



UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SECOND YEAR

1999th MEETING: 31 MARCH 1977

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1999)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The question of South Africa: Letter dated 9 March 1977 from the Permanent Representative of Nigeria to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12295) .	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.

1999th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 31 March 1977, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Andrew YOUNG (United States of America).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Benin, Canada, China, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, India, Libyan Arab Republic, Mauritius, Pakistan, Panama, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Venezuela.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1999)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The question of South Africa:

Letter dated 9 March 1977 from the Permanent Representative of Nigeria to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12295)

The meeting was called to order at 11.10 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The question of South Africa

Letter dated 9 March 1977 from the Permanent Representative of Nigeria to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12295)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions previously taken by the Council [1988th-1991st, 1994th, 1996th and 1998th meetings], I invite the representatives of Algeria, Bahrain, Botswana, Burundi, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sweden, the Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zaire and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the usual understanding that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table when they wish to address the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. Rahal (Algeria), Mr. S. M. Al Saffar (Bahrain), Mr. T. Tlou (Botswana), Mr. Z. Banyiyezako (Burundi), Mr. R. Alarcón (Cuba), Mr. A. E. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. T. Bekele (Ethiopia), Mr. P. Florin (German Democratic Republic), Mr. T. B. Sam (Ghana), Mr. M. S. Camara (Guinea), Mr. A. Marpaung (Indonesia), Mrs. L. Mair (Jamaica), Mr. F. M. Kasina (Kenya), Mr. C. D. Molapo (Lesotho), Mrs. A. Brooks-

Randolph (Liberia), Mr. B. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mr. M. Kane (Mauritania), Mr. T. Puntsagnorov (Mongolia), Mr. L. O. Harriman (Nigeria), Mr. M. Fall (Senegal), Mrs. S. Y. Gbujama (Sierra Leone), Mr. A. H. Hussen (Somalia), Mr. I. B. Fonseka (Sri Lanka), Mr. A. I. Thunborg (Sweden), Mr. M. Allaf (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. A. Kodjovi (Togo), Mr. S. A. Salim (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. J. Petrić (Yugoslavia), Mr. Umba di Lutete (Zaire) and Mr. D. W. Kamana (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: In addition, I should like to inform members of the Council that a letter has been received from the representative of Guyana in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the question on the Council's agenda. Accordingly, I propose, in accordance with the usual practice and with the consent of the Council, to invite him to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, under the provisions of Article 31 of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

3. In view of the limited number of places available at the Council table, I shall invite the representative of Guyana to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber, on the understanding that he will be invited to take a place at the Council table whenever he wishes to address the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. R. E. Jackson (Guyana) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

4. Mr. CONSALVI (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): All the representatives who have participated in this debate, and particularly the representatives of the third world, have paid tributes to you, Mr. President, which I would venture to describe as exceptional, in respect of your assumption of the post of Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations. On behalf of the delegation of Venezuela, I wish to join in those tributes. I do so not as a mere formality but because we are convinced that someone who has struggled in the streets and who has had to fight his way up has the best credentials to represent his country at the United Nations.

5. The task you have set yourself will not be easy to fulfil, because the forces of the past have always conspired against anything that is new and positive. We expect much of you but it can never be too much if, in the new international policy of the United States, goodwill prevails, as well as the spirit of understanding required in our times. This is in line with what President Carter stated here at the United Nations.

6. As one of the representatives of Latin America, I am pleased to welcome you and to congratulate you on the manner in which you have been presiding over the Security Council.

7. To Ambassador Murray of the United Kingdom I express the appreciation of the delegation of Venezuela for the skilful, witty and friendly way in which he conducted our debates in February.

8. At this stage of the debate, it is hard to say anything original about the policy of *apartheid*. Hence, we shall confine ourselves to stating our agreement with the views that have been expressed here, particularly by the representatives of Africa. For the peoples of Africa, the struggle against *apartheid* is not a political question, it is a question of human vindication. No one has suffered more during the past 500 years than the peoples of Africa. During the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, some 10 million Africans crossed the Atlantic and established, in the North, in the Caribbean and in the South—or contributed to establishing—what became our countries and our cultures. Hence, when we speak of Africa or the African, we are speaking not of an alien element but of something that is part of us, something concrete.

9. It is true that we can add nothing new to what has already been said about *apartheid*. But we can reflect about the amount of time that has been devoted at the United Nations to condemning one of the most monstrous political ideologies that have ever existed, one of the political systems most incompatible with the human condition that could ever be conceived of. And yet many years have gone by, creating a feeling of frustration and despair in the international community. As in other epochs in history, selfishness and the domination of a few powerful elements have prevailed over reason and justice. Hitler and Mussolini led the world into an international conflagration. Vorster, who thinks just as Hitler did, can lead us in the same direction, because now when we speak of *apartheid* we are not speaking of *apartheid* alone. When we use that word—and it is undoubtedly the word that has been used most often at the United Nations during the past 30 years—we associate it with questions to which I prefer not to refer at this time. As a corollary to what I have said, I would state that the inhibitions, the complications and the complacency of the past have transformed southern Africa into a particularly critical region. That is neither the responsibility nor the fault of the peoples of Africa.

10. From Pretoria, in South Africa, we are receiving the news that the Vorster régime has decided not to promulgate the law imposing censorship on the white press, and particularly on international correspondents. With great optimism, a large European weekly described that law as “an attack on one of the last few vestiges of freedom” remaining in South Africa. Undoubtedly, that decision not to promulgate the law providing for press censorship is a temporary one; it will remain in effect only so long as the Security Council debates this question. We are not going to defend the privileges of the journalists who represent the minority in South Africa because, of course, that does not constitute the freedom of expression which we support. But the aims of that law help to define the present purposes of the régime.

11. At the same time, other news from South Africa warns us that the Pretoria régime has ready a constitution under which there will be created in Namibia a State on the model of South Africa. That would obviously be a new challenge to the United Nations and to the numberless resolutions on the subject adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council; it would constitute defiance of the international community. The illegal occupation of Namibia and the exploitation of its natural resources are part of this unthinkable set of interests that enable the *apartheid* régime to survive in southern Africa.

