



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SECOND YEAR

2037th MEETING: 25 OCTOBER 1977

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2037)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The question of South Africa:	
Letter dated 20 October 1977 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12420)	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.

2037TH MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 25 October 1977, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Rikhi JAIPAL (India).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Benin, Canada, China, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, India, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, 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/2037)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The question of South Africa:

Letter dated 20 October 1977 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12420)

The meeting was called to order at 11.20 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The question of South Africa:

Letter dated 20 October 1977 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12420)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken by the Council at the last meeting, I invite the representatives of Nigeria and Tunisia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Garba (Nigeria) and Mr. Mestiri (Tunisia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Saudi Arabia and Togo, requesting that they should be invited to participate in the discussion of the question on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in conformity with the relevant provisions 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 invite the representatives of Saudi Arabia and Togo 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. Baroody (Saudi Arabia) and Mr. Kodjovi (Togo) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

4. The PRESIDENT: I should like to draw the Council's attention to document S/12424, which contains the text of a letter dated 24 October from the Permanent Representative of Finland to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.

5. The first speaker is the Commissioner for External Affairs of Nigeria. I welcome the distinguished Commissioner and invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

6. Mr. GARBA (Nigeria): Mr. President, first of all, I should like to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month, particularly at a period when we are discussing such a serious problem, which affects world peace and security. There is no doubt in my mind that, under your wise guidance, the Council will achieve the purpose for which it has been summoned.

7. Last week, the international community learnt with great horror of a new wave of political and criminal repression by the racist minority Government of Vorster. Judged by the level of its brutality, the unprovoked crackdown on defenceless Africans, and even white liberals, in South Africa is not without parallel in South Africa's chequered history. This is, however, another retrogressive step by the Vorster régime on the dangerous road towards a racial war in southern Africa.

8. My delegation contends that this crackdown is an embarrassment even to the fanatical supporters of the racists. It has been deliberately timed to further compound Pretoria's ugly record of affront to the United Nations, of which South Africa claims to be a Member. The crackdown is an insult to the Charter of the United Nations, the principles of which the racists once committed themselves to uphold. Finally, these latest repressive acts represent a brazen contempt for the Security Council, which has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

9. The Nigerian delegation finds the present acts of repression indefensible, particularly at a time when Vorster is reportedly negotiating with five Western members of the Security Council on the modalities of Namibian independence. There is only one rational explanation for this obnoxious behaviour. Vorster and his henchmen in Pretoria, like the proverbial leopard which cannot change its spots, are fundamentally opposed to the prospect of Africans being treated with basic dignity and consideration, as is normally expected in any civilized society.

10. The details of this blind crackdown on the African population are clear to everyone: the racist régime is not prepared to tolerate the slightest expression of opposition to *apartheid*. It is disturbing that some 150 blacks were arrested, among them Mr. Percy Qoboza, the black editor of *The World* newspaper, a paper which has the second largest circulation among Africans. Mr. Qoboza was reportedly haled off to the same detention camp where Steve Biko was murdered in cold blood last month. We are equally appalled to learn that the white editor of the *Daily Dispatch*, Mr. Donald Woods, was also banned for five years. An undisclosed number of other blacks and whites were also banned and, in the absence of an official list, the figure for this category of victims may well be staggering. Both Mr. Qoboza and Mr. Woods have a reputation for fair reporting. In the case of Mr. Qoboza, this could not have been better demonstrated than by the relatively restrained manner in which his paper handled the tragic affair of Steve Biko. By arresting Mr. Qoboza and banning Mr. Woods, the racists have betrayed their inner instinct for vindictiveness and callousness against all semblances of opposition, for, in racist South Africa, a reputation for fair reporting automatically confers on the reporter the tag of communist agent or a subversive element.

11. The English-speaking newspapers have always been regarded as enemies by the so-called Nationalist Party since it assumed power in 1948. Then, as the new Government began to extend racial subordination, it assumed powers that restrained the potential for press opposition. Thirty years later, editors and reporters must constantly resort to legal advice to determine whom they can quote, what they can photograph and whether they are likely to invite indictment for any one of a dozen offences: from what has been blandly categorized as "promoting hostility between whites and blacks" to the now-familiar bogey of "furthering the objectives of communism".

