

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

UN LIBRARY

TWENTY-NINTH YEAR

OCT - 1983

UN/SA COLLECTION

1803rd

MEETING: 25 OCTOBER 1974

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1803)	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 THIRD MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 25 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/1803)

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 3.50 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 addressed 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 by the Council previously [1796th-1798th and 1800-1802nd 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, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Mali,

Mauritius, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Romania, 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. Boaten (Ghana), Mrs. Jeanne Martin Cissé (Guinea), Mr. Jackson (Guyana), Mr. Jaipal (India), Mr. Harmon (Liberia), Mr. Maghur (Libyan Arab Republic), Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mr. Traoré (Mali), Mr. Ramphul (Mauritius), Mr. Slaoui (Morocco), Mr. Ogbu (Nigeria), Mr. Akhund (Pakistan), Mr. Jamal (Qatar), Mr. Datcu (Romania), 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 Kuwait requesting that his delegation also 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 the Council's discussion of the agenda item before it.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Bishara (Kuwait) 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 Romania.

I invite him to come to the Council table and to make his statement.

4. Mr. DATCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): I am very grateful to you, Mr. President, and to the other members of the Security Council for having given me this opportunity to participate in this important debate. I should like also to add the voice of the Romanian delegation to the views of all those that have addressed the warmest congratulations to you on your assumption of this highly responsible post. Our satisfaction at seeing you presiding over our deliberations is all the greater because you are the distinguished representative of an African country, the United Republic of Cameroon, with which Romania is developing relations of close friendship and co-operation.

5. We can undoubtedly consider that through the General Assembly's request to the Security Council that it examine the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa the international community has once again given expression to its severe condemnation of the policy of the racist minority régime of Pretoria and to its concern at the ill effects of this policy on international peace, security and co-operation.

6. The Romanian delegation has asked to be allowed to participate in this debate in the conviction that no State can remain indifferent when the fundamental principles and provisions of the Charter of the United Nations are flouted so flagrantly and when the most elementary human rights are denied and brutally violated.

7. My country has been a sponsor of many resolutions adopted by the General Assembly condemning the policy of South Africa and has vigorously supported respect for the inalienable rights of peoples to forge their own destinies in accordance with their national will.

8. Romania has always given and will continue to give its whole-hearted support and multilateral assistance to the peoples of southern Africa in eliminating racial oppression and *apartheid*. It is also in this spirit that we have asked for an opportunity to express our views within the framework of the present debate. We consider that the Security Council and the United Nations in general should at this historic time adopt the firmest and most effective measures, having recourse to the means provided for in the Charter, in order to prevail upon South Africa to put an end immediately to its policy of racial discrimination and *apartheid* and to the illegal occupation of Namibia.

9. Throughout its history the United Nations has never had to face such a serious situation, a situation created by the attitude of a Member State. Although South Africa, because it does belong to this

international forum, has assumed the obligations stemming from the Charter, the successive Governments in that country have repeatedly and flagrantly violated those obligations.

10. The minority régime of Pretoria has established a system of racial segregation, oppression and exploitation unique in modern history, and has elevated to the status of official policy of the State the most degrading phenomenon of our day, *apartheid*, which has quite rightly been described by the United Nations as a crime against humanity. South Africa has thus openly proclaimed its opposition to the Charter. The General Assembly and the Security Council have adopted dozens of resolutions drawing the attention of the South African Government to the fact that its policy and its actions are incompatible with the obligations entailed by the Charter. The United Nations has also asked the South African Government to comply with the provisions of the Charter and put an end to its policy of racial discrimination and *apartheid*. But all these resolutions have been cynically disregarded and violated by the racist régime of Pretoria.

11. The negative attitude of South Africa towards the Charter and United Nations resolutions is also visible in its policy of flagrant violation of the sacred right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence. In defiance of resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, South Africa continues illegally to occupy Namibia, and to promote a policy of annexation without respect to that Territory and to extend to it the policy of *apartheid*. By its attitude, South Africa is continuing to impede the implementation of the mandate entrusted by the General Assembly to the United Nations Council for Namibia designed to bring about independence for that Territory.

12. In this regard the United Nations has repeatedly condemned the policy of South Africa of dividing Namibia into bantustans, undermining national unity and destroying the territorial integrity of Namibia for annexationist purposes. South Africa's reply to appeals to withdraw its armed forces and its whole administration from Namibia has been an obstinate and arrogant declaration of its decision to persist in its actions in violation of the Charter.

13. Nor has there been any response in Pretoria to the measures taken by the United Nations concerning the policy of the racist régime of South Africa and its acts of brutal repression of the struggle of the African people, such as the odious Sharpeville massacre and similar crimes committed against the Namibian population. There has been a complete disregard also of the repeated demands of the United Nations for the freeing of all persons detained by the South African régime who have been the victims of the policy of racial segregation and *apartheid*.

14. With regard to the long list of violations of the Charter and United Nations resolutions committed by the Government of South Africa, I should like to refer very briefly to a few aspects which relate to the conduct of South Africa in its international relations.

15. As we know, under Article 2 of the Charter, Member States assume the explicit obligation to refrain from giving assistance to any State against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action. In violation of resolutions of the Security Council adopted on the basis of Chapter VII of the Charter the South African racist régime is continuing to maintain diplomatic relations with Southern Rhodesia, and persistently fails to apply the sanctions imposed against that country. Furthermore, it is a well-established fact that the South African Government is giving the illegal régime of Ian Smith substantial military support in its repression of the national liberation struggle of the Zimbabwe people. These are irrefutable facts which prove that the Pretoria régime has outlawed itself from the international community.

16. Socialist Romania has always resolutely condemned the policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination of the South African régime. At the same time, my country has firmly and unreservedly advocated respect for the inalienable right of peoples to forge their own destiny in accordance with their national will. We have also participated actively in multilateral support to the struggle for independence and the abolition of the policy of racial discrimination and *apartheid*. This policy was clearly reaffirmed by the President of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Mr. Nicolae Ceaușescu, in many talks with African heads of State and representatives of national liberation movements of Africa, both in Bucharest and in the course of visits to African countries. The message addressed by President Nicolae Ceaușescu to the International Conference of Experts for the Support of Victims of Colonialism and *Apartheid* in Southern Africa states:

“Romania resolutely condemns the policy of *apartheid* and the racial practices of the minority régimes of South Africa and Rhodesia, and firmly advocates the elimination of the shameful colonial yoke.”

17. The Romanian Government, which is tirelessly working to strengthen the capacity to act of the United Nations and to enhance its role in international life, supports the adoption of measures designed to guarantee respect for the Charter and for the principles which should govern relations between States.

18. Our delegation has listened with the closest attention to the impressive number of delegations which have preceded us to this table, and which have provided an ample indictment of the racist

policy of the Pretoria régime. The facts mentioned and the arguments put forward in this debate bring out ever more clearly the justice of a cause which is gaining ground with irresistible strength. This is the struggle to abolish once and for all colonialism and the policy of racial discrimination and *apartheid*, to eliminate force, domination and *diktat* from international life. Socialist Romania, and the whole Romanian people, resolutely support this sacred cause of all peoples.

19. In view of the serious and persistent violations of the principles of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the racist régime of South Africa, we consider that it is the duty of the Security Council to act on the basis of the Charter in order to adopt the most energetic and effective measures possible.

20. In the spirit of the militant solidarity of Socialist Romania with the just cause of the African peoples and with the national liberation struggle of the peoples of southern Africa, the Romanian delegation firmly supports the legitimate demands made by the African States, and the Organization of African Unity, for the expulsion from the United Nations of the minority racist régime of Pretoria. I believe that it is clear—and the General Assembly has confirmed this recently by an almost unanimous vote—that this régime, which represents only the white minority, is illegally occupying the seat which should belong to the legitimate representatives of the people of South Africa as a whole.

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

22. Mr. TRAORÉ (Mali) (*interpretation from French*): As it takes a place at this Council table, my delegation wishes first to extend its very sincere thanks to the members of the Council, who have been good enough to authorize us to participate in the Council's debate on the question of the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa.

