



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-NINTH YEAR

1804th MEETING: 28 OCTOBER 1974

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1804)	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 FOURTH MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 28 October 1974, at 3 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/1804)

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 3.45 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Relationship between the United Nations and South Africa:

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

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decisions taken previously [1796th-1798th and 1800th-1803rd 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, Kuwait, 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. Bishara (Kuwait), Mr. Harmon (Liberia), Mr. Maghur (Libyan Arab Republic), Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mr. Traoré (Mali), Mr. Ramphul (Mauritius), Mr. Slaoui (Morocco), Mr. Oghu (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 draw the attention of members of the Council to documents S/11545 and S/11546, which contain the texts of two letters dated 25 October to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Kenya and Mauritania, in which a request is made that the Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Noël Mukono, Secretary for External Affairs of ZANU [Zimbabwe African National Union], Mr. T. George Silundika, Secretary for Publicity and Information of ZAPU [Zimbabwe African People's Union] and Mr. Theo-Ben Gurirab, Chief Representative of the SWAPO [South West Africa People's Organization] mission to the United Nations. If I hear no objections I shall take it that the Council agrees to that request.

It was so decided.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to the draft resolution contained in document S/11547. This draft resolution has been submitted by the Permanent Representative of Saudi Arabia in accordance with the provisions of rule 38 of the provisional rules of procedure, since Saudi Arabia was invited to participate in the discussion under rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure by a decision of the Council adopted at its 1796th meeting.

4. The first speaker is the representative of Upper Volta. I invite him to come to the Council table and to make his statement.

5. Mr. YAGUIBOU (Upper Volta) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, before dealing with the grave problem before us, a matter of concern to the whole of mankind, I should like first to associate myself with the previous speakers here in congratulating you, a worthy son of Africa, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council, at a time when it is discussing a problem so crucial for our continent. The United Republic of Cameroon, which you represent here, has always pursued an admirable African policy. Therefore, your presidency here today is no more than a deserved tribute to your own wisdom, and a symbol and a sign of the times—a sign that the peoples of the third world will increasingly make their voices heard in the discussion of matters that concern them.

6. It was on 27 September last that the Credentials Committee, in a historic vote, decided to reject the credentials of the representatives of the racist régime of South Africa.

7. On 30 September, the General Assembly furthermore adopted by 125 votes to 1—the 1 being the vote of South Africa—resolution 3207 (XXIX) calling on the Security Council “to review the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa in the light of the constant violation by South Africa of the principles of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights”.

8. Those two decisions are merely the logical outcome of the process, which began in 1970, of denying the representatives of Pretoria any right to represent the South African people. Decisions taken in previous years to reject the credentials of those representatives had been interpreted as severe condemnations of the policy of *apartheid* and final warnings to the South African Government to desist from its racial practices.

9. Those appeals appear to have fallen on deaf ears: there is none so deaf as he who will not hear. The international community is now beginning to become aware of a malignant and evil phenomenon which Africans have long since been denouncing. The

international community is now realizing more and more that *apartheid* not only is a problem that concerns a specific region, but has implications which go well beyond the borders of the country where the policy is pursued.

10. This realization is not reflected merely in verbal condemnation of the South African régime, but is tending increasingly to take the form of effective measures to be applied against that régime. Indeed, whether it be a question of the violation of human rights, of legitimacy, or of the violation of the most sacred rules of the international community, the South African régime is by far the worst offender.

11. We should like to point out, indeed, that there has been no improvement in that régime since the United Nations first drew its attention to the continuing violation of the most fundamental human rights. The institution of *apartheid* is a system designed and set up to make sure, by scientific means, that the non-whites continue to serve the white racist minority. Indeed, these non-whites—the blacks and the Coloureds—are virtually slaves, since they are constantly at the disposal of their masters. Over the years, *apartheid* has become worse. Increasingly evil laws are passed, the sole purpose of which is to strip the blacks and the Coloureds of their fundamental freedoms of speech, association and movement. In South Africa we have lost count of the number of arbitrary arrests, hangings and imprisonments. The rape of young girls has become a current amusement of Vorster's soldiers, while the opponents of *apartheid*, primarily the black leaders, are hunted down, if indeed they are not already mouldering in some insalubrious gaol.

12. At the time of the electoral masquerade of 24 April 1974, the National Party strengthened its representation in the South African Assembly, thus making its grip on the country complete. The bantustan policy has been accelerated, with the result that more than a million people have been forcibly transferred. South Africa has embarked upon an unbridled arms race. Supplementary appropriations amounting to 702 million rand, or about \$912 million, have been voted for national defence purposes in the budget for the financial year 1974/75. This all goes to show how increasingly dangerous the situation is becoming in this region, and the threat that it poses to international security.

13. As to the illegitimacy of that régime, no one can any longer have any doubt about it. One may indeed well wonder what credibility can attach to a Government—that is to say, the whites of that country—which has reduced 90 per cent of its population to slavery. Furthermore, there is an increasing tendency for some people among the whites themselves to begin asking questions about the future of a régime that is retreating more and more into isolationism. We understand that in this chamber many States, and by no means the least important, have

been unconditional champions of democracy, that is to say, of government by majority rule. If this principle is really dear to them, it is they who should be the staunchest opponents of the minority régime of South Africa.

14. And what about the continued violation of the most sacred principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and of the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly?

15. Non-discrimination is a fundamental principle of the Charter. It is to be found in the Preamble, which reaffirms the faith of the peoples in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women. But what do we see? South Africa is continuing to disregard these principles with impunity.

16. It is within this context that the General Assembly and the Security Council, each in its own field of competence, have adopted resolutions calling upon the South African Government to change its policy and to establish a more human and democratic régime, with due regard for the non-white majority of its population. These appeals were not heeded, and if the members of the Council want to be completely enlightened all they have to do is refer to the excellent report of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* on the "violations of the Charter of the United Nations and resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council by the South African régime".¹

17. There is no further need, I am sure, to attempt to describe *apartheid*. Since the beginning of the present debate, persons better qualified than I have already done so. The only thing that can be said is that no society can any longer tolerate a policy of this kind and no people can any longer put up with it. That is why we must all mobilize—and above all the Security Council—to fight this scourge which our society has already described as a crime against humanity. This policy does indeed constitute a crime to the extent that in its very essence it denies men equality with other men and also elevates racism to the status of a doctrine.

18. I say to the members of the Council: this historic decision taken to entrust to you the consideration of the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa should be interpreted by you in the light of the global context in which the Assembly wished to place it. By voting by a very large majority to bring the problem of South Africa before the Council, the nations of the world demonstrated their faith in the honesty with which its members would take the decision. The questions which those nations wished to pose to them are

the following: first, does South Africa flout the most fundamental human rights or not; secondly, is South Africa violating the decisions taken by the international community or not; and, thirdly, is South Africa persistently violating the Charter of the United Nations or not? Unless members of the Council wish to contradict their own conclusions, they have no choice but to reply affirmatively.

19. If that is their reply, they must draw the necessary conclusions. They must no longer procrastinate and try to admonish a régime which scoffs at the Council's decisions and which is causing so much uncertainty in the world about the prospect for peace. The Charter must be applied, because it says verbatim in Article 6:

"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."