12. There is a particularly sensitive aspect of the problem of South Africa, which has been referred to repeatedly here. In our view, it is the central issue of this debate. I am referring to foreign investments in southern Africa. As the authors of *Global Reach*, Richard J. Barnet and Ronald E. Müller, have said: “Foreign investments and internal repression have risen sharply together in the last fifteen years.”¹

13. The Commission on Transnational Corporations, beginning on 25 April here in New York, will consider the report prepared by the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations on the activities of such corporations in Southern Africa.² The United Nations should seriously study this report and disseminate its conclusions, in so far as it is possible to disseminate what is detrimental to such powerful interests. The entire report is disquieting because we note from it that foreign investments in southern Africa, besides increasing from day to day in violation of United Nations resolutions, constitute the most open and effective material support which the policy of *apartheid* has enjoyed. Some aspects are of course more serious than others. Among the most serious and those which imply most risks, there is naturally the mining and processing of uranium and the development of nuclear energy, which is being carried out with the help of the technology furnished by the transnational corporations.

14. The great philosopher John Locke, “an outstanding champion of the inalienable rights of man”, as he was called by the authors Robert W. Fogel and Stanley Engerman in their book on the economic consequences of slavery in the United States,³ whose ideas greatly influenced political thinking in the West, at the time he was writing his works was a shareholder in the Royal African Company, which, for a long time, enjoyed a monopoly in the slave trade. This paradox, or this ambiguity, which may be judged with a certain leniency in a man of the seventeenth century, cannot be justified in the twentieth century.

15. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Venezuela for his kind words, and look forward to handing the gavel over to him tomorrow.

16. The next speaker is the representative of Cuba. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

17. Mr. ALARCON (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, I should like first of all to thank you and the

¹ New York, Simon and Schuster, 1974 (p. 87).

² E/C.10/26.

³ *Time on the Cross* (Boston, Little, Brown and Co., 1974).

members of the Council for having afforded me an opportunity to participate in this debate.

18. It has been said and repeated that the problem of *apartheid* is an ignominious heritage of colonial slavery, that it is the nucleus and root of the conflicts in southern Africa, that it antedates the United Nations and that it has been examined by the Organization throughout the whole of its history.

19. Furthermore, on more than one occasion, the international community has defined the aggressive nature of the Pretoria régime and singled it out as a constant source of threats to peace and international security. It would be as tiresome as it would be unnecessary to recall the past decisions of the Council and the numerous resolutions adopted by the General Assembly which have expressed universal repudiation of the system of *apartheid* and indicated the duty of the Council to act resolutely and firmly. Suffice it to say that, if those decisions have not been forgotten and if the sentiments repeatedly manifested by the Assembly are still respected, the least one could expect the Council to do here and now would be to impose energetic and mandatory sanctions on South Africa which would lead to the total and effective isolation of the Pretoria régime at the political, diplomatic, military, commercial and financial levels and in all other aspects of international relations.

20. The movement of the non-aligned countries has consistently upheld such a position. At its most recent summit meeting, held at Colombo last summer, it urged the Council to adopt the measures which have been called for for such a long time in respect of South Africa.

21. Anyone who imagines that it is yet possible to follow any other course of action, or who claims that there is still time for deceptive manoeuvres and for delaying tactics tried so often before, would demonstrate a total lack of understanding of the true state of affairs in Africa today, which indicates, beyond any doubt, that the days of colonialism and racial oppression are numbered.

22. This meeting is being held under circumstances which give the Council's deliberations a heightened interest and importance that I need hardly emphasize. The struggle of peoples subjugated by colonialism and racism has won decisive victories which have transformed the emancipation of the still oppressed African masses into a task that is feasible. It is no longer merely a question of a legitimate aspiration which motivates the freedom fighters to make innumerable sacrifices along a dangerous and thorny course. Liberation is today a visible goal whose attainment no one and nothing can prevent or postpone.

23. The emancipation of the former Portuguese colonies, the defeat of the racist mercenary aggression against the people of Angola, the flourishing struggle of the peoples of Zimbabwe, South Africa and Namibia reveal a process which will inevitably lead in the immediate future to the total elimination of the last vestiges of colonialism and racism on the African continent.

24. In their relentless struggle for freedom, the African peoples have always been able to rely on the total and

resolute support of the Socialist countries, the non-aligned countries and the progressive circles of the Western world, as it is called. This combination of forces—the resolute struggle of the national liberation movements and the resulting international solidarity—have already proved their effectiveness. Today it is a matter of determining the potential length of the struggle which has no other outcome but the complete victory of the African peoples. It is a matter now of deciding how long the imperialist Powers will continue to give their military, economic and political support, which is the only assistance enjoyed by the Pretoria and Salisbury cliques. In other words, history is affording an opportunity—perhaps the last opportunity—to those Western Powers to abandon a policy which renders them responsible for the perpetuation of racist exploitation and makes them accomplices in all the crimes and misdeeds against the African peoples.

25. The continued provocations against Angola, Mozambique, Zambia and other African countries, the resumption of unbridled repression by the racist régimes against peoples whom they subjugate and the recruitment and deployment of mercenaries by the agencies of imperialism are a threat to the whole of independent Africa, a threat which must be countered by energetic and effective action. The aggression against the People's Republic of Benin last January is a concrete example which will shortly be considered by the Council and which my delegation trusts will be examined with the sense of urgency and responsibility required by the seriousness of the situation.

26. The struggle against colonialism and racism, which is now entering into its decisive phase, requires the firmest solidarity among all progressive forces. The struggle is growing and being consolidated by its own development and nourished by the experience acquired in combat. All the manoeuvres of the imperialists and their acolytes will collapse in the face of that struggle. Given the reality of the struggle and the position assumed by each of those involved, all attempts by those who try to use the weapons of anti-communism in a futile attempt to confuse the peoples will be doomed to failure. Those who are tempted to use such methods should remember the words uttered by Nelson Mandela before the racist tribunal which condemned him in 1962:

“It is perhaps difficult for white South Africans, with an ingrained prejudice against communism, to understand why experienced African politicians so readily accept communists as their friends. But to us the reason is obvious. Theoretical differences amongst those fighting against oppression is a luxury we cannot afford at this stage. What is more, for many decades communists were the only political group in South Africa who were prepared to eat with us, talk with us, live with us, and work with us. They were the only political group which was prepared to work with the Africans for the attainment of political rights and a stake in society. Because of this, there are many Africans who, today, tend to equate freedom with communism.”⁴

27. I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to the South African fighters, led by the African National Con-

⁴ Quoted in English by the speaker.

gress, the complete solidarity of the people and Government of Cuba.

28. I cannot end my statement without paying tribute to Marien Ngouabi, President of the People's Republic of the Congo and General Secretary of the Congolese Workers' Party, who was assassinated a few days ago. Those who destroyed his noble and generous life in its prime will fail in the evil aims that inspired that crime. A brave protagonist of the fight for African dignity, Marien Ngouabi will continue to live in the struggles of the revolutionaries of the continent and his example will serve as a powerful encouragement in the struggle. He will be present at the dawn that will soon come to an Africa forever free from exploitation and injustice.

29. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, the delegation of Panama wishes to join in the many congratulations that have been addressed to you on your appointment as Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations and on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. We share the faith which many Members of this Organization and large segments of the public have in your great human qualities, which have been demonstrated by a life devoted to promoting human rights and to enhancing the social, moral and cultural values of your country and of mankind. Yet we are bound to recognize that your appointment does not in any way mean that the Government of the United States will allow its foreign policy, which is institutionalized and bipartisan, to be made by the decision of one man, although we recognize that your appointment is an indication of goodwill and support for the ideals of the United Nations. It is also a means to offer, through you, a direct line of communication between the aspirations of peoples affected by colonial situations and the head of the Government of your country in the White House.

30. The delegation of Panama also wishes in particular to express its appreciation of the admirable work performed in the month of February by your eminent predecessor, Ambassador James Murray of the United Kingdom and for the singular skill with which he presided over the work of the Council during that time. Ambassador Murray gave the Council the benefit of his accurate sense of time and place and made the Council more agile in its functioning as a result of his native elegance and talent, thus doing honour to the lofty responsibilities entrusted to him.

31. The studies and research carried out by the subsidiary organs of the United Nations, and more particularly by the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts set up to investigate the situation of human rights in southern Africa, reveal an acute crisis in that important part of the world due to the cruel racist practices of the minority régimes which, with blood and fire, oppress by colonial methods the large indigenous majorities of Azania, Namibia and Zimbabwe. This situation requires vigorous and firm action by the Security Council in the discharge of its functions regarding the maintenance of international peace and security through the application of Chapter VII of the Charter.

32. On the basis of that research and those studies, let us look at the situation that has prevailed during the last year in South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia.

33. In South Africa, during that period, there has been no progress towards an improvement in Government policy regarding the *apartheid* system.

34. There was a considerable rise in the number of executions, twice that of the preceding period. Numerous people died in prison, without any explanation from the authorities, and most of those prisoners who died were blacks. It is significant that in a declaration dated 18 February 1977, the Executive Committee of the World Council of Churches should have condemned the torture and killing of detainees in South African prisons, as well as all detentions of political prisoners without due process.⁵

35. There has been a vast movement of collective opposition by the native population to the *apartheid* policy. It culminated in the Soweto student demonstration, which was bloodily suppressed by the Pretoria régime on the outskirts of Johannesburg, leaving 2,840 dead and wounded. This can only be compared with the Sharpeville massacre, which occurred 16 years earlier. Yet those martyrs have not died in vain, for the day of the final elimination of *apartheid* is fast approaching, thanks to the heroism and the desire for freedom of the African peoples.

36. The forced displacement of individuals and the increase in the number of displaced families have been continuing, and will continue, because of the new law, The Prevention of Illegal Squatting Act, of 30 June 1976.

37. The sinister scope of the *apartheid* policy as currently applied can be seen in the fact that there are 100,000 prisoners in South African gaols. The application of the pass system as a means of imposing the *apartheid* policy led to the detention of 269,000 Africans in 1975.

38. The collaboration between the judicial and executive powers, or, rather, their connivance, in the application of racist security laws is repugnantly manifest in the many political trials.

39. The existing disparity between the wages of white and black workers continues to increase. A discriminatory situation like that of South Africa exists also in my country, in the North American colonial enclave known as the Panama Canal Zone, where every North American worker earns a wage three times higher than the average wage of Panamanian workers. The same labour practices which are being condemned today by the international community in southern Africa exist in the Canal Zone, where we have the so-called "United States rate" and "local rates" for wages.

40. The creation of the so-called independent Transkei illustrates South Africa's scorn for the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Hence, the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts has concluded that the "bantustan homelands" policy is a violation of the right of peoples to their sovereignty and self-determination. Indeed, the *Ad Hoc* Group is fully justified in concluding that the Transkei is actually a non-self-governing Territory, a protectorate of South Africa, and lacks the main characteristics of a sovereign State.

⁵ See E/CN.4/NGO/204.

41. As in the case of labour relations, the school system in South Africa is plagued by racial discrimination in the form of rigid segregation and low-quality education for Africans. A similar situation exists in the Panama Canal Zone, where there are North American schools and Latin American schools.

42. Student movements in South Africa encounter many obstacles, as in the case of the South African Students' Organization and the South African Students' Movement, whose protests against *apartheid* have been suppressed by means of expulsions, house arrests and trials.

43. *Apartheid* is all the more to be condemned because it serves to dislocate family life and create humiliating conditions for children, who are raised in conditions of segregation.

44. African housing is bad, lacking as it does even the most basic hygienic facilities. For example, at Soweto, where there are hundreds of thousands of inhabitants, only three out of every 100 houses have hot running water and only 15 out of every 100 houses have electricity.

45. The migrant labour system disrupts family unity and stability, since the wife is not allowed to be in the city in which her husband works. Great social upheavals are caused by the wide disparity between the male and female population of the urban areas, which in some communities comes to a ratio of 10 men to one woman, with a concentration of more children than women in many communities.

46. With regard to trade unions, there are no guarantees for the African population, because the existing legislation violates trade-union rights. Trade unionists, who are, of course, Africans, are persecuted, placed on trial and detained, particularly after strikes.

47. This deplorable situation affects the mental health of the African population alarmingly, and requires prompt action by United Nations organs to put an end to *apartheid* and the violation of human rights in that part of the world, since South Africa's entire policy constitutes criminal conduct, typifying every *crime of lèse-humanité*.

48. In Namibia, the situation is worsening for the African population of that international Territory still under the illegal control of South Africa. There, the harmful effects of *apartheid* legislation and policy are felt with increasing cruelty. It is obvious that South Africa, through the use of devious methods, is trying to settle the future of Namibia in accordance with the political and economic interests not of the Namibian people but of South Africa.

49. The conclusion has been reached that the so-called Windhoek Constitutional Conference is very far from satisfying the requirements of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), since it absurdly curtails Namibia's right to self-determination and independence. The situation is made even worse by South Africa's pursuit of its bantustanization policy, since, as will be recalled, in proclamations issued in March 1976, South Africa decreed Eastern Caprivi an "autonomous zone", thus ushering in the third and last

phase of the bantustanization process. In addition, Rehoboth Gebiet has been granted "autonomy" pursuant to a law of April 1976.

