nations intended to achieve the maintenance of international peace and security, and especially upon respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all".

23. Finally, some may say that at a time when the Organization has become virtually universal it would be incongruous to expel one of its Members. For our part, we have always maintained that the universality of the United Nations should derive from common objectives and principles, the readiness of its Members to recognize that common cause, and the determination of the Organization to ensure that it is respected.

24. Our debates have been invalidated from the outset because it has always been said that no concrete action could be taken because of the likelihood of one, two or three vetoes. This matter had been brought up at earlier meetings of the Council, particularly by the representatives of Algeria and Mauritius, and this morning again by the representative of Cuba, to mention only those speakers. When Member States were asked to express their views concerning possible amendments to the Charter, my delegation was among those that felt that it was necessary to clarify the scope of Article 27 with a view to applying its provisions in relation to Chapter VII of the Charter. In strictly legal terms, it may be difficult to decide to what extent a State other than the State directly concerned may be regarded as a party to a dispute. But if we look at it in political terms—and in what other terms can we look at the matter here in the Security Council?—if one or more States have given diplomatic, political and military support to South Africa, and perhaps are prepared to go on doing so, could we not therefore conclude that they too bear responsibility for the reprehensible actions of the South African régime? In that case they become a party to the dispute and Article 27 could be invoked against them. Furthermore, it has been said that the veto was instituted either to protect the interests of the great Powers or to enable them the better to discharge their responsibilities under the Charter. Must we conclude from this, if a veto should be cast in this debate, that certain Powers have identified or are going to identify their interests with those of South Africa and that they think that the maintenance of *apartheid* in the international community is one of their responsibilities?

25. No matter what decision the Council takes, it is clear that the relationship between the Organization

and the Pretoria régime can no longer be the same as in the past. Over and above the necessities imposed by alliances, over and above regional or particular interests and over and above historical considerations which are sometimes ill-founded, there is an international morality which does not necessarily call for retribution or vengeance, but which does require our acts to be in conformity with the purpose we have set for ourselves, namely, the establishment of a world order based on social justice for individuals and political justice for peoples. Let South Africa tell us that its policy of *apartheid* is not in conformity with that morality, with all the consequences to which such an admission may lead, but let us, I pray, not force the international community to be false to itself by accepting in advance a hypothetical act of contrition.

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

27. Mr. BOATEN (Ghana): Mr. President, may I express my sincere gratitude to you and the other members of the Security Council for giving my delegation this opportunity to participate in this debate on the question of the relationship between the United Nations and the racist régime of South Africa. I am particularly happy to be participating in this debate under your distinguished leadership. Your intimate knowledge of the problems posed by the institution of *apartheid* as a political philosophy by past and present régimes of South Africa gives us the assurance that the issue will receive the urgent attention which it deserves.

28. The history of racial discrimination and suppression in South Africa is too long and too well known to the international community to require recounting in the Council. It should therefore suffice to remind ourselves that, even before *apartheid* became the official Government policy of South Africa on the assumption of political control by the National Party in South Africa in 1948, the United Nations had been seized of the question. As recalled by our colleague, Mr. Driss, when he spoke on 18 October [1796th meeting], it was raised at the very first session of the General Assembly in 1946 on a complaint by India regarding a law enacted by the régime of South Africa to institute discrimination against South Africans of Indian origin in violation of treaty obligations and the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. On becoming independent in 1947, Pakistan joined India in promoting debates in the General Assembly of that issue. The Good Offices Committee on South West Africa, composed of Cuba, Syria and Yugoslavia, was established by the General Assembly in December 1952 to assist in negotiations between India and Pakistan, on the one hand, and South Africa, on the other. This effort collapsed because the South African

régime refused to co-operate. In pursuit of a peaceful resolution of the matter, Mr. Luis de Faro of Brazil was designated by the Secretary-General to intervene, but, again, this mission was frustrated by the intransigent position adopted by the South African régime.