23. I should like also to tell you how pleased we are to see this meeting of the Council—to which Africa rightly attaches particular significance and in which it is particularly interested—presided over by one of Africa's eminent sons, a person who, while showing great modesty, has made an impression as a wise and respected diplomat. You represent a country, the United Republic of Cameroon, which has done so much for the cause of African unity and which maintains excellent relations with my country. May your term as President be crowned with success.

24. The violence unleashed by the mad ambitions of Hitlerism to organize the world in accordance with such absurd laws as racial superiority and the

so-called need for *Lebensraum* had just been quelled when, some 30 years ago, the Charter of the United Nations was drafted by men with the dream of building a world free from the horrors of hatred and war. Representing for the most part peoples who had suffered greatly from the war, those authors of the Charter bequeathed to us a precious juridical instrument which, despite its short-comings, is designed to tear down racial, philosophical and religious barriers so that all the men on earth without any exception can, in freedom and liberated from prejudice, co-operate to achieve their common destiny, in justice and equity.

25. Thus, despite certain grave errors and the survival of some imperial rights, the international community with its membership gradually increasing, took the road of rapprochement and understanding among peoples and nations. Year after year the international community, aware of its responsibilities towards history and the Charter, has gone on denouncing and fighting evils like colonialism and racism.

26. The African countries, although they had suffered terribly from the serious misdeeds of savage colonization, did everything, in accordance with the principles of the Charter, to make those oppressing their brothers in southern Africa listen to the voice of reason. Hence, it is not surprising that, in their wisdom, the African heads of State and Government, in 1969, after the adoption of the Lusaka Manifesto,¹ appointed one of their number to come here and warn the international community of the dangers to which it was exposing itself if the application of policies of oppression, exploitation and racial discrimination continued. The Lusaka Manifesto reflected not only the deep aspirations of the African peoples but also the concerns of all men fighting for a better world, the very world that the Charter obliges us to build for our salvation.

27. My delegation cannot speak of the grave problem of South Africa and *apartheid* without in the first place stressing the basic error, an error entailing so many serious consequences, committed by the founders of our Organization in admitting the representatives of the white racists of South Africa, who, beginning in 1909, had made racial segregation a political philosophy and a form of government. The exclusion of non-whites from the South African Parliament, the subsequent refusal to allow non-whites to strike, the herding of those persons into reservations, by force, have been nothing more or less than the application of the deplorable theory of racial superiority.

28. That theory became a real system in 1948 with the coming to power of the National Party, led by

Malan, Strijdom and Verwoerd. What followed is known to everyone. In my opinion, it would be almost an insult to the members of this Council to give a detailed description of this odious and inhuman system of *apartheid*. I shall simply say that the only difference between nazism and *apartheid* is one of name. In 1940, when millions of men fighting against nazism and fascism were falling on the battlefield for freedom, Reverend J. D. Vorster, a brother of the present head of the Pretoria régime said: "Hitler's *Mein Kampf* shows us the road leading to greatness, the road that South Africa must take." Two years later, in 1942, his brother founded a pro-Nazi organization, Odessa Brandwag, and, in his turn, had the following to say during a meeting of that new Nazi phalanx:

"We are for Christian-socialism, an ally of national-socialism. It matters little whether they say that we are against democracy and for dictatorship."

And it was that dictatorship which came crashing down on the unfortunate black people of South Africa; it was that contempt for democracy, that unreasoning taste for brutality, that insult to mankind which prompted Verwoerd to say in 1963: "We want to keep South Africa white. Keeping it white can mean only one thing: white domination."

29. That, then, is the true situation in South Africa. It is cruel, inhuman, degrading and intolerable for its victim and for all of us. Also, and above all, it bears the seeds, today more than ever, of serious concern and danger.

30. The proponents of *apartheid* are inevitably moving towards an armed confrontation, towards war. War has already been declared on the non-white populations of South Africa, where the two liberation movements, the African National Congress of South Africa and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania, have long been conducting their struggle, and there is war already on the borders of neighbouring States; in the very near future war may very well approach the threshold of all those countries which oppose *apartheid*, if this scourge is not destroyed in time.

31. The United Nations quite correctly called *apartheid* a crime against mankind, and it perceived the danger on the many occasions when it declared that *apartheid* was a threat to international peace and security. However that may be, South Africa has been arming feverishly and on a massive scale with the co-operation of those which have included South Africa within their system of defence, the States members of NATO [*North Atlantic Treaty Organization*], some of whom have special responsibilities in the Council.

32. One need only dwell for a moment on some of the laws and regulations enacted and applied in South Africa against the opponents of *apartheid*,

¹ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

an impressive list of which may be found in one of the reports submitted this year by the Special Committee on *apartheid*,² to realize how far *apartheid* is a challenge to human values. These rules and regulations are intended to turn the "beloved country" which Alan Paton wrote about into an immense ghetto. They are an expression of hatred at the service of destruction.

33. The system of *apartheid* is thus in every respect in flagrant contradiction to the purposes and principles of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Accordingly, the Government practising it cannot claim to be part of the Organization. Today one readily perceives the hypocrisy in the utterances of the South African representative, Jan Smuts, at the San Francisco Conference in 1945, when he spoke about the need to include in the Preamble to the Charter certain specific provisions on the safeguarding of human rights. The Pretoria régime by its own doings has put itself outside the pale of the international community in respect of the governing principles of that community.

34. It must also be recognized that in addition to its constant violations of the principles of the Charter, the South African régime is the only one which has been in open conflict with the international Organization, first, because of its occupation by force of Namibia, a Territory falling directly under the jurisdiction of the United Nations, and secondly, because of the powerful support which it is openly giving to the illegal white racist régime in Southern Rhodesia.

35. Certain Members have repeatedly told us that rebukes and warnings will suffice to bring the proponents of *apartheid* to their senses. But we would merely point out to them that the racist Government in Pretoria has never paid any heed to the many resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council calling for a peaceful settlement of the problem of *apartheid*, nor has it ever responded to the solemn appeals which have been made to it by the Presidents of the General Assembly since 1970. It is this scorn which the racists in Pretoria have constantly shown for our Organization which impelled the General Assembly to act as it felt it had a duty to act by calling on the Security Council in resolution 3207 (XXIX) of 30 September to reconsider relations between the United Nations and South Africa.

36. In accordance with the relevant provisions of Article 24 of the Charter, the Security Council, in the discharge of its primary responsibility in the maintenance of peace, acts on behalf of Member States "in order to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations". Thus, the decisions which the Council will be adopting at the conclusion of its

present deliberations must ensure the rapid and effective implementation of resolution 3207 (XXIX), in accordance with the relevant provisions of Article 6 of the Charter. By so doing, the Security Council will be acting in line with the universal action taken against *apartheid* by the international Organization, by the specialized agencies and by world public opinion.

37. We believe that the argument that expelling the Pretoria régime would set a dangerous precedent, has no real validity. What was indeed a dangerous precedent in the opinion of my delegation, was allowing the South African Fascist régime to become part of the Organization. We believe that it is up to the Security Council to rectify an error which was committed in the emotional aftermath of victory. No Member of the Organization can be allowed any longer to ignore a fact which has long been so obvious in the United Nations, and that is, that the South African régime is in no way qualified to sit in our midst, and it must be driven from our ranks in the interests of the Organization itself.

38. Expulsion, then, is the only appropriate sanction to apply against the white racist régime in South Africa. As the contents of Articles 5 and 6 of the Charter indicate, the authors of the Charter realized that the Organization, in its long march towards peace and progress, would at one time or another have to adopt grave but just decisions on the suspension or expulsion of Member States which persistently violated the commitments they had freely entered into.

39. Today, more than ever before, the United Nations, because of the unspeakable and intolerable behaviour of one of its Members, is at a cross-roads and must make a choice which will be decisive for its future: to enforce the Charter and to see that justice is done, or to turn its back on its responsibilities and become an accomplice of a régime which is the shame of all mankind.

40. Ever since the adoption of the historic resolution 3207 (XXIX), the hopes of 17 million non-whites in South Africa, of all African States, and of all the opponents of *apartheid*, have been placed on the Security Council. We wish to place our trust in the Council. We do not believe that any of its members will continue to ignore the untold suffering of an entire people, or the real and increasing danger to international peace and security because of the persistence of the inhuman policy of *apartheid*.

41. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

42. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): At the very outset let me take this opportunity to extend to the brother delegation of Iraq our very sincere

² *Ibid.*, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 22A, part two.

condolences on the untimely death of the distinguished Foreign Minister of that country. We request that delegation to be good enough to convey our feelings to the Government and people of Iraq as well as to the bereaved family.

43. Mr. President, it is not simple courtesy or an exercise in diplomatic nicety when I say how gratifying it is to the Tanzanian delegation to take part in the discussion on this important item under your presidency. You represent a country with close and brotherly ties with my own country. You represent a head of State held in high esteem in our continent both for his statesmanship and for his commitment to the cause of African freedom and international understanding. Given your personal qualities of competence, dedication and fairness the Security Council can be assured of an effective President. Indeed, the dignified and efficient manner in which you have conducted the deliberations of the Council is eloquent testimony that our total faith and confidence in you is properly placed.

44. While the Security Council is considering the issue of the relations between the United Nations and South Africa, there is yet another aspect of your presidency which merits special mention. Members of the United Nations vividly recollect the visit of your esteemed President, Mr. Ahidjo to Turtle Bay and his memorable address to the General Assembly in 1969.³ President Ahidjo came to New York with a specific mission. As the current chairman of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, he had come to present Africa's case on the question of southern Africa. Those of us who were fortunate enough to be present still remember the degree of eloquence and sincerity with which he presented the historic Lusaka Manifesto. Acclaimed by almost the entire United Nations membership as a document of reason, the Manifesto, as we all know, fell on totally deaf ears in so far as the authorities of Pretoria were concerned. It is therefore only fitting that it should fall to you, a worthy representative of an eminent African statesman, to preside over the Council when free Africa has taken the initiative of pursuing the only alternative course left to us subsequent to South Africa's categorical and persistent rejection of the road of reason. There could be no better candidate to lead the Council's onslaught against South Africa's delinquency and recalcitrance.

45. The opening words of the Charter, whereon the Organization is based—and which is the only existing hope for the future of humanity—are the following:

“determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind”

and

“to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small”.

They are telling words from an exhausted world lamenting the disasters the Second World War had caused, yet they are also words of faith and trust in man. They summarize in part the very causes of violence and wars and also the reason for the existence of the Charter and the Organization. To underscore the fundamental philosophy contained in those words, Article 1 of the Charter, which embodies the purposes and principles of the Charter, and Articles 55 and 56 provide those very ideals in explicitly binding terms.

46. To join and belong to the United Nations is to make a solemn reaffirmation of faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and to undertake to make every effort towards the realization of those rights.

47. As a founder Member of the Organization, South Africa not only agreed to be bound by all those principles of the Charter but—and this is interesting to note—it was one of the participants at the San Francisco Conference that pressed for the inclusion of a declaration of human rights in the Charter. The then head of the Government of South Africa, Field Marshal Smuts, insisted:

“I would suggest that the Charter should contain at its very outset and in its preamble a declaration of human rights and of the common faith which has sustained the Allied peoples in their bitter and prolonged struggle for the vindication of those rights and that faith. This war ... has been a war of ideologies, of conflicting philosophies of life and conflicting faiths ... We have fought for justice and decency and for the fundamental freedoms and rights of man, which are basic to all human advancement and progress and peace.”⁴

Indeed, the victory over nazism was considered a triumph for justice and decency and the fundamental freedoms and rights of men which are basic to all human advancement and progress and peace. It was therefore proper that the basic purposes and principles of the Charter should be the achievement of those goals.

48. It was not then considered, as is now asserted, to be outside the concern of the Members what happened to the fundamental freedoms and rights of

³ *Ibid.*, Twenty-fourth Session, Plenary Meetings, 1780th meeting.

⁴ *Documents of the United Nations Conference on International Organization*, vol. 1, p. 425.

man in one of those States. Nor were those matters relegated to being purely the internal affairs of a State. On the contrary, those questions—questions of fundamental freedoms, questions of human dignity—were deemed to be so central to the whole pursuit of peace that they had to be, and indeed were, incorporated in the binding provisions of the Charter itself and later elaborated and enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In resolution after resolution the United Nations has confirmed the view that the problem of human rights is too important to the success of the Organization to be shoved aside as being purely an internal affair of a Member State. For to relegate it to being a purely domestic affair is to shake the very foundation of the Organization—namely, joint action to achieve its objectives. And, by signing the Charter, South Africa agreed to be bound by this principle of joint action.

49. South Africa, in spite of its public acceptance of its obligations under the Charter, has treated the Charter and the United Nations with utter contempt, and has done so persistently and without the slightest attention to the admonition of the rest of the Members and the opinion of mankind as a whole. It is not a case of unintentional failure to observe the Charter. All of us represented here have in one way or another violated the provisions of the Charter at one time or another. But we all try to abide by the Charter. It is one thing to try, to fail, and to try again. It is an entirely different matter to make a deliberate policy of the denial of human rights and to pursue that policy.

50. This attitude manifested itself in the socio-economic and political structure of South Africa even before the arrival of the Charter. But it is ironic and absurd that the entrenchment of this creed into the political and constitutional instruments of the State should follow immediately the birth of the United Nations which South Africa itself helped to create and in the authorship of whose Charter South Africa was instrumental. For it is reported that just before the birth of the United Nations the then ruling party had almost discarded the creed of *apartheid*, and it was in 1948, soon after the creation of the United Nations, that the creed was revived and embedded in the political manifesto of the Government of South Africa. We can therefore say that South Africa repudiated the Charter as soon as it has signed it. And ever since then the *apartheid* régime has pursued and intensified the policies of *apartheid* in unprecedented contempt of the Charter.

51. In 1948, the National Party of South Africa waged its campaign on the basis of *apartheid*. Thus, it began laying ground for the theoretical justification of racism and oppression. In that year the South African Parliament passed two laws, the Asiatic Laws Amendment Act and the Electoral Laws Amendment Act, which respectively denied the people

of Asian origin their vote and made it very difficult for Coloureds to vote. The following year that Parliament enacted the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act. This law made marriages between whites and blacks illegal. A person who contracted such a marriage outside South Africa would not have the validity of that marriage recognized in South Africa. I need not remind the representatives here that this was in direct contravention of article 16, paragraph 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which states:

“Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family”.

That infamous act was later followed by the so-called Immorality Act and the Immorality Amendment Act. The effects of those acts have been disastrous in terms of human relationship in South Africa today. They have provided more reason for oppressing the black people of South Africa and peoples of other races in that country, as evidenced by the following report:

“Whole families suffered when a male or female broke this sex law. There have also been cases of couples who have been living together for years and had grown-up children who found their bedrooms invaded by the police at the dead of the night ... men have committed suicide after being charged under the act ... Particularly tragic was the case of a white painter ... who asked the authorities to reclassify him as Coloured, as he did not want to be parted from his Coloured wife and their small children.”

52. This was not a quotation from a United Nations document. Since the representative of the *apartheid* régime yesterday demonstrated a pathological obsession for United Nations documents, I have endeavoured in my statement to refrain as far as possible from making any reference to those documents. The statement I have quoted appears in a book written by a noted South African journalist and writer, Mr. Jan Botha, in his book, *Verwoerd is Dead*, which was published in Cape Town, in South Africa, the very land of *apartheid*.

53. In other words, instead of protecting the family as article 16, paragraph 3, of the Declaration requires, the South African Government attacks the families of those who are not whites. But as if all this was not enough, discrimination continues even in the enforcement of those infamous acts. Here again let me borrow Mr. Botha's words. He says:

“During the following year up to June 1966 seven Bantu women were convicted while their co-accused—seven white men—were discharged.”