20. Some people say that certain members of the Security Council, because of their powerful interests in South Africa, will veto a draft resolution to expel that country. We are aware of this. However, we should like to draw the attention of those States to the double responsibility—I would even say complicity—which they would be assuming if they adopted that attitude.

21. Firstly, the consequence of their attitude—and an unfortunate consequence—would be that of making a laughing-stock of the Charter and thus considerably weakening it and undermining the prestige of the Organization. It would also lead us to question the true role of the Security Council, since, for the developing countries, the Security Council would in fact be rather a Council of insecurity to the extent that the prerogatives that it enjoys would not have been used for the benefit of peace and security in those areas. Furthermore, these countries must realize that millions of Africans and millions of other people throughout the world are following these proceedings very closely. Are they going to disappoint them? In that case, they would be responsible for a dangerous situation of tension prevailing in the region inasmuch as the blacks of South Africa would have no other alternative but to conquer or die. Obviously, they would decide to conquer, in spite of the innumerable sacrifices that that would require of them. We are firmly convinced, however, that wisdom will prevail in this Council and that it will tread the path of justice at the expense of short-term economic interests.

22. As for the statements we heard here a few days ago from the representative of the racist régime of South Africa, they have offered us no new element which could detain us for any length of time, unless it is the fact that they constitute a new insult and

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

challenge to the Organization. In fact the representative of the South African régime came here and stated that its resolutions and those of the General Assembly were based upon false information and prejudice. It would seem that this assertion is offensive to the good faith of those who have been dealing with the South African problem, but we realize, of course, that the role of Mr. Botha is to defend his régime. Anyone who is well informed is well aware of what is happening in South Africa, where permanent insecurity for 90 per cent of the population is the rule, and the leaders of the African movements are hunted down, if indeed they are not already languishing in some sordid dungeon, like Nelson and Winnie Mandela. In any case, it would be difficult for the representative of South Africa to prove that the many laws promulgated by his régime are not in contravention of human rights and particularly the rights of the blacks. It would also be difficult for him to prove that the occupation of Namibia is something which is not in defiance of the decisions of the international community. It is true that later in his statement Mr. Botha claimed that the concept of separate development, that is to say, *apartheid*, was not based on any racist ideology. In the final analysis, it is difficult to say whether this is not more ridiculous than it is tragic.

23. What we want, finally, is for *apartheid*, the system of separate development, the racist ideology and the colonialist ideology to disappear from South Africa. What we want to see in South Africa is a democratic State, headed by freely elected leaders, elected by the majority of the population, and not a régime which comes from God knows where and which has reduced 90 per cent of the population of the country to slavery.

24. No one can be deluded by the current policy of the South African régime, and the statements made by Mr. Botha do not encourage us to optimism. That is why it is imperative for the Council to take a firm decision.

25. The racist régime of South Africa is feeling the wind of change. It is throwing a little ballast overboard and is trying to have us believe that it is becoming more democratic, but its only purpose is to try to obtain some respite from the international community. Fundamentally, *apartheid* remains the doctrine of this régime.

26. Before concluding, Mr. President, I should like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to participate in your debate and to reaffirm once again that today we are determined to fight *apartheid* as yesterday we fought nazism and as tomorrow we shall fight any ideology which would enslave mankind or any part of mankind. In any case, the black peoples will fulfil their destiny in the course of history, with or without the United Nations. It is for us and it is for the members of the Council to see to it that it is accomplished with the United Nations.

27. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Guinea, and I invite her to take a place at the Council table and to make her statement.

28. Mrs. Jeanne Martin Cissé (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, before I take up the item before the Security Council I should like, on behalf of my delegation, to convey to you, and through you to the members of the Council, my thanks for having been given the opportunity of participating, without the right to vote, in this debate.

29. It is a source of pride for my delegation to see a distinguished son of Africa, a national of a country with traditions of justice and peace, presiding over this eminent body of the United Nations at a time when it is considering one of the most burning problems of our time, one which has a direct impact on the security of our continent, Africa. Your qualities as an experienced diplomat lead us to hope that under your presidency the Security Council will be able to bring to the oppressed people of Azania the justice they have been awaiting for more than a quarter of a century.

30. On 30 September 1974, by its resolution 3207 (XXIX), adopted by an overwhelming majority, the General Assembly, for the first time, called upon the Security Council to review the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa in the light of the constant violations by the latter of the principles of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

31. At last, after 28 years in which the United Nations has repeatedly adopted resolutions ranging from appeals to warnings and recommendations of sanctions against the white minority régime of Pretoria, after 28 years of patience and in face of the universal rejection and repudiation of *apartheid*, the Security Council is meeting to consider the consequences of the arrogance of the Government of South Africa, which continues to defy the international community, undermining its moral authority year after year.

32. Everything, or almost everything, that could be said about the policy of the racist minority of Pretoria has been said over the past 28 years but, unfortunately, the dimensions and the repercussions of the system are such that it is impossible to avoid repetitions, restatements and reminders.

33. Ever since the United Nations was created, after the horrors of Hitlerite nazism, the signatories of the Charter have been fully aware that racism was a serious threat to international harmony and peace. Thus they adopted General Assembly resolution 103 (I), in which the General Assembly declared that it was in the higher interests of humanity to put an immediate end to religious and

so-called racial persecution and discrimination and called upon the Governments and responsible authorities to conform both to the letter and to the spirit of the Charter, and to take the most prompt and energetic steps to that end. In response to that resolution, the Government of South Africa, going back on its commitments under the Charter, adopted a series of discriminatory and humiliating measures against the non-white population of that country. The right to be represented in Parliament was refused to the people of Indian and Pakistani origin.

34. Placed on the agenda of the General Assembly, the question of racial conflict provoked by South Africa's policy of *apartheid* has ever since been a constant source of serious concern to the international community. The situation regarding the policy of *apartheid* was to be marked by one of its most disturbing developments in the 1960s, when for the first time the Security Council was seized of the question by 29 African and Asian States Members of the Organization. It was asked to consider the situation resulting from the massacre at Sharpeville of unarmed and peaceful demonstrators against racial discrimination and segregation in South Africa. In the resolution adopted at the conclusion of its consideration of the item the Council stated that the situation, if continued, might endanger international peace and security, and called upon the Government of South Africa to abandon its policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination [resolution 134 (1960)].

35. Despite this apprehension, well justified because it was strictly in line with reality, the growing awareness of this evil did not, unfortunately, induce the international community to take energetic action against *apartheid*.

36. Today, even more than in the past, a combination of considerations of strategy and international economic interests in the continent of Africa explains more clearly the abdication of responsibility of one and all in the face of this unmitigated evil and of the distrust, disdain and hostility expressed by the supporters of *apartheid* and their refusal to act in accordance with the many resolutions adopted heretofore condemning this scourge. As we have already said, this attitude of the imperialists, which is one of unrelieved guilt, has in the course of time induced Pretoria each year to 'adopt further discriminatory and humiliating measures, accentuating and worsening repression to the point where "the right to live" is nothing but a phrase and where the non-whites no longer have any possibility of protesting, even peacefully, or any legal means of obtaining redress for the wrongs they suffer.

37. It would be well to recognize that all the measures so far recommended by the Organization against South Africa's policy of *apartheid*, whether we are speaking of arms embargos, economic sanctions or assistance to the peoples of South Africa in their

struggle for independence, have proved to be ineffective because of the impunity enjoyed by South Africa to which I have just referred.