12. In the case of journals or organizations, banning means depriving so many people of their means of livelihood. That is what has happened to *The World*, the major black newspaper in circulation until last week. In the case of individuals, it amounts to a form of quasi-imprisonment. That is the fate being suffered by Mr. Woods and countless others. Formal arrest, which is what has happened to Mr. Qoboza, is infinitely worse since it means that he can be detained indefinitely without trial. In a characteristic display of arrogance, the Pretoria régime claims it is acting in the interest of the West and of the so-called free world. Ironically, the racist régime constitutes everything that can be described as the opposite of Western principles and ideals of civilized conduct in human relations.

13. Barely one week ago, during the debate in the General Assembly on the question of Namibia, I reiterated¹ my delegation's scepticism about the good intentions of the South African régime with respect to the unfolding events in southern Africa. Little did we think that the racists would choose the current session of the General Assembly, as well as the time when negotiations were going on between them and five members of this body towards resolving the Namibian question, to prove us right. If this noble Organization—and indeed the Security Council—is not to lose its credibility, then it is time this effrontery was rebuffed with appropriate measures under the Charter of the United Nations.

14. I wish to reiterate that it is unacceptable that the racist régime in Pretoria should continue to hold the world to ransom. Fortunately, in spite of some of its inherent inadequacies, the Charter contains provisions which deal firmly with such an explosive situation as obtains at present in South Africa, a situation which constitutes a veritable threat to international peace and security. The Security Council has a special responsibility to humanity and should take prompt and concrete measures to arrest the present deterioration of the state of affairs in South Africa.

15. My delegation therefore will not be satisfied with a mere condemnation of the racists for their acts of brutality, repression and terrorism. This has been done several times before without any satisfactory effects on the racists at Pretoria. The Council should now move forward by imposing, particularly, an oil and arms embargo under Chapter VII of the Charter. All Member States, particularly friends of South Africa, should reinforce this measure by promptly halting new investments in South Africa and taking steps to dismantle their existing investments in that country. The situation in South Africa has assumed such serious dimensions as to make the mere act of recalling ambassadors inadequate. It is now incumbent on the Western Powers to take up Vorster's challenge to their cherished principles and ideals. Indeed, it is time for all the big Powers to co-ordinate action designed to deal adequately with this deteriorating situation, if a racial conflagration is to be avoided. This is perhaps the last opportunity we have to prevent a racial war in that part of the world. We believe that, with the imposition of mandatory sanctions and strict adherence thereto, *apartheid* will be abolished in South Africa.

16. The Nigerian delegation hopes that all nations will perceive the danger signals and take appropriate measures. All nations that have been collaborating with the racists either in terms of trade or in the exchange of nuclear technology must review these relations. They must join in the concerted efforts of the international community to isolate South Africa. I sincerely hope that they realize how much their collaboration has helped to prop up the inhuman system of *apartheid*. We expect them also, apart from terminating all their links with the racists, to grant moral and material assistance to the liberation movements in their legitimate struggle to bring down the obnoxious system of *apartheid* and create an atmosphere of equality, freedom and human dignity for all races in the area.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-second Session, Plenary Meetings*, 36th meeting.

17. On our part, as my head of State declared at Lagos during the World Conference for Action against *Apartheid*,² Nigeria is taking appropriate steps to identify those transnationals that are doing business with us in Nigeria while giving support to the *apartheid* system in South Africa. We sincerely hope they will heed this warning and act accordingly. We have also pledged our continued moral and material support to all freedom fighters committed to the achievement of freedom, social justice and self-determination in that unhappy country. In doing this, we are convinced that we are making our small contribution towards humanity. The oppressed and suffering masses of South Africa, held as hostages in their fatherland under the most horrible conditions, in quasi-slavery, look to the Security Council for succour, for support and even for material assistance. If this is given now, the Council will have succeeded in refurbishing its credibility image and contributing to the fight against *apartheid*. If this is denied, the road to freedom and self-determination will be long, agonizing and even bloody. But the advent of final triumph is merely a question of time.

18. Mr. HOUNGAVOU (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of the People's Republic of Benin sees nothing new in the present debate; it is merely a follow-up to the debate which took place in March 1977 and which was interrupted in conditions of which everyone is aware.

19. The African Group, faced with the most recent repressive measures adopted by the racist Vorster régime against the black African population of South Africa, wished to shake the Security Council out of the immoral inertia and unpardonable negligence that those who are supporting the racist régimes of southern Africa are trying to impose on it. That immoral inertia and that unpardonable negligence without doubt reflect the collaboration of the Western Powers with the régimes whose daily acts represent a serious threat to Africa and the international community.