29. Since 1962, when the complaint by India and the question of racial conflict in South Africa were combined under the item "The policies of *apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa", the General Assembly has religiously each year considered this evil policy, its practice and effects on the people against whom it is directed. I do not expect that there is anybody in this room who was not moved when Mr. Sibeko addressed the Council on 22 October [1798th meeting]. He talked about a plight in which he is personally involved; his statement was a factual description of atrocities perpetrated by men against other men in the twentieth century.

30. In the face of this, South African régimes have consistently held the position, against all wisdom, that *apartheid* is their own domestic affair and consequently not subject to discussion or review by the international community. The verdict of the international community as pronounced in numerous resolutions and declarations, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*, shows the clear and unequivocal opposition of the whole world to both the philosophy and the practice of *apartheid*.

31. My delegation is not unaware of the existence of racial discrimination and persistent violations of human rights in other countries. But these instances are nothing by comparison with what operates in South Africa. South Africa is the only country in the world where racial discrimination, suppression and other violations of human rights have been given the full force of law. It is only in that country that the extent to which the human person is permitted to enjoy human rights is, by law, dependent on the colour of his skin. The fact that the greater part of the world's entire population is non-white or of non-European stock makes it frightening to contemplate the repercussions of such policies on world peace, stability and security.

32. To date, however, every effort that has been made by the members of the international community, in both their collective and their individual capacities, to assist in effecting a peaceful change of policy in South Africa has been a failure. The General Assembly in 1962 established the Special Committee on *Apartheid* to carry out a continuous study of that policy and its application and make recommendations. Since then, the Committee has submitted its report to the General Assembly each year for study and

adoption. The Committee's latest report indicates that the situation has infinitely worsened in South Africa. The régime in that country has not let up in its determination to continue the repression of its non-white population. I should like, if I may, to quote from that report:

"South Africa has remained intransigent despite the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly recognizing that the situation in South Africa is a matter of grave international concern, and the strong warnings administered by the Assembly in its rejection of the credentials of the South African delegation since 1970".¹

33. General Assembly resolution 3055 (XXVIII) of 26 October 1973 called upon the régime to grant forthwith unconditional release to all persons restricted for their opposition to *apartheid*. That régime's reaction to that call is reflected in a letter dated 12 June 1974 addressed to the Secretary-General by South Africa's Foreign Minister. With your permission, Mr. President, I should like to quote from that letter:

"This resolution was adopted in connexion with an item which touches upon South Africa's domestic affairs. It is, therefore, contrary to the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter of the United Nations, which prohibits the Organization from intervening in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State."

34. It should be a matter of great concern to all—as it is to my delegation—that the South African régime is still unable to realize that the application of a policy which means doing violence to the rights of all non-white peoples in the world cannot possibly be a simple domestic affair. The quotations which I have given, however, convince my delegation that, until the South African régime changes its policy of *apartheid*, its membership in the United Nations cannot in any way contribute to the strengthening of the Organization.

35. My delegation believes in the principle of the universality of this Organization. South Africa, however, cannot be allowed to seek the protection and privileges of membership of the Organization while adamantly setting itself on a course of perpetual collision with the United Nations. That is why my delegation believes that the time has come for the Security Council to take some further measures, not excluding expulsion, against the régime in that country.

36. The view is held in some quarters that the expulsion of the South African régime from the Organization is not the answer to the problem.

¹ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 22 A, part one, para. 120.

Efforts involving some violence aimed at effecting a change in the régime's policy are also looked upon with disfavour by the same quarters which counsel against expulsion.

37. In his report to the United States Congress in February 1971, the President of the United States stated:

"Racism is abhorrent to the American people, to my administration, and to me personally. We cannot be indifferent to *apartheid*, nor can we ignore the tensions created in Africa by the denial of political self-determination. We shall do what we can to foster equal opportunity and free political expression instead."

Mr. Nixon went on to say:

"We are convinced that the use of violence holds no promise as the solution to the problems of southern Africa. Neither the military nor the economic strength is available to force change on the white minority régimes."