38. There is absolutely no doubt that the policy of *apartheid* is steadily spreading and becoming more and more severe and oppressive. *The Christian Science Monitor* stated in one of its issues of 1970 that between mid-1968 and mid-1969 there had been 88,000 persons in South African prisons every day, 95 per cent of whom were Africans, and that over the same period 84 persons had been executed in South Africa—half of all the death sentences imposed throughout the world. On the basis of those horrifying statistics, which go back five years now, it is easy to appreciate the seriousness of the situation obtaining in that country today.

39. The peoples of Africa, supported by all peoples of the world who love peace and justice, have never ceased drawing the attention of the international community to the inhuman policy of *apartheid* of South Africa. Two particularly important recent international conferences in Africa and the third world—the Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity held at Mogadiscio and the Fourth Summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Countries at Algiers—have published warnings on this point, have denounced *apartheid* and once again have asked that urgent and effective measures should be adopted to fight it.

40. The international community itself has never ceased to denounce *apartheid*. It has never ceased to strive to find a solution to this execrable policy. The time for taking an energetic decision has come.

41. In placing the question of the racial policy of South Africa on the agenda of the United Nations for the first time in 1946, India, a country of the third world, aimed to introduce democracy and justice into the legislation of the racist minority Government. Today the representatives of the countries of the third world and of all countries that love peace and justice, are working for the elimination of *apartheid*; they are working to ensure that the deepest-rooted aspirations of mankind, for a life of dignity and justice, become a reality for the non-white majority of South Africa.

42. The members of the Security Council have all in the course of the foregoing debates reaffirmed their deep aversion to *apartheid*. We should like to remind them what a speaker said in the plenary meeting of the Assembly a few weeks ago that all our political efforts are in the last analysis judged according to a single criterion: the ability to translate our human concerns into deeds.

43. Since all are opposed to the policy of *apartheid* of South Africa, our choice can be no different and it can only be unanimous. Concerted action against

apartheid, a practice condemned as a crime against humanity and as a threat to international peace and security, is a certain gauge of the value of international co-operation. In this international forum we have heard a representative state that in international affairs there could be no compromise with justice. Accordingly, Africa and its friends will know how to translate votes into facts.

44. After 28 years of delay, the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly seems to be the appropriate moment for extending to the Organization the ostracism meted out to South Africa in the specialized agencies. Indeed, why should we continue to proclaim the equality of all human beings and at the same time accept as a fully-fledged Member with all its rights the Republic of South Africa, whose national policy is based on the persistent violation of this principle?

45. The tone set at the outset of the statement made by the spokesman for *apartheid* in the Council on 24 October [1800th meeting] reflected a certain feeling of repentance. We were expecting more concrete proposals for the immediate proclamation of the independence of Namibia, the withdrawal of South African interventionist forces from Southern Rhodesia, and above all the promise of a reversal of the backward policy of *apartheid*. But alas, most unfortunately, the representative of Pretoria, just as in the past, has dashed our hopes. Thus, far from envisaging that reversal of policy which had been hoped for so long, far from reviewing its policy of intervention in Southern Rhodesia, the Government of the white minority in South Africa, through the voice of its spokesman, tells us that Namibia will accede to national sovereignty in less than 10 years, in order not to tell us that the independence of that Territory is not to be expected tomorrow.

46. The representative of the Pretoria régime took pleasure in concluding his statement the other day by the following allegory:

"An African bishop, a wise man, once compared the blacks and whites in South Africa to a zebra. If the zebra were shot it would not matter whether the bullet penetrated a white stripe or a black stripe: the whole animal would die." [1800th meeting, para. 141.]

This illustration is true in the mind of the bishop, but it is opposed to the concept of *apartheid*. This is all the more true since the representative of the racist régime tried, in that same statement, to describe *apartheid*, not as a concept of flagrant racism, but as a plan for the separate development of two racial communities that they claim are integrated like the white and black stripes on the coat of a zebra. Elementary common sense would have dictated that the ideal multiracial society expressed in the African bishop's allegory would admit of no separate

development plan such as the one advocated by *apartheid*.

47. In objective terms, what interest would the United Nations have in defending the rights of a Member which has regularly flouted not just one decision but all the decisions adopted by it? How can one explain that in this chamber there should be voices that eternally support the cause of a State whose only merit is that it has invariably repudiated the principles of the Charter? It is just as if a Christian were to be made an archbishop because he had spat on the Bible. The excommunication of the sinner should be paralleled purely and simply by the exclusion of South Africa from the United Nations.

48. *Apartheid* in Africa constitutes, by its very nature, a serious source of concern and there is no doubt but that it involves for all of us our security and our liberation on the basis of our devotion to unity and universal peace. Therefore, any decision which the Council may take against South Africa and on the basis of a compromise, other than the exclusion without appeal of that State, would jeopardize the Charter.

49. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of the People's Republic of the Congo. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

50. Mr. MONDJO (Congo) (*interpretation from French*): I should like right away to discharge a twofold duty which my delegation believes to be essential: first, the Congo delegation would like to thank the members of the Council and you yourself, Sir, for having permitted us to participate in this debate. The Council, by this decision, will no doubt recall the solemn undertaking at Teheran on 1 December 1943 by the founders of the United Nations to seek by all possible means the active co-operation and participation of all nations, great and small, whose peoples are in their hearts and minds ready to devote their efforts to the suppression of tyranny and enslavement, oppression and intolerance. The Congo is a peace-loving country which has always striven to struggle against all anti-democratic, colonialist, imperialist and racist forces.

51. Furthermore, I take great pleasure in expressing the great pride and complete satisfaction of my delegation at the absolutely remarkable way in which you, Sir, have been presiding over the Council. Many previous speakers have had occasion to commend your outstanding statesmanlike qualities and your diplomatic skills. Your proven competence and devotion to the cause of peace are also well known. I have no wish to prolong this debate by adding congratulations, which, nevertheless, you fully deserve. Just permit the representative of a country close to the United Republic of Cameroon by geography, by history and by sentiment, to recognize

in you, Sir, one of the tireless architects of the unity of your great nation, a patriot who has earned the confidence of the Cameroonian people and its guide, President Ahidjo, a great African leader whose dynamic contribution to the cause of the liberation and unity, in friendship and peace, of our continent we salute.

52. Many sincere and talented speakers have taken part in this debate and paid a tribute to the determination and wisdom of the General Assembly, most of whose members are aware of the record of failure to take effective joint action to eradicate *apartheid* which, through arbitrary arrests and the cruellest tortures, perpetuates the exploitation of the people of Azania, a people whose history continues to be written in blood and tears.

53. The new element in the case history of *apartheid* is the common determination of the Members of the Organization to put an end to it, their awareness of the need to break the vicious circle of racism in southern Africa once and for all. Resolution 3207 (XXIX) adopted on 30 September by the General Assembly is the outcome of long years of patience, of caution, of inflexibility and conservative reactions when the Organization did everything it could to try—alas, in vain—to persuade the racist of Pretoria to see the error of their ways. Far from doing so, they just took advantage of our procrastination in order to perfect their torture machine, engaging each day in further violations of the human rights and the fundamental freedoms of the people of Namibia, to extend their fossilized ideology to the Territory of Namibia, which they occupy with impunity in spite of the repeated appeals and condemnations of the United Nations.