54. To back these notorious schemes and the other measures which the South African Government has

embarked upon, there is a system of registration on the basis of race. The Population Registration Act provides for the registration of every individual according to race and obliges the Coloured and black population to carry passes everywhere they go. It is this infamous tool, together with the Group Areas Act, which the South African Government uses to continue herding the black people into the ghettos which that Government has established for specific population groups. Even a South African Parliamentarian, by the name of Eric Winchester, had this to say in the racist South African Parliament on 23 May 1973 about these ghettos and their effects on the populations which are herded in them:

"The attitude in the [black] townships which we have created is frightening. The slums and ghettos we have created are breeding bitterness which is a threat to our security. Frustration is leading to bitterness, bitterness to hate and hatred to crime and the breaking down of law and order. In our mania to separate, we have created scars in every city and in the minds of the people."

55. The creation of these ghettos is not the only result of this act. Recently, the country has been divided into sections for the Africans, white and Coloured. The black population has invariably been given the most unproductive, the most unhealthy and the smallest part in the relationship to population. The whites invariably have been given the largest part and the most productive, and all the boundaries have been made in such a way that all the mineral wealth is in the white areas. The whites, who constitute 17.5 per cent of the population, get 87 per cent of the land while the black people get only 13 per cent. The creation of the so-called homelands has resulted in unemployment, malnutrition, more arbitrary arrests and detentions and a general debilitation of the African population.

56. In the field of education, the South African Government has pursued a policy calculated to keep the non-whites in a permanent subservient position within the South African society. As far back as 1953, the South African Parliament passed the so-called Bantu Education Act. In a debate in Parliament, Mr. Verwoerd, then the so-called Minister for Native Affairs, had this to say on the type of education that he envisaged for the so-called Bantus in South Africa—and this is the type of education which the representative of the *apartheid* régime had the audacity to boast about yesterday:

"When I have control of native education, I will reform it so that natives will be taught from childhood to realize that equality with Europeans is not for them. ... People who believe in equality are not desirable teachers for natives."

It is on that supremacist and racist foundation that South African education is based.

57. With the same design of keeping the Africans in a position of permanent subservience, certain categories of jobs are not available to the non-white population in South Africa. The so-called Job Reservation Act prohibits employers from making available and employees from holding certain jobs if they are not white. Thus this notorious Act contravenes the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 23, paragraph 1 of which states as follows:

"Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment."

58. There are many instances of discrimination and violation of the principles of our Charter and of the Universal Declaration which I could quote. I shall not tire the Council by commenting on all of them. However, I shall refer to the machinery of oppression which the Pretoria régime has set up in order to enforce its diabolical schemes in South Africa. In their fanatic desire to enforce discrimination and white supremacy, the authorities in Pretoria have adopted strong measures of repression comparable only to the acts of madness practised by Hitler. Detention without trial and restriction to particular areas are the order of the day. They have banned all organized parties and groups which do not support their evil system. Torture of political prisoners has become a daily routine. The shooting of people who are opposed to *apartheid* is commended and the principle of the Declaration regarding peaceful assembly and the expression of ideas is completely negated.

59. Thus we have seen in South Africa the introduction of Draconian measures such as the so-called Suppression of Communism Act, the Terrorism Act and other similar measures calculated to stifle the activities of the people of South Africa who are opposed to the inhuman policies of *apartheid*. The so-called Minister of Justice is given powers in those Acts to deprive any person who is listed as a Communist of his livelihood, and to exclude him from all social contacts. In addition, it must be noted that in South Africa there is no due process of law, which in itself is a violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

60. The report by Mr. R. A. Falk, an observer at the trial of Tuhadeleni and others, a trial of the patriots of Namibia in South Africa, is evidence of this disrespect for the rule of law. That report, published by the International Commission of Jurists, shows how such trials are in fact not trials but political tools designed to entrench the *apartheid* authorities in South Africa. Mr. Falk concluded his report with the following words:

"The trials with their fanfare, then, must be understood as efforts by the Government of South

Africa to consolidate still further its claims of dictatorial powers”.

61. The system in South Africa is not different from that system which was fought against in the Second World War. It was the supremacist system which Hitler wanted to impose on the world which caused that war. Hitler had described his plans in his book, *Mein Kampf*, as follows:

“A people that fails to preserve the racial purity of its blood thereby destroys the unity of the soul of the nation in all its manifestations.”

It was in pursuance of such a supremacist conception that the world was plunged into catastrophe. It was among other things to prevent the emergence of such a supremacist doctrine, with its attendant dangers, that the United Nations was established. Yet today we are faced with an identical supremacist ideology practised in South Africa.

62. On 16 August 1963, Verwoerd, then Prime Minister of South Africa, said this regarding white supremacy:

“Let me be very clear about this. When I talk of the nation of South Africa, I talk of the white people of South Africa. ... I see the National Party today—and I say it openly—not as an Afrikaner or English or Afrikaner-English party in the future whatever it might have been in the past. I see it as a party that stands for the preservation of the white man, of the white government in South Africa.”

This supremacist ideology is the motive force in South Africa today.

63. John Vorster, the present Prime Minister of the *apartheid* régime, is quoted as saying the following in his young days—and I must stress that this, again, is not a quotation from a United Nations document but a quotation from Mr. Vorster:

“We stand for Christian nationalism, which is an ally of National Socialism, you can call the anti-democratic principle ‘dictatorship’ if you wish. In Italy it is called fascism, in Germany, German nationalism and in South Africa Christian nationalism.”

No wonder that a State in the hands of Mr. John Vorster should today be continuing this policy of supremacy and discrimination.

64. When voices of reason in Europe called attention to the true nature of nazism and what Hitler represented for the future of mankind, the world ignored those voices at the price of a tragic war to restore freedom. Today the situation in South Africa is a reincarnation of nazism. Again, voices of

truth, voices of reason, voices of justice, are calling attention to the dangers posed by *apartheid* in all its manifestations. This world Organization can ignore those voices only at our collective peril.

65. The problem of *apartheid* and racial discrimination professed, preached and practised by a Member of the Organization is a critical test of the very sincerity of each and every single Member, and of the seriousness of the Charter. If the world derived, as it did, great hope from the adoption of the Charter by the world community of nations and from the birth of the United Nations, it was because the Charter and the United Nations constitute a solemn promise to mankind that nations will make every effort to stamp out not only wars and international conflicts but also the evils that deny man dignity and freedom, evils which are admittedly the causes of all wars and human suffering.

66. The undertaking we made to men, women and children the world over must not, unless we condemn ourselves as hypocritical, be an idle promise devoid of conscious determination and conscientious efforts to fulfil it. If we said, as we did, through the Charter that we were determined not only to observe individually the provisions of the Charter but also to take joint action in co-operation for the achievement of the purposes set out therein, we could not but be expected to demonstrate the seriousness of our word. Failure to do so would make us appear irresponsible, to say the least.

67. The existence among our membership of not simply a delinquent culprit but a sworn enemy of human dignity who brazenly slaps the Organization in the face is not only an insult to the United Nations but also an indictment of the whole of the rest of the membership for permitting the betrayal of the hope which the Charter inspired in our peoples, lifting humanity from the agonizing consequences of Nazi tyranny, for our pledges and pronouncements are displayed in black and white in the Charter and read by our peoples throughout the world. Our actions are easily measured by them against our words, and we are accountable for the contradictions which we display and the slackness we allow ourselves in taking the appropriate action when it is demanded of us that we do so.

68. At this meeting the Security Council is called upon to pause and consider seriously whether the deliberate, repugnant policies of South Africa in serious violation of the Charter are consistent with the membership of this conscious defaulter in the United Nations. While we are sitting in this chamber, the whole of mankind, let alone the suffering and humiliated non-white populations in South Africa, is watching anxiously to see whether or not we were serious with our pledges, whether we have not forgotten the human degradation which we resolved no longer to tolerate among us; indeed, whether we still hold

the Charter and the United Nations as important instruments and symbols of hope for all. The moment of the test of integrity, the integrity of our words and actions and of our Organization, has now arrived. We cannot afford to fail the test. Mankind, I submit, will never forgive us.