20. The racist and minority régimes of southern Africa play a specific role in the machiavellian plan for the imperialistic encirclement of our continent, designed to bring our peoples to their knees and exploit our resources.

21. The truth is harsh, and the imperialists and their champions of all sorts do not—quite understandably—want us to unmask it.

22. What is the essence of the matter? I should like to recall the behind-the-scenes dealings, the dishonest manoeuvres and all the plots directed at the African Group in connexion with this question last March. The enemies of Africa stopped at nothing. They played their usual game of division in an attempt to pit Africans against Africans or against others, in order to prevent the Council, at the end of a very thorough debate, from taking measures against the racist Vorster régime that would be inconvenient to our enemies.

23. It is fortunate and even encouraging to see today that the African group, duly mandated by the whole of Africa

through OAU, remains staunch. The African group has not succumbed to the honeyed words which prove to be mere empty blandishments. We are proud of that. It proves the failure of imperialism, which is widely represented within the Council. It is our hope that total victory over imperialism in Africa is possible, and that the elimination of these inhuman régimes in southern Africa is inevitable. The People's Republic of Benin and the whole of Africa do not want a patched-up job of a neo-colonialist type in resolving the problem of southern Africa. We want the dignity of free men for all the peoples of southern Africa.

24. For the time being, Africa is not waging open war against the régimes of Vorster and Smith. The four draft resolutions which the three African members of the Council have submitted [*S/12309 to S/12312*] and which some have tried in vain to "kill" are not a declaration of open war against Vorster's régime, but those four drafts advocate very simple measures which to our mind have the advantage of demonstrating our firm solidarity with the oppressed people of South Africa.

25. Measures such as the arms embargo, the cessation of nuclear co-operation with the Pretoria régime and the ending of investment or any economic collaboration which strengthens the offensive potential of Pretoria are classic measures in line with the provisions of the Charter. We consider that all those measures would create an atmosphere of effective collective pressure on the racist régime of Pretoria.

26. My delegation believes that those measures as a whole, far from proving embarrassing to any party, can only hasten the peaceful and rapid settlement of the question of southern Africa. If some interpret those measures and their scope in a different way, that is clear proof that all the current negotiations run counter to the interests of Africa and are neither more nor less than a huge swindle, an imperialist sabotage operation, deliberately undertaken in order to divide Africa and dismantle the progressive forces of our continent. The People's Republic of Benin and the people of Benin will never be parties to such machinations.

27. Africa wants peace. The resumption of this debate is proof that Africa wants a peaceful settlement of all the questions of southern Africa and will support unhesitatingly all honest initiatives. But Benin will denounce and fight, both within and outside the Council, against any plans designed to create a safety belt for the protection of the racist régime of Pretoria.

28. For the whole of Africa, the independence of Zimbabwe and Namibia is an essential prelude to the downfall of the Vorster régime. That is dialectical logic.

29. The delegation of the People's Republic of Benin does not regard the present debate as hampering honest attempts to find just and satisfactory solutions to the problems of southern Africa. The friends of Africa will have no difficulty in understanding that. It is not in anybody's interest to prolong the sufferings of the oppressed peoples of southern Africa.

30. Mr. CHEN Chu (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): Since the Security Council considered the question of

² United Nations publication, Sales No. E.77.XIV.3, annex IV.

South Africa last March, the South African racist authorities have not shown the slightest restraint in their reactionary arrogance; instead, they remain impenitent and have intensified their brutal suppression of the Azanian people's just struggle against racist domination and for national liberation.

31. Not long ago, a horrible incident took place, in which Steve Biko, a South African black leader, was subjected to all kinds of brutal persecution in gaol by the South African authorities and tortured to death. On 19 October, after careful planning, the Vorster racist régime flagrantly closed down two newspapers of the blacks, banned the activities of 18 anti-apartheid organizations and arrested a large number of leaders of black people's mass movements all over the country in persecution and repression of the Azanian people. This is another grave, savage crime committed by the South African authorities against the Azanian people since the Soweto massacre last year. This has been strongly condemned by a large number of African countries and their people as well as all the justice-upholding countries and people of the world, who are extremely indignant.