54. Speaking as I do at this late stage of the debate, my delegation would like to stress that it endorses unreservedly the pertinent legal arguments advanced by most speakers who have appeared here to support the historic decision taken on 30 September by the General Assembly requesting the Council to review the relationship between the Organization and the racist régime of South Africa, in the face of the obstinate refusal of the Pretoria administration to respect the principles laid down in the Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. We should particularly like to stress that in this case the Council in its wisdom can very well apply Article 6 of the Charter relating to the expulsion of a Member State.

55. The Pretoria administration, which is persistently infringing the principles laid down in the Charter, is a veritable cancer gnawing away at the Organization. The South African racists have offered sufficient evidence that they have no intention of complying with the fundamental obligations of a Member State. Therefore, to persist in keeping a seat for them in the Organization—which they so often scorn—serves

only to demonstrate the tremendous ambiguities of this whole problem of *apartheid*, a crime in which the many accomplices produce an atmosphere of resignation and defeatism. To persist in reserving a seat in the Organization for the South African racists is an example whose pernicious influence on the credibility of the United Nations needs no further proof. The duty of us all is to take the punitive action required by the intransigent attitude of this rebel State, which refuses to bow to the rules of common discipline, and thus to express unequivocally our complete condemnation of the advocates of *apartheid*.

56. Accordingly, it is time to break the vicious circle of ineffective manoeuvres, of inaction, and invoke Articles 41 and 42 of the Charter so as to give the Council's decisions teeth and show the Pretoria racists that the law must prevail. However, I should not like to give any impression that I have come here to tell the Council what to do; the Council is very well aware of what measures are required to provide a just and urgent solution to this deadlocked situation, which could not be more humiliating to the Organization.

57. In spite of our disgust at the empty monologue delivered by the emissary of the Pretoria racists, and our swelling indignation at the rhetorical outbursts with which he attempted to becloud the debate, we would like to spare the Council any polemics, which will of course do nothing to change the fact that *apartheid* constitutes the supreme example of the most outrageous racism ever known.

58. Without doubt there are many ways of approaching history, but to shower us with information in which lying and dissembling are elevated to major art forms is certainly not the most distinguished. Following the example of all those for whom Africa is a problem, a problem in any case created by the standard brutality of colonialism and racism, and the intensity of the bloody repression of which the African peoples have been a victim, the envoy of the racist régime of South Africa did not understand that one of the best roads to an understanding of the history of a people is that of objectivity in an impartial analysis of the facts recorded in history. A careful deciphering of the history of the peoples of southern Africa, whose fierce resistance began with the very first contacts with the Boer settlers, is something that has been recorded by distinguished historians and researchers who have brought us evidence of undeniable feats of arms and of the fierce determination of the peoples of southern Africa to defend their liberty. From this fine tradition of resistance by the oppressed peoples many outstanding figures emerged. We would include in that list the name of the Zulu chief Dingane, half-brother of Shaka, a military genius, who had established an empire over a territory larger than Europe, of that Zulu nation which was

rightly considered the best army in Africa south of the Sahara.

59. We have no need to go into detail about the facts of the case, of which the Council is fully cognizant. The false pleading of the emissary of the racist régime of Pretoria, full of falsehoods, delivered in his normal tone of arrogance and of contempt for the Organization, left us with a bitter taste in our mouths, however. And even if we do not jump to any hasty conclusions, we can at least conclude that it is difficult for the South African racists to appreciate the heady wind of change which today is causing the collapse of the most solid buttresses of the oppression and exploitation of peoples. The time of colonialist rampages is past, as indeed *apartheid* itself must pass, the emblem of a doctrine and a policy which every day arouses universal disapproval.

60. The free flowering of racism in South Africa, and its extension to the Territory of Namibia stem from the fixed ideas of Vorster's gang, which wants to carry everything it does to extremes involving an endless series of the most barbarous crimes. All the Members are sufficiently well aware of the horrors of *apartheid*, rightly considered a crime against humanity, *apartheid*, a word with increasingly sinister overtones. For Vorster and his gang of Calvinist fanatics the objective is to create a white South Africa where the blacks will have only the status of foreign labourers. The notorious laws which the followers of *apartheid* use for the most savage oppression of the opponents of that diabolical doctrine are well known to all. Hence we must express our astonishment at lack of enthusiasm of certain Powers for eradicating this cancer from humanity. Should we not therefore believe Aimé Césaire when he writes:

"what the most distinguished, the most humanitarian, the most Christian bourgeoisie of the twentieth century ... cannot forgive Hitler is not the crime itself, the crime against man, it is not the humiliation of man in itself; it is the crime committed against the white man, it is the humiliation of the white man, and his having brought into Europe colonialist practices which hitherto had been inflicted only on the Arabs, the coolies of India and the Negroes of Africa".

61. In spite of the frenzied attempts to dehumanize the non-whites of Azania and Namibia, where workers are considered as cattle, where the pass laws and the "odor of the black" precedes any judgement on the black and where the majority of the people of South Africa are herded into reserves in indescribable conditions of overcrowding, millions of men and women of Azania and Namibia now know that the defeat of *apartheid* is inevitable.

62. Because it is daily violating human rights, reducing man to the status of a talking beast,

because it is trampling the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations underfoot, because of its constant policy of defying and humiliating the Organization, because of its criminal complicity with the illegal régime of Ian Smith, because of its obstinate refusal to respect decisions which establish the sacred right of the Namibian people to independence in unity and in territorial integrity, the racist and Fascist régime of South Africa has voluntarily put itself beyond the pale of humanity. *Apartheid* is a subject of concern to the whole world. What the victims of that doctrine want is help to rid themselves of this scourge. What the General Assembly, in its majority, expects from the Council is not vetoes—which in any case, are no longer awe-inspiring and will only serve to make the deadlock even worse—but specific acts, because we want to look together to the future with our eyes open in a world where problems will no longer be posed in terms of power relations but in terms of justice, peace, and freedom for all the peoples of this planet.

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

64. Mr. MAGHUR (Libyan Arab Republic): Allow me, Mr. President, to congratulate you, on behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf, on your assuming the presidency of the Security Council for this month. The good relations between our countries will not fail to provide a good basis for co-operation between you and my delegation.

65. I wish to thank you and the members of the Council for giving me the opportunity to address myself to the item on the agenda. I do so in behalf of the Arab Member States. It is only natural for my delegation, whether representing the Libyan Arab Republic or speaking as the Chairman for this month of the Arab delegations to the United Nations, to participate in the discussion of an African issue, for we Arabs are an integral part of Africa.

66. Now is not the time to discuss the suffering that Africa has been, and still is, subjected to at the hands of the colonialists as a whole. That would take more than one Security Council meeting and more than one statement. One look at the records of the General Assembly, the Council and the various committees will attest to that. The ineffectiveness that characterizes certain resolutions of the organs of the Organization is disappointing indeed. For while our whole continent believes in the rightness of bringing its grievances before the Organization, the colonialists and the vestiges of colonialism go too far in flouting this process and this Organization by persistently aiding racist régimes and colonial enclaves and protecting them, even within the Organization. Speakers preceding me have enumerated the offences

committed by the colonialists, and I am sure some of those following me will do likewise. The records of this Council in particular are full of cases where the veto was exercised for the protection of the racist régimes. The records and documents of the committees abound with instances of violations by certain permanent members of the Council of resolutions adopted against South Africa and the racist régime in Zimbabwe.