69. Throughout the history of the Organization there has not been any segment of the membership, not one single Member, that has at any time, even obliquely, sought to justify or rationalize the policies propounded and practised by the Pretoria régime. The reason is obvious. For while many of the Member States have short-comings in the policies relating to the rights of individuals, only South Africa has as a State doctrine the principle that human beings are not equal and are not to be treated as equal. Membership in an Organization presupposes adherence to and observance of the fundamental principles upon which the Organization is founded and the goals for which it aims. The Charter is based on the cardinal principle that human beings are equal and that they must enjoy all the fundamental freedoms that are the natural and inalienable rights of man. The Pretoria régime refutes in theory and denies in practice this fundamental principle. Thus, where in all countries human beings can seek recourse to national and governmental institutions to right the wrongs done to them, it is only in South Africa that the national and government institutions are utilized to wrong and suppress the people. Hence, it is this fundamental issue that has made all the Members denounce the Pretoria régime. And it is this aspect which has given South Africa the very distinction of being the single country whose policies have featured on every agenda for analysis and for efforts to redress the evils visited upon the people of South Africa.

70. The Security Council needs no retelling of the crimes that the racist régime in South Africa has committed in contravention of the Charter. These, as I have already indicated, are a matter of common knowledge and are fully documented. Nor does it need to be reminded how often the Council's decisions on South Africa with its *apartheid* and racist policies have been ignored with contempt and with impunity. The General Assembly has *ad nauseam* adopted resolution after resolution, just to be rebuffed with further intensification of those very violations which that régime is called upon to desist from. And for the last four sessions the General Assembly rejected the credentials of the racist régime and made it known that it was a serious warning to that régime. But the warnings, like most warnings, do not seem to have impressed the *apartheid* régime. The specialized agencies and other international forums, like the Organization of African Unity, have spared no effort in their endeavours to correct the Fascist mentality of that régime, but these again have equally fallen on the barren rock of bigotry.

71. The sum total of all these is that South Africa has been given sufficient admonition to conform with the accepted international norms and standards of conduct required of a Member of the Organization. Nevertheless, the *apartheid* régime has grown in its arrogance and defiance of the world community. The General Assembly therefore has correctly decided that the time has come to reconsider the relations of the United Nations with South Africa. Indeed, the Organization of African Unity, which took the initiative for that decision, has already come to the conclusion that the membership of South Africa in the United Nations is an anomalous contradiction of the Organization. The Charter itself, in Article 6, provides in clear terms:

"A Member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the Principles contained in the present Charter may be expelled from the Organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

South Africa has not only persistently violated the principles contained in the Charter, but prides itself on those violations. It has rejected the Charter and does not qualify to remain in the Organization. Indeed, by submitting this question to the Security Council, the General Assembly has indicated that it is high time the United Nations purified itself by ridding itself of the blemish and stigma of associating itself with racial bigotry institutionalized. The United Nations cannot coexist with racial bigotry so institutionalized.

72. Proceeding from this fact it is to be noted that often it has been stated that among the Members of the Organization the difference lies not in whether we universally abhor *apartheid* but in the approach towards eliminating that cancer in our body politic. We would sincerely and most honestly like to believe this. However, there are Members among us which, by professing the theme of "difference in approach", have co-operated with South Africa, collaborated with South Africa and, contrary to their pronouncements, encouraged the Pretoria régime in its misguided and evil policies. Is it truly realistic to believe that it is possible to deal with a malignant tumour without radical surgery?

73. Fraternization with South Africa entrenches the evils of *apartheid*. Half-hearted measures cannot be an adequate substitute for the surgery so indispensable to remove the cancerous element in the Organization. The United Nations cannot coexist with *apartheid* South Africa. Any member of the Security Council which disregards this opinion at this critical moment will, in so doing, confirm the disregard with which it treats mankind.

74. To pretend that the principle of universality demands that South Africa should remain in the United Nations is to distort the very sense of that

principle. For it would be to assert that universality is an empty word. If that were valid, would there be any sense in including Articles 4, 56 and, especially, Article 6 of the Charter? Would it not be to deny the Charter of any content, if not to ridicule the very principle of universality? We will only render discredit to the signatories of the Charter to argue in this manner.

75. Those who think that South Africa will see reason by the repetition of resolutions, resolutions which are not followed by action, are mistaken, even if innocently so. The presence of South Africa in a respectable Organization like this only gives it a cloak of respectability and a cover for its condemned, repulsive and nefarious policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination. South Africa's presence in the Organization gives the impression that it subscribes to the purposes and principles of the Charter. That will be for the United Nations the biggest cover-up of all the cover-ups in its history. The exhortations contained in the numerous resolutions of the United Nations have already proved ineffective. It is therefore only by dissociating itself from South Africa that the United Nations can demonstrate to the world how mutually exclusive are the United Nations and *apartheid* South Africa.

76. The time has come: this is the hour. The hand of history is waiting, anxiously waiting, to record a momentous decision of our time. Will it record the words and decisions of courageous men, who call for the start of and set the pace for our race to universal justice, a race which indeed we have to win and must win? Will it record decisions of men of destiny, the destiny of universal justice under sovereign equality for all men and all peoples? Or will it record the words of prevarication and of States afraid of their own responsibilities and indifferent to the suffering of innocent men in South Africa?

77. This is the time when the Security Council and in particular its permanent members with their powers of veto must be aware of their responsibilities and reconcile them with the hopes and expectations of mankind. There should be no escaping this responsibility. The Council has the opportunity to write the first chapter in the book of human justice, thereby closing, if one may be allowed to hope, the last chapter of the book of injustice in that part of the world. For we know that no people can become immune to suffering and persecution because they have been persecuted and have suffered so long. We know that no people can become immune to human degradation simply because they have suffered degradation so long. And history teaches us that they will struggle and continue to struggle until they have overcome the oppression irrespective of the decision we make in the Council. It is only fitting and wise, however, that the Council should associate itself fully with such a legitimate struggle.

78. We want to make it quite clear therefore that if we do not take the decision that we should take, then the Council will be writing another chapter of injustice. Even before the momentous decision of the General Assembly to reject the credentials of the South African régime, that régime's intransigence was a matter of continuous record. You heard yesterday the representative of the *apartheid* régime make his flippant excuses for *apartheid*. There was no apology, there were no regrets, only another unashamed defence of the very policies that stand discredited and are perpetually condemned in the Organization. If, therefore, we do not take the correct decision now, that intransigence will, through that failure to take action, be abetted and encouraged by those of you who sit as members of the Council and fail to take action. And history will not absolve you.

79. Let me also say this: those who claim to be the guardians of our Charter should indeed be the last people to take any action that would undermine it. Is this too much to expect of them? Those who eat and pride themselves on eating at the table of *apartheid* must recognize that their pleasure comes from the sweat of *apartheid* slavery. They do not therefore escape the guilt for *apartheid*, for they help to give sustenance and nourishment to the policies of *apartheid*.

80. My African colleagues who have preceded me have presented more than eloquently Africa's stand on this vital issue. I need only refer, for example, to the brilliant statement made by a brother and colleague, the representative of Mauritius, Mr. Ramphul [1797th meeting]. Yet, and this is an important fact, no amount of cataloguing can adequately document the iniquities that are daily being perpetrated against the innocent people of South Africa. At the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly we had this to say:

"each day that *apartheid* is allowed to reign supreme in South Africa constitutes 24 hours of scandal and disgrace for civilized humanity and the Organization".⁵

This situation has not changed, and in fact would be made worse if the Security Council failed in this hour of decision.

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

82. Mr. JAMAL (Qatar): Mr. President, at the outset of my remarks I should like to associate myself with my colleagues who have extended to you their

⁵ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings, 2133rd meeting, para. 62.

warm congratulations on the occasion of your assumption of the highly important post of President of the Council. Your presence in this post is a tribute to the people of Africa and the third world and constitutes a recognition of your high abilities and wisdom in conducting the deliberations of the Council. I wish also to thank you for allowing me to state the views of my delegation on a subject which is a cause of great concern to the Government and people of the State of Qatar.

83. My delegation strongly welcomes the decision of the General Assembly, taken on 30 September 1974, which calls upon the Security Council to review the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa. We are all aware that the white racist minority régime of South Africa has consistently violated the resolutions of the Council and the Assembly ever since the founding of the United Nations. That régime has further conducted itself in a manner most offensive to all decent human beings and has flagrantly violated the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It is a régime whose arrogance and firm belief in its superiority have deprived millions of our brothers in mankind, the black majority of South Africa, of their very humanity.