32. In recent years, with the powerful support of the entire African people and the people of the rest of the world, there has been a new upsurge in the struggle of the people of southern Africa against colonialism and racism. Under difficult and complicated conditions, the people of Zimbabwe and Namibia have persevered in armed struggle against colonialism and racism and for national independence and liberation, and have won continual victories. Defying brute force, the valiant Azanian people have unfolded a series of struggles against violent repression and against *apartheid* and racial discrimination. Recently, the black students' campaign against the *apartheid* system of "Bantu education" has swept over the whole nation. The Vorster and Smith reactionary régimes have found themselves besieged on all sides and bogged down in great isolation and desperation. Under these circumstances, the handful of racists, with the support of the imperialists, are stepping up their counter-revolutionary dual tactics in an attempt to save themselves from their imminent doom.

33. In Namibia, while declaring its "readiness" to settle the Namibian question through "negotiations", the Vorster racist régime is adamantly refusing to withdraw all its armed forces from the Territory in an attempt to force the Namibian people to lay down their arms and accept the so-called "free elections" at the point of the bayonet. In Zimbabwe, Vorster has kept on giving blood transfusions to Ian Smith, supporting the Smith régime in maintaining its tottering reactionary rule. In South Africa, while trumpeting the "improvement of the inter-racial relations" and "the granting of greater power to the urban black people", Vorster and his ilk have been speeding up their bantustan plan and reinforcing their apparatus for violent repression in a redoubled effort to persecute and suppress the Azanian people.

34. Even the Vorster racist régime itself has to admit that its recent large-scale brutal repression is a carefully premeditated action taken after several weeks of preparation. All this has belied the so-called racial reconciliation and negotiated settlement advertised by the South African

authorities. In their terminology, the so-called improvement of interracial relations actually means the intensification of racial persecution and oppression.

35. Apart from being driven by their reactionary nature, the few racists in southern Africa dare to continue to put up a desperate fight and indulge in their perverse acts because they have the encouragement and support of the super-Powers in different forms. Motivated by their strategic needs to contend for world hegemony, both super-Powers want to control southern Africa. One super-Power has been offering advice to the racists in southern Africa to help them peddle the political fraud of "peaceful evolution" in an attempt to maintain its own vested interests in southern Africa. Flaunting the banner of "supporting the national liberation movement", the other super-Power has been trying in a thousand and one ways to sow dissension among the African countries and the liberation movements and to undermine the just struggle of the southern African people so as to facilitate its intervention, control and expansion there and thereby to take the place of old-line imperialists and racists. Their doings have further enabled the southern African people to realize that, as in many other places in the world, southern Africa is facing the pertinent and demanding task of "repelling the tiger while chasing away the wolf".

36. The Chinese Government and people firmly support the people of Azania, Namibia and Zimbabwe in their just struggle against imperialism, colonialism, racism and hegemonism and for national liberation and independence. The Chinese delegation strongly condemns the South African racist régime for the new series of grave crimes it has committed recently against the Azanian people. We firmly support the just positions expressed by the African States. We hold that the Security Council should adopt a resolution to condemn strongly the atrocities committed by the South African authorities, impose a mandatory arms embargo and economic sanctions against South Africa, and call on all Governments and peoples to render powerful support and assistance to the people of Azania and the rest of southern Africa in their just struggle for independence and liberation.

37. In the final analysis, the atrocities committed by Vorster and company are bound to serve as a negative example, which will further enhance the political consciousness of the people of Azania and the rest of southern Africa and enable them to realize more clearly that there should be no illusions about the most reactionary colonialists and racists and that independence and liberation can be won only by strengthening unity and persevering in struggle.

38. As pointed out in a resolution adopted at its twenty-seventh session by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity:

"the only effective guarantee for the African people of South Africa against the repetition of the massacres is the launching of the armed struggle for the seizure of power by the people".

On 21 October, OAU issued a press release on the atrocities committed by the South African authorities in which it

reiterated the above position and called upon the people of South Africa to "rise up in arms at this crucial hour to meet the challenge and free themselves from the racist yoke". Using revolutionary violence to fight against counter-revolutionary violence—such is the best reply of the great African people to Vorster and his ilk.