38. My delegation views the situation differently. It is convinced that both the military power and the economic strength to force the necessary change are available. The only constraint on their use is the unfortunate unwillingness to use them of those who should see it as a duty to mankind and a contribution to world peace to do so.

39. What are the alternatives to complete boycott—that is, the prescription and enforcement of total sanctions and adoption of such violent measures as may be necessary to induce civilized political, social and economic policies and practices in South Africa? That is the question this Council is being called upon to answer; and if it is to continue to enjoy the confidence of the United Nations and the world in general, it must answer that question responsibly.

40. The Council considered the question in August and then in December 1963, and again in June 1964. On 7 August 1963 the Council, by its resolution 181 (1963), solemnly called upon all States to cease the sale and shipment of arms, ammunition and military vehicles to South Africa. By its resolution 182 (1963), unanimously adopted on 4 December 1963, the Council urged that the arms embargo should be extended to include equipment and materials for the manufacture and maintenance of arms and ammunition in South Africa. On both those occasions and since then, the Council and the General Assembly have also exhorted South Africa to change its policies and cease suppressing the rights of its non-white population. On each occasion the South African régime has not only rejected but also denounced the advice of the international community.

41. Certain well-known countries have also ignored the resolutions of the Security Council and actively

encouraged trade in military equipment with South Africa. Some of these not only have sold fighter planes to the régime but have gone so far as to conclude agreements with the régime for the production of such planes in South Africa. Others have since co-operated with the régime in the field of nuclear technology. On 23 July 1970, in its resolution 282 (1970), the Council voted, by 12 in favour to none against, with 3 abstentions to condemn all such violations of the arms embargo and called on all States to strengthen the embargo by implementing it fully, unconditionally and without any reservations.

42. The Lusaka Manifesto of 1969, since adopted by the United Nations, states: "We believe that all the peoples who have made their homes in the countries of southern Africa are Africans, regardless of the colour of their skins; and we would oppose a racist majority government which adopted a philosophy of deliberate and permanent discrimination between its citizens on grounds of racial origin. We are not talking racialism when we reject the colonialism and *apartheid* policies now operating in those areas; we are demanding an opportunity for all the people of these States, working together as ... individual citizens, to work out for themselves the institutions and the system of government under which they will, by general consent, live together and work together to build a harmonious society."²

43. All over Africa there abounds clear evidence of the determination of independent African countries not to pay back citizens and governments of former colonialist and repressive Powers in their own coin; Africans have given incontrovertible proof that they denounce racism in reverse; they have given every indication of a desire to co-operate fully with everybody, of whatever colour, on a basis of mutual respect. South African whites do not, therefore, have any reason to fear that they will be treated with discrimination of a nature similar to the viciously evil one to which they have always subjected their non-white population.

44. The racist régime and its white adherents, however, refuse to see reason; they insist on carrying out their racial policies even at the risk of jeopardizing world peace and security. Sports and other boycotts have not discouraged them and are unlikely to do so in the future so long as they are not total in their application. The racist régime has, in fact, insulted the international community at every opportunity. Not only has it refused to change its policies; it has even extended them to Namibia, which is a Territory under United Nations administration. It has rejected the numerous exhortations of the General Assembly and spurned the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on that matter. When

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

confronted within the Commonwealth of Nations with its *apartheid* policy, its answer was to withdraw from that organization.

45. In this intransigence it has never lacked support from the majority of its white population. In the elections held recently in South Africa, on 24 April this year,—elections in which only whites voted because non-whites have no right to vote—the racist régime's Prime Minister, Vorster, was returned with a greater majority than before; he polled more votes than any other candidate. If that is not an endorsement of *apartheid* by the white population of South Africa, I do not know what is. Mr. Muller, the Minister of the Interior in the racist régime, in giving expression to the white South African's obsessive fear, is said to have stated just before the election, "I would prefer to live in a paddock next to a fenced bull than walk with a black mamba in my bosom". That fear underlies the actions of successive racist régimes in South Africa.