84. *Apartheid* is modern-day slavery. There are no words eloquent enough to describe the spiritual, mental and physical suffering of the black people of South Africa or the degree of oppression to which they have been subjected. We have all agonized over this situation. We have lamented this situation. We have adopted resolutions and recommendations. But the South African régime, instead of heeding the sombre voice of world opinion, has intensified its policies of repression. Murders, assassinations, kidnappings and jailings of opponents of its evil policies are daily occurrences. The reports of the Special Committee on *Apartheid*⁶ give factual information on the policies of oppression and on the arbitrary and inhuman laws designed to suppress every voice of opposition. I am certain that members of the Council are well aware of the contents of these reports and I shall therefore refrain from discussing them in detail.

85. The repeated warnings of the United Nations to South Africa have gone unheeded. In the meantime, the black population, which constitutes 83 per cent of the total, has had no reprieve. We have a responsibility to this people. Its hopes are pinned upon us. And if we take no action, we shall only be strengthening the hand of the racist régime.

86. In addition to its repression of the indigenous black people of South Africa, the white minority régime is continuing its illegal occupation of Namibia in violation of the resolutions of the United Nations

and has subjected the Territory and its people to the worst form of exploitation. Furthermore, the vast degree of military and economic co-operation between the evil régime of South Africa and the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia is in violation of the sanctions imposed against the latter régime and is an additional indication that the South African régime has no regard for the United Nations.

87. It is indeed a cause for wonder that the Organization, which considers *apartheid* to be a crime, should allow a régime which glorifies and lives by this crime to be represented in it. Article 6 of the Charter states:

“A Member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present Charter may be expelled from the Organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council.”

My delegation is firmly convinced that the South African régime has acted and continues to act in contravention of the Charter and urges that this Article be invoked for the purpose of expelling South Africa from the Organization.

88. My delegation, which supports the principle of universality, believes that the expulsion of South Africa would not in any manner violate this principle. On the contrary, such an act affirms it. If only 17 per cent of the population of South Africa enjoy political rights by virtue of their belonging to the white race, while the black majority are denied their most elementary rights, how can such a minority's claim to represent the entire population be acceptable to anyone?

89. We believe that it is the solemn duty of the Security Council to act decisively to punish a régime that has already been expelled and excluded from the World Health Organization, the International Labour Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and a host of international organizations and conferences.

90. It is now more evident than ever that we should take concrete steps towards strengthening the effectiveness of the United Nations. One such step would entail the co-operation of all, particularly the big Powers, in ensuring that the resolutions of the Organization are implemented. The contempt that the régimes in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Israel have shown for the repeated resolutions of the United Nations severely impairs its effectiveness, detracts from its prestige and discourages those struggling to liberate themselves from the colonial yoke. The settler régimes of South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Israel have built themselves up on the pain and suffering of the indigenous population. In fact, the Zionist régime of Israel went so far as to declare the continuous presence of the indigenous

⁶ *Ibid.*, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 22 and Supplement No. 22A, part two.

Palestinian Arabs to the undesirable and proceeded to expel them from their homeland. The unholy alliance between Israel and South Africa or, perhaps more aptly, between Zionism and *apartheid* is now firmly sealed. Both are elitist. Both are exclusivist and both are subjected to attacks by an enraged world opinion. So it is not surprising that South Africa and Israel, which have recently elevated their diplomatic representation to the ambassadorial level, find in each other a natural and trusted ally as well as a comrade in isolation from the world community. The high level of their co-operation in all fields, particularly the military field, is in line with their unified goal, that of oppressing the indigenous population.

91. The goal of world peace and security cannot be attained as long as *apartheid*, colonialism, occupation by force and annexation continue to be tolerated. The interdependence of the world community has recently been highlighted by a series of important events. This interdependence can be constructive and beneficial to all only if it is based upon the Charter of the United Nations and the noble aims and purposes of the Organization.

92. In conclusion, my delegation believes that the expulsion of the evil racist régime of South Africa would enhance the prestige of the Organization, would serve as a warning to those who persist in defying its resolutions and would give support and encouragement to the millions of South African blacks who aspire to regain their elementary rights and their dignity as human beings.

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

94. Mr. HARMON (Liberia): As this is the first time I have spoken under your presidency, Sir, and most especially as the Security Council is now seized of one of the gravest problems facing Africa and the world community, nothing gives my country and me more pleasure and satisfaction than to be able to extend to you the warmest congratulations of a sister country, and my own congratulations, on your assumption of the high office of President of the Council, and to extend to you also our prayers and best wishes that you will preside over and lead this month's meetings of the Council with credit to your great country and people, the people of Africa and the people of the world.

95. This also brings into focus the fact that, correspondingly, another worthy and illustrious son of Africa is now presiding over the General Assembly while you, Sir, preside over the Security Council, when the Council has been requested to review the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa in the light of South Africa's violation of the

principles of the Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

96. By the same token, I would be remiss if I did not commend your predecessor, Mr. Richard of the United Kingdom, who held the office of President of the Council for the month of September. I extend to him my Government's and my delegation's congratulations on a job well done.

97. We had asked to be the last of the non-members of the Security Council to speak in this debate—although I now understand that we shall not be—in order to remind this body that my Government's concern about the issues of *apartheid* even predates the consideration of those issues by the United Nations. Our concern stemmed both from our humanitarian ideals and from our deep awareness that a policy that was the offspring of racial conflict in any part of the African continent not only would lead to internal disorder but would very definitely endanger the peace and stability of the whole continent. Most of our leaders of Africa can well testify that President Tolbert, like his predecessor, has been most vocal in his commitment to fight for the total liberation of his brothers from oppression and every form of racial domination.

98. My Government's position on the question of *apartheid*, in particular, has been consistently clear and positive. This position can be traced back to long before the year 1952, when the United Nations became seized of this problem. Thus, more than 20-odd years later, Liberia remains committed among those who are ready to be counted in raising their voices against the iniquitous and diabolical policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa. This crime touches the hearts of decent men and women throughout the world and fills them with deep sadness. It seems crystal clear that the Security Council members, who must be the judges of this period of world history, must act in the best interest of the world community, and in particular of the peoples of Africa, whose brothers are being shattered and unnecessarily denied respect for human dignity and the fundamental freedoms given to them by God.

99. The very agonizing question of race conflict in South Africa, resulting from the wicked and atrocious policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa, has reached a climax and has thereby brought into focus the need for all peace-loving countries to exert concerted efforts to give evidence of their Governments' adherence to the avowed policies guaranteed under the United Nations Charter. Their failure to do that would be a denial of the ideal of human equality, human worth and human dignity, the foundation-stones of civilization.

100. As a consequence of my Government's consistent position on *apartheid* and because of the importance we attach to that question, my Government

has authorized me to repeat, for emphasis, some of the relevant portions of a statement made about 13 years ago by Liberia's representative, Mr. Barnes—who unfortunately cannot be here because he is recovering from his recent illness. Speaking on the question of *apartheid*, he said:

“In a moment I would like briefly to recall the development of this grave issue of *apartheid* in the United Nations; but before I do so, I should like to set the framework for my discussion.

“Within that framework I should like to turn to the Charter and reread with you a few of the principles contained therein. These words cannot be spoken too often, nor can we reflect on them too frequently; first, from the second paragraph of the Preamble: ‘To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small’; secondly, from Article 1, paragraph 3: ‘To achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion’; and more specifically, Articles 55 and 56, which I have no need to quote.

“It was within this framework established for the purpose of developing a just and secure world order in which all men could live and grow in an environment free of inequality, of hate, of fear and of poverty that the General Assembly in 1952 undertook consideration of the question of *apartheid*.

“Since that time, the General Assembly has passed many resolutions affirming *apartheid* to be racial discrimination inconsistent with the Charter and with the obligations of Members under Article 56. Even so, the Government of South Africa has persistently failed to comply with the repeated requests and demands of the United Nations and to revise its racial policies and observe its obligations under the Charter.