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

40. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): In congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council, I would indeed be congratulating myself. You are such a close friend that it would be superfluous and embarrassing to you to tell you not only how much I esteem you but also how much affection I have for you. Not because you belong to Asia—for, after all, there may be others who are as close to me who do not come from that continent—but indeed because an Arabic proverb applies to our relationship. That proverb says: "How many a good brother I have who was not born of my mother". You are one of those brothers. Whenever I want to seek advice I exchange views with you and I always benefit. You are younger than I in years but undoubtedly much more mature in wisdom.

41. Having said that, I believe it is incumbent upon me to speak on the question of South Africa, because we have been seized of this question since the days of Lake Success, but more intensely during the 1950s when we started to elaborate the principle of self-determination into a full-fledged right. It took some of us about seven or eight years to do so and, fortunately for us, we succeeded, because the right of self-determination appears as the first article in both the International Covenants on Human Rights.

42. But what is the use of having covenants on human and other rights if a Member State like South Africa does not observe the right of people, the right of the majority, the right of those who are really the indigenous people of that part of Africa? It is superfluous to come here, year in and year out, to talk about South Africa and to condemn it, as if to get things off our chest, and then do nothing.

43. One could say: "Well, it is better to talk than go to war". That is true in the field of disarmament and in many other fields of the United Nations. But here we are accomplishing nothing with regard to South Africa. No doubt there were earnest efforts on the part of the Secretary-General and previous Secretaries-General to handle the matter discreetly, and there is no doubt that the Governments of the major Powers have taken the initiative to do something about it. I do not say they have done so "half-heartedly". Take, for example, the United States, which recently sent our brother and colleague, its United Nations Ambassador, to talk to Mr. Vorster. Of course, they are a major Power. I do not think Mr. Vorster would be on speaking terms with the Soviets, because, after all, he is frightened that the Communists will pervade his country. That is understandable, but those who more or less have direct financial interests with Russia have, no doubt, been bringing laudable pressure and have been making praiseworthy interventions—not in the affairs of the Soviet

Union, but on behalf of the United Nations, which has to live by its Charter.

44. And where have we got to? Year in, year out, we have paraphrased ideas that are identical, with no result. Shall we be smug and let this question trail on without any result, or shall we do something drastic? When I say "something drastic" I mean "military intervention", and I do not think it would be wise for the United Nations to embark on a project whereby it would actually be fighting the South African régime. After all, we are committed to peace. Of course, we may send troops to see that no clashes take place in spots where there is trouble—"peace-keeping operations" we call this. But the United Nations cannot take the decision to send an army to South Africa to overthrow the régime because, year in, year out, they seem to be recalcitrant, stubborn, inflexible, not open to reason.

45. What shall we do? A lot can be done, provided there is goodwill and the pursuit of a plan—not that I have discovered one; not that I have a copyright on one, but because I think one might work, with goodwill, taking into account Vorster and, as our colleague from China mentioned, "his ilk". I will come to that.

46. Having given you a preface to the effect that it is futile to go on meeting like this without any result, I say that we have to have a big breakthrough. Here I have before me—I have read them very carefully—four of what I would call factual draft resolutions that were submitted last March by none other than my friends from Benin, Libya and Mauritius [*S/12309 to S/12312*]. And, I must say, they were wise in breaking down the whole subject into four different sections: the first deals with the release of prisoners; the second with the threat to international peace; the third with the arms embargo; the fourth with the economic aspect—how to apply sanctions. I think those delegations were wise, instead of putting those elements into one draft resolution, to see what could be done separately under each of the titles that are presumed to sum up the substance of these draft resolutions.

47. But even then, let us examine what is being done today. Taking them at random, here I have the draft resolution on the financial, or economic, question. Now, dispassionately and objectively, I want to tell my African friends that certain Powers—without naming them—have economic interests in South Africa, and, as you know, we are now confronted not perhaps with a recession but with quite a depression in this, the host country, as well as in Europe. Except in the case of our Japanese and German friends, I think the world is in economic disarray. They seem to know how to balance their budgets and tighten their belts.

48. Incidentally, I must say here parenthetically that what I said about you, Mr. President, applies also to Baron von Wechmar in having served the Council last month very efficiently, and in the best German manner. So better late than never in extending my thanks.