67. The issue before the Council is specific and crystal-clear and is in no need of lengthy discussion. A direct question has been put to the Council by the General Assembly, the organ most representative of the peoples of the United Nations: will the Organization maintain its relationship with a régime that has, for over a quarter of a century, deliberately violated the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights? In other words, the General Assembly has raised the following question: will the Council, in defiance of the overwhelming majority of the Members, maintain an illegitimate and repugnant relationship with a régime that is founded on violations of the Charter and on breaches of its resolutions and declarations?

68. The issue has two aspects, in our view. One is purely legal, and the other substantive, bearing on the very existence and structure of the United Nations. The Charter entitles the Security Council to consider a recommendation with regard to the termination of the membership of any Member State violating the Charter, provided that the General Assembly adopts a resolution in pursuance of that recommendation. Needless to say, the Council does not have the freedom to make a recommendation without taking into consideration the views of the other organ of the United Nations. As the main body of the Organization, the Council shoulders the responsibility, in accordance with the Charter, of reflecting the views of the majority of the Members and of acting in accordance with those views. None of the provisions of the Charter entitles the Council to act in contradiction with, or in defiance of, the views of the majority. Therefore for a minority of Members with power in the Council to take decisions on, or to obstruct the adoption of, resolutions that have a bearing on the essence of the relationship between the Organization as a whole and those who violate the Charter is something that cannot be accepted.

69. In the light of the foregoing, we believe that when the General Assembly expresses a view regarding an issue before it and requests that the Security Council make a recommendation on that issue, the latter's recommendation should be consistent with the views of the Assembly. When the Council refuses to act in accordance with the General Assembly's views, or takes a decision inconsistent with those views, such behaviour places the Council's action outside the legal framework of the Charter. Accordingly, we believe that General Assembly resolution 3207 (XXIX), and the

spirit underlying other resolutions condemning the racist régime in South Africa, all of which are based on the reports of special committees and proven facts, make it necessary that the Council adopt a resolution severing the relationship of that régime with the Organization. Indeed, any faltering on the part of the Security Council, any obstruction of the will of the General Assembly by any of its members, constitutes a flagrant violation of the Charter and a defiance of the dictates of the human conscience as reflected in the General Assembly's most recent resolution as well as in its previous resolutions.

70. The substantive aspect does not need any elaborate discussion. The status of the racist régime in South Africa has been considered hundreds of times. Its persistent violation of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and its travesty of the most sacred and noble ideals of man have been proved beyond any doubt. What we say about those offences is based neither on fabricated incidents nor on the misinterpretations in the news media. It is specified in the laws which are enforced by the racist régime in South Africa and are the declared policy of this minority clique. Such policies have been condemned and deplored by all: by clergymen, by politicians and by other just men.

71. Even those States maintaining relations with that racist régime have been unable to justify such behaviour to their peoples. Therefore, there are only two alternatives before us: either to sacrifice the Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the international court of ethics, or to isolate this racist régime from the family of man in order to protect human dignity and to uphold the principles of the Charter. As the Secretary-General said:

"The second question relates to the position and credibility of the United Nations itself and the respect of its Members for the decisions of its main organs, especially the Security Council."
[1793rd meeting, para. 20.]

72. We wonder now what the future and the value of the United Nations will be if the Security Council itself does not respect the General Assembly resolution adopted by 125 votes to 1. What will happen if the Council does not take a decision regarding the relationship between a régime that persistently defies basic human values and the United Nations? We leave it to you to give the answer. Your decision will be subject to the judgement of the peoples of the United Nations.

73. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Members of the Council will recall that the Council today decided, under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure to invite Mr. T. George Silundika, Secretary for Publicity and Information for ZAPU, as requested by the representatives of Kenya and Mauritania. Mr. Silundika has made it known that

he is ready to address the Council at its present meeting. Therefore, with the consent of the Council, I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

74. Mr. SILUNDIKA: We thank you, Mr. President, and the Council for graciously allowing us to address the Council on issues raised before this organ by the representative of the racist *apartheid* régime of South Africa in regard to our country, Zimbabwe, and our organization, ZAPU. Before proceeding to the subject-matter, may I congratulate you, Mr. President, on your assumption of office and say how much we as a struggling people are inspired by that fact, since to us you represent a beacon in the successful liberation struggle of your country.

75. We would not have sought to expend any more of the time of the Council on an issue on which, for the sake of international peace, there is need for urgent decision and action, had the conduct of our liberation struggle not been dragged in for distortion of facts regarding the situation in southern Africa. We feel we should put the record straight, as it may not be long before the Security Council finds itself seized of a far graver situation as a consequence of the arrogant, racist and militaristic policies of the South African and Rhodesian régimes.

76. Addressing the Council on 24 October, the representative of the racist régime of South Africa quoted his Prime Minister as follows:

"there are ZANU and ZAPU leaders outside Rhodesia who are suspected ... of exerting influence on black Rhodesians not to come to terms." [1800th meeting, para. 130.]

That was apparently Mr. Vorster's attempt to extricate himself from what he himself, in the same passage, confessed in the following words:

"I must also say that I know it is being said in some quarters, on the one side, that South Africa is holding the Rhodesian Government back" [*ibid.*]

—presumably, from coming to terms.

77. These hollow tactics must be exposed. It should be noted that the last attempt to remove the Rhodesian minority racist régime through the idea of a constitutional settlement was made in 1961, with rather bitter results. The United Kingdom Government of the day used the Constitutional Conference as a magic container from which it pulled out the 1961 Constitution—a fraudulent piece of paper designed permanently to entrench white supremacy and white minority racist rule by some transparent camouflage of 15 seats for Africans. Thanks to the steadfastness of the people of Zimbabwe and the international community through the United Nations, the fraudulent

1961 Constitution was rejected totally by the Zimbabwe masses, as well as by the United Nations. As I have said, in our view this was the only and last attempt at coming to terms over the Rhodesian question. There was no Zimbabwe leader outside at the time.

78. We are aware that subsequently there were such proposals as the *Fearless*, the *Tiger*, the 1971 Douglas-Home and Ian Smith proposals, and the latest British-inspired conversations between Bishop Muzorewa and Ian Smith, all of which have been called attempts at coming to terms or so-called settlements. Quite frankly, all those were, and are, conspiratorial attempts by British Governments to avoid the issue and impose a constitutional device, leaving decisive power in the hands of the minority racists of Rhodesia—terms, of course, favourable to the Vorster régime. By what stretch of logic can proposals emanating from a colonial régime and its governing agent for imposition be called "attempts at a solution"?

79. Once again, thanks to the vigilant and resolute Zimbabwe masses, all these conspiracies against unqualified majority rule and independence for Zimbabwe were and are being firmly rebuffed and rejected. The resounding rejection of the Douglas-Home-Smith settlement proposals by the people of Zimbabwe in 1972 is a loud record of the voice of the people—a record printed by the blood of unarmed masses sacrificing themselves for the restoration of their country, freedom, majority rule and independence.