“Quite the contrary, the Government of South Africa has intensified its policies of *apartheid* and stepped up its systematic repression of the Africans, who constitute more than two thirds of the population of the country. Indeed, the representative of South Africa has recently had the effrontery to lecture the General Assembly itself about the presumed necessities and virtues of his Government's *apartheid* policies, which no other State supports.

“I might note that in extolling the virtues of *apartheid* in the Assembly on 11 October last,⁷ the

Foreign Minister of South Africa managed to cast a disapproving eye at almost all the nations represented in the Assembly and endeavoured to demonstrate that the benefits of South African repression far exceed the blessings of equality, freedom and independence which is the happy lot of the people of my country and elsewhere in Africa and other parts of the world. In my view, that type of defence surrounds the Minister's statement and the policies he defends with an aura of paranoia.

“This incredible situation where South Africa insists that it alone is right and the rest of the world is wrong has just produced a vote of censure against South Africa. This censure should be such a drastic shock to South Africa that its Government must begin to heed cumulative United Nations resolutions and the entire force of world public opinion which demands an end to *apartheid*, and coming on top of South Africa's break with the British Commonwealth, has now virtually isolated the South African Government from the rest of the world community.

“There are certainly few, if any, precedents in modern history where a Government has so persistently pursued a wholly immoral, impractical policy in the face of total condemnation by the rest of the world—including membership in international organizations. This frustrating anomaly has quite naturally led to strong movements within the United Nations for the employment of political and economic sanctions against the Republic of South Africa, and even for its expulsion from the United Nations.

“These are, of course, exceedingly strong measures—sanctions have rarely been invoked by the United Nations, and no Member has yet been expelled. But one can understand the powerful emotional and practical pressures behind the movement for such drastic measures.

“For South Africa's attitude and behaviour is perhaps the most contemptuous rebuff that the United Nations has experienced. It is particularly difficult for us, African States, to witness this most virulent and flagrant example of racial discrimination practised against our own brothers on our own continent.

“In South Africa racial discrimination is not just an emotional or social attitude that good people and good Governments deplore; it is the official policy of the South African Government and the ruling white citizenry.

“What is this *apartheid* policy? It is a doctrine of racial superiority, domination and exploitation. It holds that the black African is mentally inferior. The then Union Government's Bureau for Educational and Social Research undertook certain

⁷ *Ibid.*, Sixteenth Session, Plenary Meetings, 1033rd meeting.

surveys in an effort to prove this claim. Tests were also carried out by the Interdepartmental Committee on Native Education of the Union to prove what is a purposeful but unfounded assumption. They were not only limited in scope but taken without regard to the environmental situation of those tested or to the nutritional differences between the African and European children so tested.

"In a survey carried out by Mr. Gunnar Myrdal, an eminent Swedish sociologist, by comparison of the capacities of the Negro and white population of the United States, in his work entitled *An American Dilemma*, volume 1, 1944, he reached the conclusion that findings regarding innate mental abilities cannot be drawn from comparisons between children whose home environment and state of nutrition differ as widely as do those of the African and European children tested in South Africa.

"Of course, I should state at once that Africans and, for that matter, other so-called Coloured peoples of the world, reject out of hand, as false, mischievous and unfounded the doctrine of racial superiority. In fact, in its true setting, its objectives are based on fear and the determination to continue the domination and exploitation of them.

"We have been told time and time again by the representatives of South Africa that the aim of *apartheid* was to help the 'Bantu'. All reason dictates an opposite conclusion. For briefly, what does the policy do: it puts ever greater limitations on educational opportunities; it perpetuates dreadful economic inequality and a system of enforced poverty; it restricts opportunities for decent housing; it affords precious little freedom of association; precious little freedom of speech and precious little freedom to participate in the political affairs of the State of which these oppressed peoples are citizens.

"We can only conclude that this policy restricts the development of the human personality, destroys initiative, erodes self-confidence and impoverishes the human spirit. Moreover, there is no one present who does not remember the dreadful incident at Sharpeville which made a prophet of the United Nations Commission on the Racial Situation in the Union of South Africa, which stated in its first report⁸ that the policy of *apartheid* sowed the seeds of internal disorder and foreshadowed even greater conflagrations. No one can doubt that there will be an inflammatory tinderbox on the continent of Africa as long as we, the free inhabitants of that continent, are confronted with the painful picture of our brothers shackled in human bondage by repressive legislation.

"Our purpose has been fourfold: first, to alleviate the abysmal conditions under which our brothers on the African continent live; secondly, to help to bring about a change in the attitude of the white South Africans; thirdly, to focus world attention on this most unhappy spectacle of human behaviour so that the world will long remember with dismay and disgust the things they have seen through our eyes; and, fourthly, to help the United Nations translate its high principles into living realities in South Africa and throughout the world."

101. The problem with which we are dealing at present is not only vital but one which goes to the very root and foundation of human life and must influence for good or ill the destiny and fate of the United Nations among our people and all decent men and women everywhere.

102. Our intervention at this time is not made either as a matter of politics or out of selfish motives. As was mentioned by the South African representative yesterday, it is made only to try to influence the resolution of a matter which lies near the hearts not only of the peoples of Africa but of the peoples of our one world. *Apartheid*, racial discrimination, or whatever name it is given or called by, can no longer be tolerated. Africans as a rule hate no one and would love everyone who allowed it. However, they will not be put off or delayed for the simple reason that they will no longer suffer the indignities to which they have been subjected for far too long.

103. *Apartheid* has ever and anon been condemned by the United Nations and other international bodies. In 1961, the Conference of Heads of African and Malagasy States met in Monrovia, and in May of that year unanimously adopted the following resolution regarding the South African situation:

"Condemns unreservedly the theory and practice of *apartheid* by the Government of the Union of South Africa;

"Calls on all African and Malagasy States to apply immediately political and economic sanctions, collectively and individually, against the Government of the Union of South Africa, not only to demonstrate our resentment of the ruthless degradation of the non-white there, but also ultimately to compel the Government of the Union of South Africa to abandon the iniquitous practice of *apartheid*;

"Calls on all African and Malagasy States to take all necessary steps to give all material and moral support to the Africans and Asians of South Africa in their struggle to regain the stature of man;

⁸ This statement was made at the 272nd meeting, of the Special Political Committee, the official records of which are published in summary form (see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixteenth Session*).

^{*} *Ibid.*, Eighth Session, Supplement No. 16.

"Affirms that all the participating African States strongly support the reiterated decision of the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations that the Government of the Union of South Africa must acknowledge the authority of the Council as guardian of the Mandate over the Territory of South West Africa."

104. Liberia and a number of African Governments proceeded to break off diplomatic and economic relations with the South African Government following that declaration. More than that, Liberia and Ethiopia undertook to bring a case before the International Court of Justice against South Africa for the violation of its Mandate responsibilities concerning South West Africa, including racial discrimination against the native population, but despite that trend of events and actions the Government of South Africa has continued even to accelerate its *apartheid* policy.

105. As a passing reference, let me at this point, following those issues from an historical point of view, ask who among the members of the Council or the members of the General Assembly could have prophesied in 1952, when the question of *apartheid* in South Africa was first brought under consideration, that today, when a final decision on events is to be made in connexion with South Africa's relationship with and its expulsion from this Organization, that the two top positions would be held by illustrious sons of Africa? That is what change does. The greatest thing about change is change itself. The Government of South Africa should not, nor would it wish to, live in isolation. There is at present a wind of change that prevails in our one world. If the country of South Africa or any other country does not want to live in isolation, it should take steps to put its house in order and show some positive approach and willingness to accept change. No nation of today can survive as an island unto itself, nor can any country, regardless of how great or powerful it may be, afford to defy world opinion and be oblivious to change. We wish to warn South Africa to take heed and not simply continue to say that expelling it from the United Nations would not solve anything, that it would merely make it harder for the Government to play a positive role in the development of its country. The time for platitudes is past; it is time for positive action and full recognition of the principles of human dignity.