49. Without breaking the thread of my thought, I might add that the so-called democracies—although many of them are democracies by subscription and contributions, since

democracy is not as it used to be—have to serve the interests of various factions inside the State. Let us be practical: do we for a moment think that those who have interests in South Africa will not bring pressure to bear on their Governments by saying to them: “Look, we will not vote for you next time”. The politicians are there to perpetuate themselves if they can, or, if they are selfless, to perpetuate their parties in power. Therefore, my African brothers—and we Asians and Latin Americans, for that matter—let us analyse it a little bit: let us not think for a moment that pressure will not be brought to bear on Governments to maintain their economic ties with South Africa, unless things get out of hand, unless there are riots here and not necessarily by blacks. There are 30 million blacks in the United States; there are I do not know how many blacks or Coloured people in the United Kingdom. If somebody organizes them and makes it difficult for the Governments, it will not be wise, because it will bring a sort of rupture of the social order, and I do not think we are committed to such methods.

50. Then, what is the answer to this financial question? Do not attach too much importance to it. That is why I said that, although the intent of the four draft resolutions before me is laudable in that they represent an attempt to grapple with the issues to see what can be done, I did not think that from the economic and financial point of view much could be done, except perhaps very gradually. And, frankly, I am sick of this gradual, step-by-step diplomacy. As I mentioned, if we were to go to the door step by step, and each step took five years, good Lord, in 30 years we would not have finished with this problem which is before us.

51. Now we come to the release of prisoners. One of those draft resolutions deals with that. Of course, they should be released by the South African régime. But is it reasonable for the Government of South Africa, misguided as it is, to release those prisoners and leave them at large to work there against the régime? It is unthinkable that they would; not only they, but any country that thought such prisoners were dangerous would not set them free.

52. Therefore, what shall we do about them? Did the United Nations think for a moment that it might perhaps be wise—of course it would be wise—or possible to have those prisoners released and to find asylum for them to continue their work for liberation, especially in the countries where financial and economic aid is being extended to the South African régime? They would be the torch-bearers of the liberty and the freedom of their own people. Why do we not ask our illustrious Secretary-General to negotiate such a release by saying: “All right, you South Africans, you are afraid that if they are released they will create trouble. Give them to us, the United Nations, and we will place them, some in England, some in the United States and in other countries.” Perhaps there should be some activism to influence the people of those countries that are extending aid, under pressure, I must say. The Governments are to be praised; they are extending financial and economic aid because of pressure from certain groups. To whom? To South Africa. They can discontinue it if they want to maintain their political positions in their own respective countries.

53. Remember that politics revolves around economics. One day I was saying this in another statement and my good friend Yakov Malik said “This is Marxism”. I said “No, before Adam and Eve it has been so; it is not Marxism”. We, the Arabs, 2,000 years or so ago, said it in two words: “Interests must be served”. Palmerston had to say it in Parliament: “Let it be known that this country has no eternal enemy or perpetual allies; only her interests are eternal and perpetual”. Whether in politics or whether in social matters or in any field of human endeavour, “interests must be served”.

54. Now the third subject dealt with in these draft resolutions is the disturbing of the peace in the region. This is factual; this is taking place. Look at what is happening in Rhodesia. Look at what is happening in South West Africa, Namibia; look at what is happening in neighbouring countries. The people are all longing to do something for the blacks in South Africa. Can we quiet these things by resolution? I submit that we have been trying to do that, but we have not yet succeeded.

55. Last but not least is the arms embargo. I have lived through two world wars and I remember how I used to read about a certain gentleman—considered as such because our British friends knighted him—called Basil Zaharoff, who became Sir Basil Zaharoff. He was of Greek origin and lived on the Riviera. He manipulated the arms trade, not only in Europe but anywhere where filthy lucre was to be had from that trade. Someone wrote a book about Zaharoff in the 1930s, entitled *Les marchands de mort*. He is gone now, but there are others who are merchants of death. There are hundreds of Zaharoffs today. Zaharoff's activities were negligible in comparison with what we are witnessing today in arms smuggling, arms peddling, sometimes covertly, but most often overtly. Anyone who wants to buy arms only has to read Anthony Sampson's latest book, *The Arms Bazaar*,³ with the subtitle: “From Lebanon to Lockheed”. I read it two months ago, the same week it appeared, to refresh my memory, and I learned a lot of what goes on. So, without going into further details, I can say that the arms embargo will not work out, because there will always be smuggling.

56. In 1929, when I was a young man of 24, I learned from my French, German and English friends in Europe that a small State, in fact Luxembourg, or rather not the State as such but the people in the State, were selling not arms but the raw material of armaments, steel, to both the central Powers on the one hand, that is, the Germans and Austrians and so forth, and the so-called Allies, meaning France and Britain, on the other. So how can we hope for any results from embargoes?