50. South Africa not only maintains its illegal occupation of Namibia, displacing from their traditional homes great sectors of the population; it has also carried out an alarming militarization of the Territory in pursuit of a colonial war which is being waged according to planned State terrorism against the Namibians and their heroic liberation movement, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), which without a doubt is the most representative and responsible political organization that has been created for the defence of the legitimate, permanent interests of the people of Namibia, their independence and self-determination.

51. As regards Southern Rhodesia, the delegation of Panama concurs in the prevailing opinion at the United Nations that the year 1977 must be a decisive one in the solution of the dual problems of the decolonization of Zimbabwe, or its accession to independence as a new African State, and acceptance of the principle of majority rule, which must put an end to the abuse of power by the racist Ian Smith régime and to the semi-slavery in which Africans are kept in their own country.

52. The *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts set up to investigate the situation of human rights in southern Africa, which deserves our warmest appreciation for its outstanding work, has pointed out, as can be seen in its report of 31 January 1977,⁶ that the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia continues to be characterized by the extreme cruelty with which it treats Africans, by harsh racial discrimination, by the abject conditions in which the Africans live, and by its abuses, arbitrary acts and persecutions. The same Group of Experts recommends that the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity, the United Kingdom and other Powers, as well as world public opinion, should exert pressure on the rebel Government, when the Geneva Conference is resumed, so that tangible results may be achieved and so that the transition period may proceed peacefully.

53. Panama joins in the tribute paid to African States for having had recourse to the United Nations for a peaceful solution to the conflicts in southern Africa. These African States have called for change in South Africa to be brought about through negotiations and have asked for the support of the rest of the world. The attitude of the African States makes it evident that the process of decolonization is no isolated phenomenon but, on the contrary, should take place anywhere, because a colonial enclave is as reprehensible in Africa as it is in Asia or in Latin America.

54. The similarity between the African colonial problem and the Panamanian colonial problem leads us to state that for like situations we must seek like remedies. Panama, like Namibia, Zimbabwe and Azania, proportionately speaking, suffers in the heart of its territory the lacerating presence of an alien colonial enclave where there is racial discrimination and where, absurdly enough, foreign courts, foreign legis-

⁶ E/CN.4/1222 and Corr.1.

lation and a foreign language are imposed in contravention of the recognized right of peoples to political and economic self-determination. Like the African States, Panama is negotiating with a great Power to recover its full sovereignty which has been violated by the existence of the colonial enclave but, like the African States, we also seek the support of the rest of the world which is so well represented here.

55. The Panamanian Government maintains that where colonialism exists there is discrimination. It is like the relationship between a disease and the bacteria that cause it: where there is tuberculosis there is Koch's bacillus; where there is leprosy there is Hansen's bacillus; where there is syphilis there are spirochaetes; where there is cancer there are cancerous cells. That is like colonialism and discrimination and, therefore, the colonial and discriminatory practices carried out by South Africa in southern Africa and by the United States in the Panama Canal Zone, albeit by other means, deserve to be compared and should lead us to similar conclusions, because in both places the same evil and injustices exist.

56. On the one hand, there is colonialism represented by the North American enclave which maintains a foreign governmental structure in the heart of our territory, unilaterally administered in a foreign language; and, on the other hand, there is racial segregation and *apartheid* in the Canal Zone accompanied by all the characteristics and peculiarities of those practices that are particularly evident in labour relations, education and housing. For further details, I refer the members of the Council to the report submitted by Panama on 3 November 1976 to the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.⁷ Part II of the report is devoted to discrimination in the Canal Zone.

57. President Carter's devotion to respect for human rights gives particular support to the efforts that you, Mr. President, are making, so that we may adopt by consensus what may prove to be a programme of decolonization for the oppressed peoples of southern Africa. It is quite obvious to both the United States and the international community that the right of peoples to self-determination is a fundamental human right, the exercise of which, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and pronouncements of the General Assembly and the Security Council, is the key to the peaceful solution of the major conflicts which afflict mankind.

58. We suffer in the same way as the African States because of the traumatic slowness of the negotiating process which, in the case of southern Africa, has taken several decades and, in the case of Panama, has been going on for 13 long years. Now there is a possibility that, during the Carter Administration and with the assistance of all the regions of the world represented in the Council, the last vestiges of colonialism in Africa and in Latin America will be eradicated.

59. My country expects and claims its right to the speedy conclusion of a new treaty with the United States on the Panama Canal to put an end to North American jurisdiction

over Panamanian territory, restore the territorial integrity of Panama and give Panama control and operation of the Canal so that the waterway between two oceans may be an instrument of peace and progress, open and accessible to the ships of all countries of the world at all times, without any discrimination and on conditions of complete equality. We are certain that major mental reservations will have to be overcome, as well as the still persistent psychological effects of anachronisms that prevailed at the beginning of the century and that still come up in negotiations. But we hope that all that will be superseded so that, in 1977, the two parties will intensify their efforts to conclude a treaty in keeping with the principles of international law relating to friendship and co-operation among States.

60. Some encouraging signs have been seen. The visit by President Carter to the United Nations and his statement to the delegations of Member States is, no doubt, a major step towards the strengthening of the United Nations which, if its work is to succeed, must have the support of other leaders of the world. *The New York Times*, in today's main editorial, states: "A new President and a new spirit have produced a thaw in attitudes toward Viet Nam, Panama, much of Africa and now Cuba." The same editorial adds that there is talk about new steps with China, new Middle East negotiations, improvement of the institutions of international collaboration and, above all, control of the arms race, in respect of which it is necessary, in our opinion, to arrive at positive agreements with the Soviet Union.

61. With that background on the international scene, the countries of the third world and all those who are devoted to the principles of the Charter will agree that the colonial problems of Africa and Latin America and, most particularly, the problems of southern Africa and the Panama Canal, must be solved in harmony with the spirit of our times, which requires that, for the peaceful solution of those situations which threaten international peace and security, the following factors be taken into account:

—First, the process of decolonization in each of those areas must be carried out promptly and in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which solemnly proclaims the necessity of putting a speedy and unconditional end to colonialism, because it constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter and an impediment to the promotion of world peace and co-operation.

—Secondly, each country, in the exercise of its territorial sovereignty, must be able to recover its natural resources, in conformity with the principles and norms established in the following declarations of the General Assembly: the declaration on permanent sovereignty of peoples and nations over their natural wealth and resources, according to which that sovereignty is a basic constituent of the right of peoples to self-determination [*resolution 1803 (XVII)*], and the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, which establishes, *inter alia*, that the new international economic order should be founded on full respect for the following principles:

"Full permanent sovereignty of every State over its natural resources and all economic activities . . . ;

⁷ CERD/C/8.