80. The leaders of these masses—our leaders, Joshua Nkomo and others—have been in prisons and concentration camps for over 10 years for being of the same iron determination with the masses in rejecting minority rule and insisting unswervingly on majority rule and independence. In this settlement, who is to come to terms, and with whom? Smith and members of his régime are irretrievable racists, and therefore have neither the status, the capability nor the capacity to reconcile themselves to the reality of the only correct solution required in Rhodesia. The mentality of Whitehall is incapable of getting out of the colonialist groove.

81. ZAPU is the people in Zimbabwe; it is in Zimbabwe; its leaders are in Zimbabwe in Rhodesian gaols; its fighters are in Zimbabwe, fighting the racists on Zimbabwe soil; and, therefore, the eloquent and decisive voice of the people is in Zimbabwe, acting on no influence from outside. The objective of our liberation struggle is not to come to terms with racism but to remove it from our soil. The task of the few of us outside is to inform the international community of the factual situation in Rhodesia, and to effect the liaison between external support and the development of the armed revolutionary struggle in Zimbabwe.

82. Seeking to justify the seizure of areas of the Transvaal and of the Orange Free State—that is, in South Africa—for exclusive claim by the Boers, the representative of the South African *apartheid* régime made the following interpretation of history:

"Mzilikazi, a lieutenant of the Zulu king, Shaka, who had fled from his former master, subsequently completed this devastation and annihilated the African tribes living there." [*Ibid.*, para. 72.]

Mzilikazi was one of the valiant kings, among others, constituting the background to the present Zimbabwe nation. It is true that wars were fought in the same manner that wars were fought among tribes in Europe, but Mzilikazi did not wipe out any tribes anywhere. In fact, he fought the Boers at Mosega, trying to halt their attempt to seize land in the area. Mzilikazi is no excuse for the seizure of other people's lands. History proves the contrary of the South African racist claims that they never had colonialist or expansionist claims. Having imposed themselves in the areas of the present Transvaal, they entered the race of fraudulent treaties through their dispatch of a Mr. Grobler to conclude such treaties with King Lobengula in Zimbabwe in competition with the British.

83. Now I should like to turn to the question of the presence of the South African racist régime in Rhodesia as part of that régime's machinations to interfere with the affairs of Zimbabwe. Economically, South Africa is waging a two pronged assault on our country. First, firms of South African origin, as well as South African farming interests, have systematically expanded in our country and dug in their roots of exploitation. In advance of this and to assist this expansion was the well-known Broederbond financial lending house, called SANLAM, whose monuments stand out in Salisbury. A substantial percentage of the farming settler community in Rhodesia is South African, well known to be the backbone of the racist policies of the Rhodesia Front—the party of the ruling régime in Rhodesia. Secondly, South Africa under its racist régime is the staging post into Rhodesia for most of the big international financial, commercial and industrial monopolies. Pick any enterprise of economic significance in Rhodesia—General Motors, ranches, tea estates, Anglo-American, O.K. commercials—they are routed through and managed largely from South Africa. Most transportation and trade is handled through South Africa. All this is not just a matter of economic convenience; it is an economic stranglehold on Zimbabwe. This explains why the South African régime is a sanctions-breaker where Rhodesia is concerned.

84. Politically, the South African *apartheid* régime and the Rhodesian settler Fascists share a common ideology, that of racism. It is, of course, no surprise, because the two régimes are creations of British

colonial policies and derive their racist attitudes from the nature of British policies towards other races. The concept of separate racial settlements and their administration, the pass system, were of British colonial origin. The South African Boers, pursuing these policies to the logical extreme, as well as the British colonialists in Rhodesia, have reached the present abominable racist stages of *apartheid* and the so-called provincialization respectively. The Natives Land Act of 1913 in South Africa, laying down the basis of bantustanism, was emulated by the British settlers in Rhodesia in 1930 when they enacted the Land Apportionment Act, laying down the basis for the present Tribal Trust Land system. The Bantu Development Corporation to exploit the Africans economically in South Africa was passed on as the Tribal Trust Land Development Corporation in Rhodesia for the same purpose. In short, the Rhodesian régime has made a carbon copy of nearly every racial law enacted in South Africa to impose discrimination between blacks and whites in every avenue of life. To crown it all, Ian Smith takes counsel from Vorster at every turn of events under the transparent and hackneyed diplomatic cover of going to watch rugby matches in South Africa.

85. I may once again ask the question: Who then influences whom in Rhodesia? We cannot be accused of influencing a people of which we are a part. The people's decisions are our decisions. Vorster is not part of the Zimbabwe population. His role is that of interference, blocking the advance of the liberation struggle and defending racialism.

86. The Broederbond is the underground intellectual, racist and criminal machinery of the Afrikaner group in South Africa. It hatches the schemes to suppress the blacks and to preserve the so-called white man's civilization in southern Africa. It is a hush-hush organization. It has now emerged concretely in its spread in Zimbabwe right into the cabinet of the Rhodesian régime, holding the most decisive posts to prevent a correct settlement of the Rhodesian problem. It is present in the persons of a Mr. Van der Byl, a Mr. Cronje, a Mr. De Kock and a Mr. Blomberg, selected on the admission of the Rhodesians themselves through their press to ensure South Africa of a continued racist relationship. These four are of South African origin and are supporters of the Broederbond. Between them they hold the posts of Defence, External Relations, Information, Labour, and Special Security matters.

87. The presence of South African military personnel in Zimbabwe is not a thing of yesterday or today. It is as old as the historical relationship of the two racist régimes. It has been brought into prominence with the increase in numbers by the escalation of the confrontation with the Zimbabwe liberation forces. The first significant indication of the presence of South African military and security personnel was in 1960, from July to November, when the Zimbabwe

masses took to the streets in their hundreds in demonstrations and demands for their freedom. The South African military personnel participated already then in the slaughter of our people. Since then they have done soon an increased scale. They are deployed openly in units all along the borders of Rhodesia with neighbouring independent African States and in certain key installations all over the country. Our forces are engaged in frequent encounters with them in various liberation battles in the country. I do not have to list names for evidence since this is now a public fact. The continuous supply of weapons, personnel, aircraft, bombers and armoured cars by South Africa to the racist régime is an escalating process. I may as well quote the South African régime itself on this matter. Questioned on the sending of South African troops to Rhodesia, Vorster, the racist Prime Minister there, on 29 May 1974 in the presence of Ian Smith, had this to say:

"Our position is unchanged. We sent our police to Rhodesia to pull our own chestnuts out of the fire and that is exactly where the position rests at this moment."

88. While the representative of the South African racist régime was speaking before the Council of his régime's policy of non-interference in other countries' affairs—that was on Thursday—his Minister of Police, Mr. Kruger, was almost simultaneously announcing in the South African Parliament that the confrontation in Zimbabwe with the liberation forces was now reaching the level of conventional warfare and that, therefore, his Government was now organizing mercenary guards to meet the situation. We can all see through this. It is a belated admission of the presence of troops. The British Junior Minister for Commonwealth Affairs, Miss Joan Lester, said this in a report published by the *Zambia Daily Mail* on 31 May 1974: "We know it is true that South Africa has troops in Rhodesia and we have no doubt about this".

89. We do not have to labour the issue. I can only say that as we have flushed out the South African troops in the bushes of Zimbabwe in guerrilla confrontations, our armed liberation struggle is going to continue vigorously and relentlessly, whatever troops or armaments they bring, until Zimbabwe is liberated totally from colonialism and racism.