46. The Sharpeville incident of 21 March 1960 has been followed by other mini-Sharpevilles. Available records indicate that as of June this year 38 workers had been brutally massacred by the racist régime during peaceful demonstrations over pay and working conditions in the Orange Free State.

47. My delegation firmly maintains that after nearly 30 years of continuous and adamant refusal by South Africa to comply with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and resolutions of the United Nations, any excuse we may have had for entertaining hopes of a change in attitude on the part of South Africa should disappear. Membership in the United Nations carries with it certain obligations which all Members must accept. Membership in the Organization, like friendship between two persons, presumes mutual respect and a community of certain interests. The régime of South Africa has persistently shown contempt for the Organization and has given no indication that it is willing to allow itself to be bound by the Organization's fundamental principles. In my delegation's view, until South Africa has revised its policies it will continue to be a liability rather than an asset to the Organization. This situation cannot and should not be tolerated. As I said earlier on in this statement, the time has come for this Council to take appropriate measures, not excluding expulsion, against the régime in South Africa. The situation in South Africa could explode to engulf the whole of mankind. If we act now, we shall avert a future disaster.

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

49. Mr. HUMAIDAN (United Arab Emirates) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, allow me

first of all to address to you the warmest congratulations of my delegation on the occasion of the accession of your country, the United Republic of Cameroon, to the presidency of the Council. I also wish to thank you and the members of the Council for allowing me to participate in this debate.

50. We are very gratified to have a Security Council meeting to discuss a problem which we consider to be of the utmost importance, namely, a review of the status of South Africa in the Organization. This is an important problem because it bears directly on the credibility and prestige of the Organization. It is not proper that the policy of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa should continue at the very time when the Organization is affirming its universality and its determination to safeguard human rights and the right of peoples to self-determination, nor is it proper for a Member State to continue to be seated among us while defying the Charter, the fundamental principles of human rights and the whole of world public opinion.

51. Was not the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Somalia, Mr. Ghalib, quite right when he said that "South Africa's continued presence as a Member State makes a mockery of international law and of international morality" [*1796th meeting, para. 52*]? What is more, we believe that the policy of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa constitutes a threat to peace and security in Africa and, accordingly, a threat to international peace and security.

52. In this brief statement I do not intend to go into the details of the disgraceful policy of *apartheid* which is practised by the racist Government of South Africa: most speakers who have preceded me have already done so. What I wish to express in this statement is the anxiety and anguish of the people and Government of the United Arab Emirates on seeing this policy perpetrated, a policy which in our opinion is a modern form of slavery. Furthermore, this anxiety was expressed by our Minister for Foreign Affairs in the course of his statement on 8 October last before the General Assembly.³ He said:

"We are gravely concerned at the inhuman treatment, by the Government of South Africa, of the indigenous population of that country... The policies of *apartheid* and the oppressive rule of minority racist régimes are an intolerable affront to human dignity and a challenge to world opinion."

Our Minister for Foreign Affairs likewise informed the General Assembly that "we have imposed a total embargo on the shipment of oil and are strictly applying this policy".

53. Our boycott of South Africa is as total as our boycott of Israel because we believe that the two

³ *Ibid.*, Twenty-ninth Session, Plenary Meetings, 2261 A meeting.

régimes are of the same colonialist and racist nature. Is it not true that, by occupying Palestine, Israel drove an entire people from its country and forced it to live in wretchedness in refugee camps? Furthermore, the complete co-operation between the racist régime of South Africa and Israel is now known to the entire world. This co-operation extends to every field—military, economic and political. The excellent address by the representative of Egypt, Mr. Abdel Meguid, on Monday last, leaves me nothing to add, I only wish to say that, like him, we believe that

“the collaboration between the racist régimes in South Africa and Israel represents a serious threat to the war of liberation and to international peace and security.” [1797th meeting, para. 31].