"The right of all States, territories and peoples under foreign occupation, alien and colonial domination or *apartheid* to restitution and full compensation for the exploitation and depletion of, and damages to, the natural resources and all other resources of those States, territories and peoples" [resolution 3201 (S-VI)].

62. The delegation of Panama believes that, in parallel with the negotiations to resolve the questions of South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe, the Security Council should take all the measures authorized under Chapter VII of the Charter to make its decisions effective. Accordingly, my delegation will support decisions taken to that effect in accordance with the statements made in the Council by the African and non-aligned States and others. Our position is based on the political concept expressed by the head of Government of my country, General Omar Torrijos, at the Summit Conference of the Non-aligned Countries held at Colombo in August last year. On that historic occasion, General Torrijos said the following:

"I wish to say to our brothers of Africa that when the United Nations orders a mission of war our armed forces will be present with you to eradicate the power of that minority in Rhodesia and South Africa.

"We know what *apartheid* is, because racial discrimination is precisely what is most shameful in the geographical area which cuts our country in two."

63. Southern Africa is on the threshold of profound and historic changes, which must be carried out with the vigorous support of the United Nations. No one can deny that the cause of Africa is also the cause of Latin America, of Asia and of all countries that are loyal to the decolonization process. In sum, the cause of Africa is the cause of the United Nations and it is also the cause of the non-aligned countries. The Political Declaration of Colombo placed on record the following:

"The Non-Aligned identify themselves with national liberation movements in their struggle for independence from colonial rule, all attempts to destroy unequal relations and domination of any sort, and will pursue action towards these ends through every means in accordance with the UN Charter."⁸

64. Mr. LEPRETTE (France) (*interpretation from French*): In placing on its agenda the question of South Africa, which, if one is to judge from what has been said by so many previous speakers, is also in a broader sense an examination of the situation in southern Africa, the Security Council took account of the gravity of the challenges facing our Organization in that part of the world.

65. The Security Council and the whole world community have three basic complaints against South Africa. The first and the most fundamental concerns *apartheid*. Contempt for human dignity, which has been elevated to the status of a system, is an offence to our ideas and the purposes of our Organization. The second relates to the persistence of the illegal occupation of a Territory which enjoys international

status, Namibia. The third complaint relates to failure to comply with the mandatory measures imposed by the Organization against an illegal rebel régime, that of Southern Rhodesia.

66. I have said that the most fundamental complaint relates to *apartheid*, in other words, to man's very understanding of man. My country condemns this system as being contrary to the basic principles of French and Western society. Permit me here to make an analysis of the different levels of the problem.

67. Underlying the problem there is our conception of the natural equality of man, the principle of which is intertwined in our society with the very sources of Christianity. The intellectual ferment of the eighteenth century had the effect of secularizing it and of ensuring that it was officially institutionalized. French and other European philosophers have laid stress on the spirit of equality, without which, in the words of the French philosopher, Montesquieu, "there can be no democratic system". The reign of reason, as distinguished from the reign of prejudice, served as a point of departure for two major declarations of the eighteenth century, the American and the French, which proclaim in their very first words that "men are born and remain free and equal in respect of rights".

68. At a second stage, the reign of reason and the principle of equality were translated into laws "equal for all and applicable to all". The citizens of our countries became equal under the law. They are now the authors of laws which have made it possible for democracy to assert itself as the most appropriate system for the point we have reached in history.

69. The twentieth century has seen new egalitarian advances in the economic and social fields and hence in the everyday lives of men. We are fighting today against the most varied forms of enforced inferiority and exploitation. We consider this point to be as fundamental as the abstract equality of the eighteenth century. France has enshrined it in its own Constitution, the preamble to which is worded as follows:

"No one may be placed in a situation of economic, social or political inferiority contrary to his dignity which makes possible his exploitation by virtue of sex, age, colour, nationality, religion, opinion, ethnic origin or any other reason."

70. Turning now to the subject of our debate against this background, I should like to make the following point: the principle of equality is not recognized in southern Africa; on the contrary, it is actually being flouted. The laws there are not equal for all; the economic position of the majority is vastly inferior to that of a minority. We condemn the *apartheid* régime because it is anti-democratic, because it has organized a pseudo-society instead of building a human society and because it defies the aspirations which mankind has been cherishing for the last two centuries.

71. I come right away to the other point of our debate, that is, the relationship that exists between the crisis situation resulting from the existence of the *apartheid*

⁸ A/31/197, annex I, para. 34.

régime and the duties of the international community: it is very clear that the relationship should be strong and that we should do something and contemplate some action. Mr. de Guiringaud, French Minister for Foreign Affairs, stated in the General Assembly on 29 September 1976:

“Peace, the goal which is central to our action, is the product of an equilibrium which is built on the independence of States and nations . . . but it also needs broader foundations. Back in 1945 did we not, after all, proclaim our ‘faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person . . .’?”

“. . . we are forced to note that there are . . . situations in the world today which may at times actually jeopardize peace. Those situations arise from the failure to recognize [these] fundamental rights . . .

“I am thinking most particularly of southern Africa, where tension and confrontation are becoming more acute. This development justifies the part we are taking and the support we are giving to the efforts to prevent a fatal escalation. It is all too evident that racial discrimination is the underlying cause of the crisis, though situations may differ here and there.”⁹

72. Thus an analysis in depth by my Government of the situation in southern Africa has compelled an initial condemnation of *apartheid*.

73. When the sickness of a society not of a colonial type relates to its image of man, when it has not conceded that the spirit of equality is necessary for the operation of democracy, what would be done to restore it to health? Should it be consigned to outer darkness; should it be irrevocably punished and, along with it, most of the people of southern Africa? We cannot help noting that we are faced not only with a régime deaf to political reason but also with a series of social tensions and passions.

74. The isolation of societies has never made them more open. Quite the contrary. History teaches us that it has in fact led to the hardening of conflicting positions and to the blocking of any progress. In a previous debate, the French delegation stressed that to prefer medicine to surgery, to admit the possibility of a long and necessary negotiation with the sickness seems to us to be the only possible course because it is the only one liable to induce change.

75. When we attempt to tackle the deep-seated ills of a society, the pressures of the world community must be constant and assume many forms. I have spoken of patience, not of weakness. Some, of course, will hasten to say that they have no further use for moral condemnation, the time for which has passed, or for pressure, the effectiveness of which they question. There are many who believe the time has come for obligatory sanctions.