90. I indicated earlier that the Rhodesian and South African régimes share a common racist ideology. An impression is being created in this chamber that the white man in southern Africa is being driven or swept to the seas by the liberation struggle; hence the insistence on policies of racialism and separate development; in short, the policies of multinationalism as enunciated by South Africa and multiracialism as enunciated by the British for Rhodesia—what they call power-sharing. We know what the British mean by constitutional multiracialism,

as exemplified by division and strife in Ireland, Cyprus, Bangladesh and Pakistan, eventually leading to multiracialism. And we know indeed that this same policy of separate racial administrations has led to the present *apartheid*, which is an international problem before the Council.

91. We reject completely—I must repeat—we reject completely and unreservedly these policies of multinationalism and multiracialism. We cannot allow constitutional sanctioning and cementing of racial prejudices. This is what our President Nkomo said in 1961:

"We do not accept multiracialism and these people of other races who want to remain here must identify themselves with the African people. We do not want to swim with them in the pools, we want to swim with them in Parliament."

92. Therefore, the freedom we seek is not only the restoration of our countries but the establishment of a Government popularly elected by its citizens, natural and naturalized. We are not out to establish multigovernments for multiplied racialism in a single country. Sovereignty of government for a State is one and indivisible.

93. We are tired of being told of how much is being done for us by these racist régimes in education, free health services, good houses and all the nauseating statistics along that line. We could well be treated to the statistics of stock breeding and the free veterinary services where the bill would perhaps prove to be higher. We are not objects of sympathy and help. That is not the issue in southern Africa. The issue is the dismantling of the system of white racism and the establishment of State power based on the democratic will of all citizens as equals, man to man.

94. The ultimate settlement of all power problems is through power itself. This is what our armed liberation struggle has set out to achieve in the interest of peace in southern Africa. We cannot flinch from the horrors of rivers of blood if it means crossing them to achieve our freedom. The racists in southern Africa, supported by the NATO [*North Atlantic Treaty Organization*] Powers, are demanding this development. We have no illusions. Freedom we must achieve regardless.

95. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Members will recall that at the 1796th meeting the Council had decided to invite Mr. David Sibeko to address the Council. Mr. Sibeko has already addressed the Council, but I have just been informed that he would like to make an additional statement. With the consent of the members of the Council, I shall invite Mr. Sibeko to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

96. Mr. SIBEKO: Mr. President, I thank you for allowing me once more to appear before the

Council. I would not have sought to crave your indulgence had it not been for the fact that, because of the mendacious statement made before the Council by Mr. Vorster's representative, we felt that certain points had to be brought further to light.

97. Having so requested you, Mr. President, alone as I am in representing my organization and having to attend to other committees within the United Nations, I have continuously followed with as much attention as I could summon the interventions made by other delegations. Flowing from that, I am aware that the tissue of untruths which was brought before you here has been to some extent appropriately repudiated, but we feel it incumbent upon us to bring to the attention of the Council part of the arrangement which goes into the make-up of today's racist South Africa.

98. I am, I believe, without being too subjective, a classical victim of what *apartheid* is in South Africa for our people. Therefore, I have a minimum amount of formal preparation in academics, but I have striven throughout my life to make myself as articulate as I possibly could. Your patience with my inadequacies, Sir, is I believe a reflection of the deep concern which certain Members—the majority of Members, I dare say—have with our cause, a sympathy and in many cases a solidarity. But during that limited preparation that I enjoyed when I went to school we used to be presented with what was called the white side of the history of South Africa. I will not pretend to know how that title, which is no misnomer, was conceived. Having been conceived, the textbook used to go something like this. The white man came to South Africa to seek a half-way station on the sea route to India from Europe. Upon coming to South Africa, he met some primitive people in what is today Cape Town and neighbouring areas, whereupon these primitive people offered him the comfort of shelter, fresh vegetables and other fundamentals that go with sustaining life. These are the primitive people that so provided for the white man, and the white man felt that he had a duty to bring civilization into this area. Among the first things he did was to move out these primitive people from the immediately fertile land in which he landed so that he could maintain a civilized station there for passing ships. Now, as you know, Mr. President, you yourself being an African, we are not in the habit of fencing in any territory, but the white man, who came there and found no fences, began to put fences around what land he regarded as his own. Without entering into any contractual agreement with any of the indigenous people, and having decided so to set himself up, he proceeded to "civilize" South Africa.

99. We must bear in mind that the primitive state of navigation of that time did not even allow the white man to bring with him any stock from Europe—what with faulty compasses and uncertain distances. And, remember, at that time he still believed

that the world was flat, although the universities that we had in Ghana, in Mali and in Egypt had already achieved success in detecting the phenomenon of our planet and conceiving it to be round. This evidence is abundant, especially here in the United States of America, where black people have gone to great lengths to find out their background, and before I go on I should like to refer the representative of Mr. Vorster's régime to a record I listened to only yesterday called *The Black Rhapsody*. It is full of information about this early civilization. Having said that, I should like to add that they went on to say that, after the people that they had found there, whom they derogatively called Bushmen or Hottentots, they then came into contact with the so-called more militant more aggressive—as they said—Xhosa people. This again is turning the facts upside down: the owners of the land are the aggressors, and the expansionist is the victim of aggression. Having so said, we add that the one thing we always found peculiarly outstanding in this history was that the white settler always recovered the cattle stolen from him by the Xhosas.

100. In our statement immediately after Mr. Botha had spoken, we said that the South African racist régime was using new words but maintaining the old system of white supremacy. After trying to fool the entire black school population of Azania, the South African Government is now attempting to fool the international community by standing the facts on their heads. The history that Mr. Botha related here is the history which they ordinarily leave the black man to follow, because I happen to know that they have done sufficient historical research to compel them to prevent in Azania today archaeological exploration into places such as the one which they found to be Tabazimbe and which is still Tabazimbe today. Now, Tabazimbe—and I am sure our Chinese colleagues with their vast experience and civilization will vindicate us—had a very prospering iron and steel industry in the Middle Ages and thereafter. It was called Tabazimbe; which is a very Bantu expression; it cuts across both Suto and Zulu, which are the principal languages in South Africa. They have decided in South Africa that that history will not be dug into, but that we shall be subjected to the kind of mendacity which Mr. Botha attempted to confront us with here. But let us deal with that clearly from the statements that have been made by my colleagues, Mr. Elias and others, who, because of their interest in Azania, have acquired a far more intimate and far more accurate knowledge of what is happening there.

101. There was also an attempt here by Mr. Vorster's representative to make conciliatory statements; but even a brief glimpse at what is happening in Azania today, as we see it here, amply demonstrates that Mr. Botha's statement was nothing more than an *Alice in Wonderland* tale; that his protestations of the reform of policies of racial arrogance were just one

long swan song; and that his feigned remorse was nothing more than crocodile tears of self pity.