57. I said that we might get results if our Secretary-General were to negotiate the release of those who are in prison. All right, then we are where we started. How can we solve the problem? Now I am going to suggest something radical, from my humble experience about these matters. It may be that some of my ideas will be deemed unpopular, especially with some of the intransigent African groups. If intransigence brings any results, I will, at my advanced age,

³ The Viking Press, New York, 1977.

carry the flag and march in front of them. But intransigence under those circumstances will be of no avail. No, but the zeal must remain. And in the long run the South African régime has no chance whatsoever, because we know how empires have tottered and fallen, in my life time, empires which had mandates in the Middle East. And sometimes I tell our Arab people: "Do not think it is through our efforts that those mandates dissolved, because those empires dissolved themselves". Of course, we did our little bit. And the régime in South Africa cannot survive forever. Things are happening in the world over which the industrial Powers in Europe and others have no control. But shall we in the United Nations wait for so long, until these things develop? I submit that something can be done to put Vorster and his ilk—as my Chinese friend said—on the spot, time and time again.

58. First of all, Namibia should be declared free, so that any black who is disgruntled can go and live freely in Namibia. I hear that it has a lot of resources and a sparse population. What is the idea of maintaining that Mandate? There are no mandates any more. We should impress on Vorster and on those who have the same views that they cannot keep Namibia under their rule and that it should have an open door; but those who support him should be assured—those whites who have certain economic interests—that those interests will not be jeopardized. It is for the benefit of the blacks that it should be so because, until the blacks can establish themselves there, they must learn from the whites. The blacks have had no chance to develop industry like the whites. So they should learn from them. If the whites want to live in peace, what is wrong? Leave them, let them live there, but in an independent Namibia. That is the first step, to work on the independence of Namibia right away and to open the doors of Namibia to all blacks who do not wish under any circumstances to live in South Africa. That is the first step to be taken.

59. I do not watch television, but somebody has told me that Vorster is going to appear on television here in the United States. Somebody went out to South Africa and he was interviewed on television. I watched the man and his interlocutors very carefully. Vorster and his people are frightened people, and they are so self-righteous that they will fight with their backs to the wall if need be, and the fight will be protracted because we cannot enforce any arms embargo. Do you know what it will mean? They will sacrifice their own people, the whites and many innocent blacks. Many of the whites are innocent, but have been brainwashed, like other people can be brainwashed.

60. I wish Gandhi could be resuscitated. If only the blacks, instead of boycotts and arms, could use non-violent resistance. Then the whites would give in, because it would be an economic question. But we do not have a Gandhi there, although he used to be there in his early days.

61. Therefore, we must remember that they will fight with their backs to the wall, it will be a protracted fight because they will be receiving surreptitious aid, financial as well as arms aid from abroad. The thing to do would be to talk on the following basis with them. Leave aside *apartheid*; we talk about *apartheid*, racial discrimination and all other forms of discrimination in the Third Committee. We should

not duplicate here what we say in the General Assembly, or repeat here what we say in other bodies dealing with the question. Say "All right, you want to preserve your white colour. All right. Geographically, let us see: Taking into account your numbers, taking into account your needs and your standard of living, carve for yourselves a state in South Africa, and the other part will be independent under the blacks, either totally independent or, if the whites listen to reason, federalized with a common foreign policy".

62. These are what I consider to be practical solutions. But if you want to spin in circles, then I think next year at about this time we shall be having another set of draft resolutions which, however constructive, are inoperable when they are adopted, because there is a lot of talk but little action on the part of those who wield world power. Those who wield world power do not want a confrontation. I am sure there is a sense of justice on the part of the Americans and I am sure—although I am a monarchist—that the Russians are committed to support anyone who is oppressed. They did it in their own country, so why should it not spill over into Africa? But they do not want any confrontation, those two super-Powers. They do not want confrontation because something might get out of hand and they would destroy themselves and us, who are on the periphery. Therefore, instead of amicably trying to do things which will bear fruit, jointly, what do they do? They have wars in their spheres of influence and small countries are the victims. It is nauseating even to mention it, but that is what is taking place. Let us appeal to the super-Powers to see what can be done, drastically, in order to liberate the blacks in South Africa. Forget your SALT⁴ talks!