76. Permit me to differ. In our present situation my delegation believes that the most appropriate course would be to collect in a solemn document the principles which

should be incorporated in the reforms we shall call upon South Africa to put into effect. I hope the Pretoria Government will not be mistaken about the significance of the declaration that has been worked out in the working groups of the Council. Where the text rejects the basis of *apartheid*, the conduct of the South African authorities and the different aspects of the way of life unjustly imposed upon the black majority, Pretoria must understand that we are calling upon it to carry out precise changes, to undertake a re-examination in depth of its policy. The present repression is not only humiliating, it is also dangerous. It is imperative for South Africa to help itself and to help us to prevent the “fatal escalation” mentioned by Mr. de Guiringaud. It should as soon possible abolish all traces of racial separation and co-operate with all those working to that end in the Churches, in business and in other organizations. It should recognize that all its inhabitants have a right to citizenship and a political status which enables them to decide upon their own destiny. It should renounce the system of bantustans, which my country and the countries of the European Community have totally condemned, as they demonstrated in the case of the Transkei. Above all, the very philosophy which underlies the present situation in South Africa should be abandoned and replaced by an egalitarian political and economic system, which there is no reason to think would be unacceptable to the privileged few who hold power at present.

77. As I have already said, the situation of the white South Africans is not of a colonial type: those men and women are not expatriates. I have not heard our African colleagues talking of oppressing them in their turn. Quite the contrary. I was struck by a significant phrase used by Ambassador Harriman, for example. He said,

“We only call for majority rule based on equal rights for all the racial groups of South Africa.” [1988th meeting, para. 72.]

Since, for his part, the Commissioner for External Affairs of Nigeria said the Africans want to “build, not to destroy” [1989th meeting, para. 30], it is important that, beyond threats and simplistic refusals, in South Africa and elsewhere, thought should be given to the best means of embarking upon continuous dialogue based upon a new approach to the difficult problems of the area. I have no hesitation in agreeing with the ideas put forward to this end, by my Canadian and German colleagues [1998th meeting] and I think the time has come to strive to break the stalemate and obtain from South Africa the first really significant concessions in the area for which it is responsible.

78. I should like to quote another phrase from this debate: “South Africa”, said a particularly well qualified African speaker, “will never be prosperous and free until its people live in fraternity and enjoy equal rights”. The representative of France could not help being moved on finding in the same phrase three words of his own national motto, among them one too often forgotten: fraternity. It is a profound truth that no society is worthy of the name if it does not enjoy a minimum of fraternity. It is also at the human level, at the level of human relationships, that we

⁹ Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Plenary Meetings, 9th meeting, paras. 108-110.

should seek and find remedies for the crisis from which South Africa is suffering. Our efforts to this end should be unremitting. Each of our countries—and in this regard those having relations with Pretoria have particular responsibilities, as we recognize—must, through its own initiatives, make clear its determination to see evolution in a society which has engendered violence. However that may be, persuasion and the exercise of firm and gradual pressure remain means which it would be wrong to abandon. The solemn declaration we contemplate is evidence of that policy. In the view of France it is the duty of everyone with regard to southern Africa to encourage those still too few white South Africans who are fighting to allow the voice of justice to be heard; it is also to remain faithful to the objectives of our Organization, striving remorselessly and unremittingly to create the best possible conditions for peaceful solutions to the situation.

79. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Togo. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

80. Mr. KODJOVI (Togo) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, thank you for permitting me to speak in this august body in a debate the importance of which is obvious to everyone and to remind you of my country's position on the problems of South Africa and of the premises upon which that position is based.

81. First I should like to pay a respectful tribute to the memory of Commandant Marien Nguabi, the valiant freedom fighter who fought for human ideals and who was tragically snatched from the affections of the people of the Congo and of all peace and progress-loving peoples. Commandant Nguabi has left in fighting Africa and perhaps throughout the world a vacuum it will be difficult to fill.

82. I should now like to tell you, Mr. President, how pleased I am at having an opportunity to associate myself with previous speakers in conveying to you congratulations upon your appointment as Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations and also upon the brilliance with which you have conducted the proceedings of the Security Council this month.

83. Your name has been gloriously linked with that of the Reverend Martin Luther King, whose memory we venerate, in the fight for civil rights for black Americans. You understand what a human being is; you know that a man is a man, whatever the colour of his skin; and you have fought for the dignity of man. We think that your appointment is a sign, just as we think that the declarations of intent concerning human rights we have heard with so much interest these past few weeks are a sign. We know that everyone is aware that in this matter, while all-out action has to be taken by everyone, everywhere, on a permanent basis, there are priorities that require immediate action to be taken with determination and vigour. One example is South Africa, where an explosive situation prevails, created by the indescribable oppression to which the white minority subjects the black majority; where Namibia is illegally occupied; where detention camps, called bantustans, are established—all this on the basis of *apartheid*.

84. More than 30 years ago the alarm was sounded regarding the racial discrimination practised in South Africa. Hundreds of resolutions, recommendations and reports on *apartheid* have been adopted by the international community, in the General Assembly, the Security Council, and various specialized agencies and committees and commissions of the United Nations. And, in addition to those resolutions, recommendations and reports, when one refers to the awesome number of declarations condemning *apartheid* and to the flow of ink and saliva stimulated by this doctrine and its application, one cannot say that our Organization has not taken a sufficient interest in the problem; nor can it be claimed that this problem is not of concern to the entire human community. The policy of *apartheid* has been the subject of unanimous condemnation, because it is outrageous and immoral in its very conception; abominable, inhuman and inadmissible in its application. *Apartheid* is a clear stumbling block to the advance of universal morality, and it systematically and comprehensively flouts all the basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations: the equality of races and peoples, justice, respect for the human being, the right of peoples to self-determination.

85. Since it is unanimously conceded that only the scrupulous observance of these principles can arm humanity against the indescribable horrors of the Second World War and ensure lasting peace in the world, it is not hard to foresee the catastrophes to which *apartheid* is irresistibly and inexorably leading the world. Those horrors of the Second World War, which caused such upheaval in the world and so much tragic suffering to mankind, and which provoked such turbulence in all fields—turbulence that does not seem to be abating—were the result, as we know only too well, of a racist system. The human community still bears in its flesh and its conscience the consequences of the horrible events of that war.