106. It therefore seems clear to my delegation that we have certainly reached the point where some forceful measures must be seriously considered and immediate action must be taken as the first step in trying to force the Government of South Africa into fully realizing that it cannot avoid the inevitable, which is change, and we cannot go on from year to year adopting resolutions requesting the South African Government to modify its policies which, as a Member State, it continues to flaunt. It is imperative that the

Council find effective means to bring the South African Government to its senses and to provide credible support for its own resolutions.

107. My delegation is of the opinion that the basis of our action in bringing relief to this situation which has plagued the United Nations for more than two decades must now end at this meeting and be resolved by you, the members of the Council, so that history can record that at this time the appropriate action was taken by a Security Council charged with the responsibility of ensuring international peace and security.

108. In conclusion, I am moved to re-emphasize that in Africa and in the United Nations we have been extraordinarily patient, and we must now take appropriate steps that will uphold the dignity and meaning of the United Nations itself. The United Nations is not a neutral body but rather, as has often been said, the embodiment of our civilization and the reflection of us all. Should we fail in the discharge of our duties, this generation of man stands to be condemned before all future generations for all its weaknesses of will, for the narrowness of its vision and for the limitations of its intellect.

109. The whole world is eagerly watching to see what will be the outcome of these Council meetings. Press reports are constantly arriving, giving a day-to-day commentary on the positions of Member States. Whatever the ultimate position may be, let it truly reflect the fact that an historic decision was made affecting the future and dignity of so many oppressed people who have been denied their God-given rights.

110. With your permission, on behalf of my Government I should now like to pay a special tribute to the Secretary-General, whose untiring efforts and dedicated service in the cause of peace and world understanding deserve our highest commendation.

111. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The last speaker is the representative of Kuwait, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

112. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): May I congratulate you, Mr. President, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month and wish you the best of success in guiding the deliberations of this Council. I am grateful to you and to the other members of the Council for acceding to my request to address the Council on an item of overriding human and political importance.

113. South Africa has been the bastion of *apartheid* since the success of the white minority in achieving supremacy over the black and the Coloured indigenous majority. *Apartheid* was introduced into the area by the whites as an instrument designed to perpetuate unchallenged the dominance they enjoy in the

economic, political, cultural and military fields. In other words, it is an attempt by the minority to elevate itself to the attractive luxury of multifaceted power, while relegating the non-white majority to abominable conditions of subordination, backwardness and degradation. The motivations behind the authors of *apartheid* are primarily and chiefly economic. The objectives are the maintenance of an uninterrupted flow of cheap human labour whose submissiveness is ensured through harsh, repressive and brutal measures of intimidation and terror. The theory of establishing a human reservoir for the sake of creating a small enclave of affluence for the white inhabitants in the midst of the black majority was uppermost in the minds of the architects and the progenitors of *apartheid*. To achieve this end laws that deny the majority their rights of equality in all aspects of life have been promulgated. The white minority has been trying to keep the black majority docile and submissive by depriving them of basic human rights such as education and isolating them from civilized society and rewarding living conditions. In short, South Africa has erected a barbed-wire system around the majority with a view to preventing the penetration of civilization and suppressing all calls for equality and the assertion of rights.

114. The United Nations long ago declared *apartheid* a crime against humanity. One wonders why the perpetrators of such a crime are allowed to remain in an international community which constantly proclaims its indignation over the policy of South Africa and is always ready to condemn the theory and practice of *apartheid* with all its ramifications. My delegation is disinclined to believe that there is room for compatibility between the presence of South Africa in the United Nations and the continuous condemnation of its policies by our international Organization. South Africa's record in challenging the United Nations and flouting its resolutions justifies its immediate expulsion. The world will not condone the action of a small minority in vitiating its will and therefore would like to see South Africa's racist régime expelled from the United Nations. For the world has, a long time ago, declared South Africa *persona non grata*. South Africa's allies and friends invoke all sorts of legal arguments to maintain its presence within our Organization. We know that the economic and political interests of some prevail over their moral obligations. We know that political considerations often prevail over moral responsibility. But we are equally aware that the United Nations will lag far behind in its quest to achieve its goals if such considerations are accepted as guidelines for norms of conduct. For, as long as interests have priority over other considerations the realization of the aims and purposes of the Charter will be beyond our reach. As long as *apartheid* and other anachronisms exist our endeavours to attain the noble goals of the Charter will be a wild-goose chase. Universality of representation in the United Nations does not in any way countenance the presence of a minority régime

which represents 17 per cent of the population of South Africa and which consistently usurps the rights of the majority who should rightfully be represented in international bodies.

115. Two types of measures have hitherto not been tried. The first is the imposition of complete and total sanctions on South Africa. Experience with the imposition of sanctions on Rhodesia has shown that they are often observed by certain countries in the breach rather than in the application—so much so that the economy of Rhodesia is advancing with perceptible progress, contrary to what we had been advised to accept. The second type of measure is, as I indicated earlier, the expulsion of South Africa from this Organization. There is no place in this body for a country whose official policy is predicated on degrading man, debasing the ideals of the Charter and devastating the principles of equality enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The situation in South Africa is, no doubt, a threat to international peace and security. The continuation of the policy of *apartheid* therein is a blemish on the face of humanity and a disgrace to mankind. The eradication of this policy is not the responsibility of a single Government or of a certain people but rather rests squarely on the shoulders of the Security Council. It is indispensable that the Council should initiate collective and punitive measures to free the black majority from the tentacles of servitude.

116. Listening to the sordid statement of the representative of Mr. Vorster yesterday, I realized that South Africa is still far from being able to take a leaf from the book of Portugal. He alleged that the discriminatory laws in South Africa were introduced to avoid friction and to promote and protect the interests and the development of every group, whether white or non-white. But it is well known that these very laws and their present application triggered friction, animosity and hatred with all the attendant results of suppression and oppression. He pleaded innocence while he admitted the application of measures initiated for the preservation of the whites' superiority. South Africa a long time ago lost its pretense of innocence. However, the statement of Mr. Vorster's representative reaffirmed our belief that only through a combination of the forces of the suppressed majority and the enlightened world can *apartheid* be eliminated. He contented that his Government conquered no people and threatened nobody. One is tempted to ask whether the relegation of 83 per cent of the population to the limbo of misery by brute force is not a human conquest; or whether the continuous threats against the neighbouring African States and the military encroachment on their Territories is not an attempt to reverse the wind of change so as to make it blow in favour of Pretoria.

117. The General Assembly overwhelmingly rejected the credentials of the representative of the white

minority régime in South Africa. The voice of the majority was resoundingly against the presence of the Pretoria régime in the United Nations. There is a clear mandate from the General Assembly for the Security Council to act upon, and the hopes of the predominant majority are reposed in the Council, which is called upon to respect and live up to those hopes and expectations. The failure of the Council to take the necessary measures will have a grave bearing on the situation inside South Africa. The majority of the people, betrayed by the supreme organ of the United Nations entrusted with maintaining peace and order, will resort to sanguinary violence and bloodshed that has no bounds. For the indigenous people of South Africa who have placed their faith in this Organization cannot accept its inaction, which prolongs their misery and suffering; when there is no light at the end of the tunnel, people are spurred by their frustration to violence and armed conflict. This is the lesson of history since the inception of life.

118. The continuation of *apartheid* in defiance of world public opinion and in contravention of the Charter will certainly invite more resistance, more

bloodshed and more destruction, for oppression spawns revolt, with all its implications. My Government consistently supports liberation movements in their fight for a just cause. In April last we were happy to receive in Kuwait the representatives of the liberation movement from South Africa, and we were gratified at the results of the talks. We believe that the abolition of the heinous policy of *apartheid* is an international responsibility, as this crime constitutes an affront to humanity and an insult to mankind. Only forceful action can assist in eradicating *apartheid*. A tepid compromise is doomed, as have already been the voluminous resolutions on South Africa. Many years ago Aimé Césaire, an outstanding pan-Africanist, wrote:

“There can be no question for us of displacing colonialism or making servitude an internal affair. What we must do is to destroy it, to extirpate it, in the proper sense of the word, to tear up its roots, and that is why true decolonization will be revolutionary or nothing.”

I submit that this applies to *apartheid*.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.