54. I should be failing in my duty were I not to express the regret of my Government at the failure of every effort made to put an end to *apartheid* and to restore their human rights to the non-white population of South Africa. Failure is due, above all, to the continued co-operation of certain States with the Government of South Africa. As we see it, the list of the main trading partners of South Africa should not be considered only as a statistical table but also as a bill of indictment against those countries and as a measure of those countries' defiance of the aims of the United Nations.

55. Allow me to say, finally, that the time has come for the Security Council to take more effective measures to abolish the policy of *apartheid*, which is a flagrant violation of the Charter. For our part, we believe that the Government of South Africa, which practises official racist oppression, is no longer qualified to be a Member of the Organization.

56. I listened most attentively to the statement made by the representative of South Africa this morning [1800th meeting]. I regret to say that his statement contributed nothing positive; on the contrary, all he did was to defend the racist institutions of his Government.

57. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is Mr. Vejvoda, the Deputy Foreign Minister of Czechoslovakia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

58. Mr. VEJVODA (Czechoslovakia): First, I should like to express our appreciation of the fact that our delegation has been given an opportunity to participate in the deliberations of the Security Council on the question of the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic fully supports the efforts of the African States to review this question with all sincerity and responsibility in the Council. Allow me to say how glad we are that these significant deliberations are being presided over by you, Mr. President, a representative of free Africa, which struggles for the

elimination of all remnants of colonialism and racism in the world.

59. The adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 3207 (XXIX), which Czechoslovakia voted in favour of, is a logical consequence of the deplorable position in the United Nations of the Government of South Africa, which has refused to heed innumerable appeals and concrete decisions taken by the United Nations urging it to fulfil, as a Member State of the Organization, the fundamental obligations arising from the Charter.

60. The whole history of South Africa's participation in the Organization has proved that that country does not intend to change substantially its attitude towards the United Nations. That is why during the last four years an overwhelming majority of the General Assembly has rejected the credentials of South Africa's delegation. In spite of that the Government of South Africa has continued its flagrant and shameless violations of the generally recognized principles enshrined in the Charter. During all that time Members of the United Nations have exerted great efforts to convince the régime of South Africa that the policy of *apartheid* and racial segregation is wrong and harmful.

61. Among the most important positive achievements of the Organization is, without any doubt, the fact that from the very beginning of its existence it has proclaimed that the policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination constitutes a crime against humanity. This happened as a result of the experience of many nations, including my own, which encountered the Fascist policy of racism and inequality of people during the Second World War. From that time the actions emanating from the policy and practice of *apartheid* and from the similar policy and practice of racial segregation and discrimination constitute crimes in violation of international law, because they clearly contradict the aims and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. Those actions are being justly described as threats to international peace since they incite people against people and so create dangerous situations that could lead to uprisings and wars.

62. Every year the United Nations, in the interest of eliminating this threat, has to deal with the policy of the present régime of South Africa, which has promoted *apartheid* and racial segregation to the level of a State philosophy, thereby causing untold suffering to millions of Africans and tens of thousands of other people who are different from the so-called “governing race” only because of a difference in the shade of their skin.

63. This morning [*ibid.*], the representative of the South African Republic tried to find excuses for his Government's position. In substance, however, he did not say anything about the intentions of his Government to fulfil its obligations vis-à-vis the

Charter, as a Member State or, above all, about its readiness to put an end to its policy of *apartheid*.

64. It remains an indisputable fact that for nearly 29 years the régime of South Africa has been ignoring the appeals of the international community in Article 1, paragraph 3, of the Charter with regard to promoting and encouraging respect for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion. For 29 years the South African Government has had ample opportunity to prove that it intends to participate in a constructive manner in the activities of the international community in the interest of strengthening world peace and security, and that it is willing to keep pace with the spirit of our times. However, the South African régime has proved the very contrary of this.