86. In South Africa, today, we see unmistakable signs: the escalation of violence in the area; the vicious circle of oppression-protest-repression in which Vorster has imprisoned Azania; the brutal massacres carried out in cold blood and which have caused a growing loss of life among black men, women and even children whose sole crime was to ask to be treated as human beings; the inhumane measures taken to confine the blacks of South Africa once and for all in a political, economic, social and cultural ghetto; the establishment of bantustans, which are nothing other than huge concentration camps; the provocations and attacks carried out against the independent neighbouring countries. All that constitutes a grave threat to the peace. The belligerency and aggressiveness of the racist régimes are well known, as are the calamities to which their feverish policy leads.

87. Why, then, despite the efforts that have been deployed for the past 30 years to eliminate the *apartheid* régime, despite the unanimous condemnation of that régime, despite its outrageous nature, despite the obvious danger it poses to the world, despite the lessons of history—why, despite all that, is the *apartheid* régime able to maintain itself and even become stronger, arm itself to the teeth and take such devilish joy in defying the international community?

88. It is hard to understand why the Vorster régime has enjoyed so much scarcely concealed complicity. Is it because Vorster and his clique of white torturers claim that they want to make South Africa the bastion of the free world? That is a strange way indeed of viewing the free world, of representing and defending it! The cruel fraud is too obvious for anyone to be misled. There are no more effective methods of ensuring that this so-called free world is detested and to contribute to the ruin of the West than those used by the Pretoria masters—if it is indeed necessary to maintain so stubbornly this cleavage between the East and the West and to continue to bank so much on such a convenient but dangerous division of the world into two opposing camps; instead of simply considering, as is demanded by the exigencies of our time, the human race as a single family which should develop in harmony and in which every individual should enjoy guaranteed essential and inalienable rights. Is this done in order to protect the economic and financial interests of the business circles that are constantly stepping up their investments in that area? There is a saying—perhaps it is somewhat vulgar—that money has no odour. But it is nevertheless inhuman and repugnant to sacrifice moral principles and so many innocent lives on the altar of a few selfish material interests. Is it to ensure the survival of the whites that certain economic and military Powers are helping that minority to continue imposing its barbaric laws on the vast black majority? No African, since the colonial night, with all its humiliations, has ever undertaken to exterminate the former white colonists. They have remained active partners in—and sometimes even privileged beneficiaries of—the development of the young independent nations. Why should there be any particular fears about this with regard to South Africa, particularly when we are aware of the lofty notion held by the black man of brotherhood and multiracial harmony?

89. Support for the frightful Vorster régime, with all its cruelty and treachery towards our community, only cultivates hatred among the races, and that is the crux of the problem. How then can we explain that profound scorn for one of the fundamental principles in the Charter, that is, brotherhood between races and the peoples of the whole world, if not by the fact that the South African régime and its accomplices have, in order to keep their grip on southern Africa, adopted the motto "*Oderint, dum metuant*"—"Who cares if they hate me as long as they fear me"?

90. That is why we are convinced that the strong who base their power on bullying the weak can never be strong enough to remain masters for ever. A people which has been injured in its dignity will shrink from no sacrifice in order to free itself from barbarous oppression. The racist régime of South Africa is therefore doomed to pass away, and it is because it has become aware of this fact that it is desperately trying to strengthen itself outside its frontiers, on the one hand by winning the devotion of the rebel at bay, Ian Smith, and, on the other, by annexing Namibia. The fury with which it is trampling under foot the many resolutions calling on it to liberate Namibia and its perfect understanding with the Rhodesian rebels, who have also been spewed out by the international community, can only be explained as the last convulsive reflexes of the minority Vorster régime.

91. In opening the meeting of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity held at Lomé from 21 to 28 February last, General Gnassingbe Eyadema, President of the Togolese Republic and President and Founder of the movement of the Togolese people, speaking of the most recent developments in Azania, declared that:

"The dominant powers will remain too imbued with their alleged superiority to capitulate unconditionally. Therefore, we should not be surprised at the manifestations of pride revealed in the desperate resistance of Ian Smith or the masquerade of a conference organized by South Africa to settle the fate of Namibia and excluding the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, SWAPO. We should increase our active vigilance so that the solutions which sooner or later will have to be adopted are in keeping with the deep-seated aspirations of the peoples concerned. Africa will win, and with it peoples of goodwill and peace. Yes, Africa will prevail because its cause is just and its struggle legitimate."

This is not just an ephemeral statement. Far from it, it is an act of faith on the part of the lucid guide of a profoundly humanist revolution, the expression of a fierce determination to mobilize all energies to fight unremittingly for final victory against injustice and oppression in order to ensure the triumph of the ideals of liberty, equality, dignity and tranquillity for all in a world of solidarity and brotherhood.

92. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Ethiopia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

93. Mr. BEKELE (Ethiopia): Mr. President, allow me to express my delegation's appreciation to you and, through you, to the members of the Council for acceding to its request to be allowed to participate in these deliberations. In the absence of my Ambassador, who is away from New York, it is a great honour for me personally to be able to address the Council. My delegation would like to take this opportunity to express its congratulations to you upon your appointment as Permanent Representative of your country to the United Nations and also on your assumption of this month's presidency of the Council.

94. The question before the Council has, for a long time now—31 years—been the subject of United Nations debates, declarations and resolutions, without any fruitful result so far. During the last 31 years, phenomenal progress in all fields of activity has been achieved. A number of new independent nations have emerged in the world and a number of difficult questions have been seriously tackled, if not solved.

95. During these 31 years, only one phenomenon has gone unchanged, unyielding and unmindful of the world, but one that the world will not forget—South Africa and its *apartheid* system. Every time the question of South Africa has been debated in the United Nations, we Africans have been led to believe in form rather than substance, in words rather than in action. We have often been led to believe that the course of action which South Africa's friends espoused would get better results than our own. South Africa's

friends have had their way during the last 31 years. Meanwhile, South Africa has adopted *apartheid*, that is, institutionalized racism in place of mere discrimination; South Africa has become an aggressive nation rather than merely a nuisance neighbour; South Africa has openly become defiant of the United Nations rather than just being uncomfortable with the Organization.

96. As delegations come before the Council today to plead for action, as members of the Council no doubt hold intensive consultations on an acceptable text for a declaration, South Africa, in its total defiance of the world community, is taking much more concrete action. While the Council is concerned with the words it will choose after this debate, South Africa is taking action. *The New York Times* reports today from Johannesburg that, at the time when we are discussing South Africa, that country is increasing its defence budget:

“Growing concern over the country’s security was reflected in a 21.3 percent increase in defense spending and a 15 percent increase in the outlays for the police. The increase brought the defense budget to \$1.9 billion, 18 percent of the \$10.3 billion total.”