102. The fact of the matter is that, as we were sitting here considering this matter, the South African Minister of Justice was announcing that the South African racist régime, because of the situation inside Azania—where, as you know, Mr. President, militant strikes have been going on, protests have been mounted by students, and so on—was pulling back its troops from Zimbabwe. But it was pulling back those troops in order to replace them, not to pull them out completely in response to resolutions of the United Nations. The South African racist régime has now become even more brazen. It is raising a mercenary force, under the euphemism of "a voluntary force", to go there and man the posts hitherto manned by its aggressive troops—even as we were talking, even as Mr. Botha was making his lament before the Council. We have assurances from his own statement. I must really thank the delegations of those countries that know themselves, that persuaded Mr. Botha to engage in an exercise which he usually avoids, which his country has avoided, of entering into a dialogue with civilized people about conditions in South Africa, persuading him to come here and explain the policies of his Government, because he succeeded in exposing the fact that there is no intention on the part of the racist régime in South Africa of giving up its racist and oppressive policies.

103. Too many speakers have already specified, giving chapter and verse, the violations of the Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights for me to need to belabour the Council with any further details. I have already cited one example of South Africa's refusal to reform and I have no doubt in my own mind that whatever has been installed through reactionary violence will never be removed through peaceful persuasion but only through revolutionary violence. That is why the Pan Africanist Congress is committed to nothing less than a revolutionary struggle in Azania for the overthrow of *apartheid* tyranny.

104. That is not a choice which has been arrived at lightly; it is a choice that has been arrived at painfully, after streams of victims have been found. It is a choice similar to that made by the people of what is today the United States of America when they decided to revolt against the colonial empire of Westminster, a similar decision to that made in 1789—if my date is correct—by the people of France when they chose to revolt against the tyranny of King Louis, a similar decision to that taken by the United Kingdom to stamp out Hitlerite nazism in Europe—if it had not taken that decision there would have been no point in its and other countries' dropping people behind the lines in support of the Maquis forces in France. We are doing nothing unusual. We are on the same course.

105. I do not want to speak of the great October Revolution in the Soviet Union. I do not want to speak about the protracted people's war waged by the Chinese people. I just want to speak about the far more concealed similar activities, not of their results but of the activities, undertaken by people in order to right a wrong. What we are doing is righting a wrong.

106. In this day and age, when we come to take certain decisions, it amazes us when the successors of George Washington, of Voltaire, even of Winston Churchill, who felt it was right to fight against nazism, deliberately choose, at this point in time, to be duped by Admiral Hugo Birmann of the South African Defence Forces, who claims that Communist penetration into the southern hemisphere and the threats that this portends have caused the southern hemisphere, and particularly the Indian Ocean, to emerge dramatically from a position of relative obscurity and to assume a conspicuous position in the East-West power struggle. We have been lectured continuously, and we are told by the mass media of the West, that there exists a *détente*, an *entente cordiale*, between the Powers of the West and the Powers of the East. Why should little Azania be the obstacle, unless this is a mere cover-up for other, much more sinister, designs? We are now being held to ransom in what we have been told is an antiquated ideological conflict between East and West. There is a behaviour that leads us to think that perhaps the buccaneers and pirates who menaced the high seas in the last century and earlier have not been completely wiped out, and that by some twisted logic the navies of the socialist countries have become the marauding ships of the pirates of yesteryear, for we hear nowhere in the world of a people's freedom being undermined because certain pirates are threatening the normal trade that goes on between East and West—except, that is, around Azania.

107. I say this because you, Mr. President, like myself and members of the Council, are being inundated with a deluge of leaks, inspired and otherwise, in the local press. This is not invention of the so-called "subversive" United Nations, as was implicit in Mr. Botha's statement. These inspired leaks inform us that joint naval exercises will be taking place between the South African navy and the navy of a Western Power, such as are taking place now, and that on 15 October yet another flotilla of warships left a Western European port to go to South Africa to engage in similar exercises.

108. Added to that, we have received information that there are 12 leading officials from a member of the Security Council currently visiting South Africa on a sales mission for arms to South Africa, that 6 of these 12 are high-ranking officers and they are led by a senior general. We have checked with the embassy of the country in question; rather than deny it, they have offered no comment. We also know that

Mr. James Johnson, the current commander of the South African navy, has been invited to yet another Western country for a one-week stay by a deputy to that Western country for later this week in November. We have checked and this has been confirmed. We know also that South Africa is conducting a campaign to recruit mercenaries in European countries to serve in its naval forces. And this is no invention of the Pan Africanist Congress or the United Nations. I have this document. But I have been counselled not to antagonize the members of the Security Council with the veto. Hence my restraint, for I have no instructions from my headquarters to proceed further. You see, I am not a diplomat; I cannot conceal the truth.

109. But the truth that I am trying to place before you is that it does seem that the stories we have heard, the speculations we have listened to of an impending involvement of Indo-China proportions in our part of the world, are not wild. Because the *New Statesman*—a British publication of tremendous prestige—says that the Vice-Admiral commanding the forces that are engaged in joint exercises with South Africa says—unlike the Foreign Office—that these are not a routine call; the Vice-Admiral has let it out that this week's exercises are to improve the fighting efficiency of both forces.

110. To the best of our knowledge there is no country in the world that is threatening South Africa with any aggression. The only people we know to be threatening South Africa with a fight are the national liberation movements. So that these people are really being prepared by responsible members of the international community to fight against us.

111. May I go back briefly to the *New Statesman* where it says:

"To engage in manoeuvres with a Power that wages war against its own population, harasses the borders of other countries and maintains an illegal occupation of Namibia is not ensuring against aggression. It is condoning it."

It is not a figment of the imagination of the Pan Africanist Congress.

112. We all know what goes on in the corridors. We all know what the speculation is. We all expect that should Africa's just case, should the just case of the Azanian people be received with majority approval before the Security Council, the almighty instrument

of the veto will be exercised. And South Africa will retain its stamps of respectability by retaining membership of this august body, whilst the majority in that country, whose leaders are the true custodians of all the principles enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Charter, are kept under house arrest, are imprisoned or have been executed. That will not undermine our own resolve to do what is necessary.

113. Mangaliso Sobukwe long ago pointed out that the whole world can sympathize but they can never liberate us. The task of liberating Azania is a task that must be played out by the Azanian people themselves. We believe, with the dramatic turn of events that has taken place in the southern hemisphere as it affects the African region of that hemisphere, that we too—much as we may not be on the eve of our just liberation and our just freedom—are well on the way to our own freedom, because we believe that every revolutionary country, every progressive country that has attained its freedom through bearing arms, through engaging in militant struggle, and through ridding Africa of the scourge of colonialism, has taken heed of what Amílcar Cabral once said: "Every independent African country should regard itself as a liberation movement in power." And if that is true, no amount of flotillas, of war planes, of submarines, can ever quell the flames of struggle that will break out in that part of Azania. And those who today stand with our enemy should not really expect us to embrace them when the inevitable comes to pass—the inevitable being our ascension to full statehood, independence and freedom.

114. I should like to end, Sir, with your permission, with an old African saying which I was reminded of yesterday, because we concern ourselves with matters of our freedom even at weekends; this is no pastime with us, it is a total commitment. We do not leave our parents, our mothers and our fathers, and commit ourselves to exile purely for the glory of appearing—with due respect—before your august bodies. It is a painful exercise such as was defined by one eminent black American scholar, because we are trying to deliver into our part of the world a new dawn. He says "Every new birth must needs be painful." But the Azanian saying I wanted to invoke here, in the face of this evidence of intensified collaboration with South Africa, says: "There is no bird that flies alone. One that does so is lost." Evidently, South Africa is not lost.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