65. Security Council resolution 269 (1969) confirmed the termination of the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia and called for the withdrawal of South African troops from that Territory. The South African régime has stubbornly refused to comply with that decision. In spite of an emphatic condemnation by the United Nations and by broad world public opinion, it has transplanted the practice of *apartheid* and racial segregation to the Territory of Namibia, where it creates buffer zones and, in so doing, uses extreme means of terror against the indigenous population. In so doing the present régime of South Africa systematically and actively opposes every decision taken by the United Nations to achieve the aims and purposes set by the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

66. The fundamental change in Portugal's policy towards African Territories has created a particularly favourable opportunity for the Government of South Africa too to embark upon the historically inevitable and irreversible path of the process of decolonization and to remove the evil represented by the inhuman policy of racial segregation. This is the only path South Africa can choose to emerge from its deep international isolation and to contribute in a fruitful manner to the solving of other burning problems of the present world. On the contrary, however, we are witnessing an ever closer co-operation of the South African régime with the minority racist régime of Southern Rhodesia.

67. Those régimes spare no effort hastily to attempt to strengthen, with the assistance of their allies, the buffer zone that has suffered a strong blow as a consequence of the positive developments in the Territories under Portuguese administration, particularly in Mozambique. South African paramilitary police operate along the border, assisting the Rhodesian security forces in the struggle against the national liberation movement. As history has already proved, there is no force which can stop a people fighting for its national liberation. It is that very irreversible fact that the régimes of Pretoria and

Salisbury are afraid of. This close co-operation of the racist régimes flagrantly violates the sanctions against the Smith régime imposed by the Security Council under resolution 253 (1968), with which South Africa as a Member of the Organization must comply.

68. From the aforementioned, it is clear enough that the present régime of South Africa continues to ignore not only United Nations calls for its abandonment of the policy of *apartheid* but also all substantive decisions taken by the United Nations in its struggle against colonialism. The South African Government hampers all steps taken by the United Nations aimed at the liquidation of the colonial régime in every corner of the world. Numerous examples of this attitude of the South African Government have been cited by the representatives who have preceded me in this debate.

69. The negative attitude of the régime of South Africa towards the United Nations is, however, becoming more and more apparent each year also in all the other fields of the Organization's activities. For instance, we may recall the position taken lately by South Africa on such important initiatives as General Assembly resolution 2936 (XXVII), entitled "Non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons"—only four States, including South Africa, voted against it—or resolution 3185 (XXVIII), adopted by the Assembly on the question of "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", where one of the two negative votes was cast by South Africa. Let me mention these facts only. Everybody who knows the records of the United Nations well can add many more.

70. Permit me briefly to ponder another aspect which we regard, in the context of the matter under discussion, as being important. South Africa is connected by thousands of varied links with some of the former colonial metropolitan countries, which provide it with every assistance. In this connexion, I should like to quote the words of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Republic of Tanzania, Mr. Malecela, who said the following in the general debate of the present session of the General Assembly:

"Arguments that economic investments in South Africa by foreign companies bring anything other than increased misery to the majority of the African people are wholly fallacious. Such argumentation is definitely meant as a campaign to mislead the world. The fact is that, as the economy of South Africa has expanded, so has the misery of the non-white population in that country."⁴

71. Today, as we speak about the policy pursued by South Africa, we cannot fail to mention the vast

⁴ *Ibid.*, 2250th meeting.

financial, trade, economic, military and other contacts of the South African régime with its Western allies. These Powers, in the interest of their strategic and economic aims in the region of the Cape of Good Hope, are *de facto* helping South Africa to remain as the last bastion of colonialism and racism in the southern part of the African continent, a bastion that constitutes a permanent danger to the independent African States. That is why, together with the régime of South Africa, its generous allies are also being brought to shame today.

72. On the grounds I have stated, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic fully supports the opinion of the African States that the time has come for the United Nations to draw, resolutely and within the possibilities provided by the Charter, the necessary conclusions from the approach by the Government of South Africa to the obligations resulting from its membership in the Organization.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.