Will this further defiance of the United Nations perhaps be an incentive to the members of the Council to take stronger action? I hope they will be able to do so.

97. It is in this context that the Ethiopian delegation approaches the examination of the question of South Africa. On the one hand, we have a situation where South Africa has gone from bad to worse and, on the other, we have some members—and important members at that—abetting and encouraging South Africa in the course of action it has chosen to follow. True, those members have not written South Africa’s racial legislation, they have not planned its aggression or that of its protégés against African States, nor perhaps have they advised it to be defiant of the United Nations. But have not those same friends boosted its economy, armed its military to the teeth, resisted its isolation by the international community in their encouragement of it and cosy relations with it in sports, science, the arts, communications and diplomacy? Have those friends of South Africa, as a sign of their aversion to *apartheid*, ever taken even a token action? What we are always being lectured about is that they are free and democratic societies. Consequently, their Governments have no say in how their sportsmen should behave, where their artists may perform, their businessmen trade or their nationals travel. They cannot discipline their arms merchants; they too are free people, doing business where they find it. As for their diplomatic relations with South Africa, their presence there is needed as a moderating influence. Their excuses are inexhaustible. Meanwhile South Africa becomes more defiant. It becomes more deadly. Is this deception to be continued?

98. The time has come, indeed is long overdue, when action must be taken to avert disaster in South Africa. The Security Council must do its duty and put an end to the wanton murders, imprisonments and aggression by South Africa and its protégé, the racist régime of Ian Smith. Those Governments that have made the application of human rights their new-found credo can perhaps be persuaded to

— apply it in South Africa instead of roaming all over the world looking for acceptable candidates for their wrath. A veteran in the struggle for human rights is supposed to have said only recently that human rights had suddenly become the thing and that her office was being flooded with all kinds of queries. I may also add that, in her opinion, she did not see that new-found interest as contributing to the achievement of human rights, but rather to impeding it. The question of human rights is too important, too worthy a cause to be a fad for the radical chic to play with. There may be differences as to what exactly constitutes human rights. In some Fascist countries, people may have indeed been denied their economic and political rights; in some other countries, agitators, common criminals and Trojan horses may have been clamped down upon, and those people have suddenly become great warriors for human rights. Be that as it may, in no country of the world other than in South Africa have people lost their basic human right, the recognition of themselves as human beings. That is so basic that any genuine concern for human rights should have applied its pressure there, in South Africa.

99. While those new champions of human rights do a little more work where it is needed most, they may also reconsider whether their so-called security and economic interests may not be better protected by some means other than at the expense of the black people of South Africa. Is South Africa so important to their security and economic well-being that it must be allowed to deprive the black man of his life, his liberty and his own country? I ask that question because that seems to my delegation to be the underlying reason why South Africa’s friends always rush to protect it from any action the Council may take.

100. The now famous “National Security Study Memorandum 39”, otherwise popularly known as “the Kissinger study of southern Africa”, brings out very clearly that United States interest in the area is one of security and economics, and that United States policy, therefore, would have as its goal the maintenance of those interests. Some would add a third interest, that of the racial affinity of the ruling class with the architects of *apartheid*, but we can leave that thought aside as being uncharitable to a ruling class that has finally struck from the books all laws pertaining to race. But the two other interests, those of security and economics, must be faced squarely. The study describes the economic interest as follows:

“US direct investment in southern Africa, mainly in South Africa, is about \$1 billion and yields a highly profitable return. Trade, again mainly with South Africa, runs a favorable balance to the US. (Our exports to South Africa were about \$450 million in 1968 against imports of \$250 million.) In addition, the US has indirect economic interest in the key role which South Africa plays in the UK balance of payments. UK investment in South Africa is currently estimated at \$3 billion, and the British have made it clear that they will take no action which would jeopardize their economic interests. The US has an important interest in the orderly marketing of South Africa’s gold production which is important to the successful operation of the two-tier gold-price system.”¹⁰

¹⁰ *The Kissinger Study of Southern Africa* (Westport, Connecticut, Lawrence Hill and Company, 1976), p. 87.

The security interest is outlined thus:

“Southern Africa is geographically important for the US and its allies, particularly with the closing of the Suez Canal and the increased Soviet activity in the Indian Ocean. The US uses overflight and landing facilities for military aircraft in the Portuguese Territories and South Africa. There are major ship repair and logistic facilities in South Africa with a level of technical competence which cannot be duplicated elsewhere on the African continent.”¹⁰

101. It may be argued that the study is dated, that it was prepared some seven years ago for consideration by a different Administration and portrays the problems as perceived by that Administration; that conditions have changed—the Suez Canal, for one thing, is open; that the Portuguese colonies are now free, and so forth. It may also be argued that Memorandum 39, in any case, is only a study and not approved government policy. That may well be true, but the point is that, despite the peripheral changes, the main thesis of Memorandum 39, it seems to me, still stands. As long as the United States continues to perceive those two interests as worthy of its protection, we must not expect any help or understanding from that quarter in spite of the signals we are receiving.

102. What is true of the United States is of course true of France, the United Kingdom, West Germany, Italy, Israel and Japan. The role those countries have played and continue to play in strengthening the hold of *apartheid* on the black people of southern Africa has been too extensively documented to need any further elaboration.

103. The question before the Council, therefore, is whether South Africa should be further protected at the expense of the black man, with all the consequences such

protection entails. South Africa has had all the protection and support it could use for the past 31 years; now it is time to give the black man some of that support by clamping down on the racist régime of Vorster. We have, during these 31 years, diagnosed the sickness. If anything, we have diagnosed it too much. No medicine has been prescribed, let alone surgery attempted. Some may still think that further diagnosis is necessary. I feel, however, that it is too late even for surgery. The sickness is of such magnitude that the only humane thing to do is to kill the body.

104. Allow me to conclude by quoting from the message the Chairman of the Provisional Military Administrative Council of Ethiopia, Lt. Col. Mengistu Haile Mariam, sent to the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* on the occasion of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination:

“On behalf of the people and Government of Socialist Ethiopia, I take this opportunity to appeal to the international community, in particular to those members of the Security Council who, through their continued investments and regular use of the veto power aid and abet outlaws of Pretoria, to listen to the voice of the suffering majority in South Africa and comply with the decisions of the world body.”¹¹

105. Ethiopia, as a country struggling against great odds to establish a just society, sympathizes with and understands the difficulties and agonies through which the peoples of Azania, Namibia and Zimbabwe are going. The support offered them by Socialist Ethiopia, therefore, is strong and total.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.

¹¹ See A/AC.115/L.462.

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.