63. We want results, otherwise you blacks will say that we are full of hot air. We are not full of hot air, but do not believe that what is being told you by the major Powers—not wilfully on their part but as Governments—is not hot air itself. We want action and fewer resolutions.

64. I should like to reserve my right to continue—not today, because one of my African brothers, who asked me if I would speak before he did and who is one of the freedom fighters, wants to address the Council. I do not think that he will take more than half an hour, and, after all, members should use the time of the Council and of the General Assembly profitably lest our Secretary-General should have to act with regard to the budget. We are wasting a lot of time.

65. Having spoken thus, I hope, should I see fit, to resume the discussion, not with a prefabricated speech but with what comes from my humble experience.

66. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. M. J. Makatini, to whom the Council extended an invitation at its last meeting under the terms of rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure. Accordingly, I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

67. Mr. MAKATINI: Mr. President, our delegation attaches a great deal of importance to the fact that this

⁴ Strategic Arms Limitation Talks.

session, whose historic task is to choose between action against *apartheid*, on the one hand, and inaction in favour of that inhuman system, on the other, meets under your presidency.

68. The strong ties that bind the peoples of South Africa and India are well known to historians and international statesmen. Our two peoples have for centuries fought against a common enemy and for a common goal—the right to self-determination. As part of the British imperialist exploitation, at some stage, between 1860 and 1866, about 6,300 indentured Indians were transported to Natal, South Africa, from Madras and Calcutta. Little did the British colonialists realize that they were forging a situation that has resulted in the cementing of unbreakable brotherhood and solidarity between our two peoples. This has manifested itself in various forms, especially in the active role played by Mahatma Gandhi in the struggle against racial discrimination in South Africa, as well as in the fact that, at the very inception of the United Nations, India requested the inscription on the agenda of the problem of white supremacy in South Africa.

69. I am pleased to say that the oppressed South African people of Indian origin have remained loyal to this tradition. Under the leadership of the African National Congress, they continue to fight shoulder to shoulder with the African and Coloured peoples, as well with a steadily growing number of white democrats. One of them, Mac Maharaj, a well-known veteran of this struggle, a few days ago had the opportunity to petition the Special Committee against *Apartheid* on the occasion of the Day of Solidarity with the South African Political Prisoners.⁵ This was after his recent escape from restriction following the termination of 12 years of imprisonment on Robben Island, in the same section as such of our illustrious leaders as Nelson Mandela, Walter Sisulu, Govan Mbeki, Ahmed Kathrada, the latter also of Indian origin, and Arthur Goldberg, a white, for whom the beginning of the forthcoming General Assembly debate on the question of *apartheid* on 7 November will mark the fifteenth anniversary of their condemnation to life imprisonment on Robben Island.

70. Mr. President, because of your country's resolute and unrelenting fight against *apartheid*, as well as your personal commitment and experience, we are confident that, under your presidency, the Council will adopt prompt and far-reaching punitive measures commensurate with the challenge before the international community today, thereby restoring the waning credibility of the Organization.

71. At this stage, I should like to depart briefly from my prepared statement. In keeping with African tradition, we have always been brought up to respect our elders. I speak following the representative of Saudi Arabia, who has, I believe, in good faith put before the Council what he considers pragmatic resolutions of the problem. I should be failing in my duty if I did not state that for the blacks in South Africa the principle of the right to self-determination was as precious as it is all over the world, and if I did not also recall that this principle of the right to self-determination of the South African people had been endorsed by

the Organization on several occasions, in particular by the Council, and, finally, if I did not state that the Organization had correctly rejected the policy of bantustans. To advocate the transfer of blacks from South Africa to Namibia would be tantamount to supporting bantustanization, which we reject since that policy is the cornerstone of *apartheid*. It seeks to deprive the African people of their birthright, and I will seize the first available opportunity to recommend to my leadership that we discuss this problem with the friendly country that His Excellency represents. I have had occasion in the past of being part of a delegation that met with the late King Faisal, who assured us of his support; I am therefore convinced that the remarks made by the representative of Saudi Arabia today were made in a good spirit, but we should always ensure that our positions harmonize.

72. This series of Security Council meetings has been convened at the request of the 49 African Member States. We sincerely appreciate this swift action which undoubtedly is hailed throughout the length and breadth of the African continent and welcomed by the justice-loving forces in the capitalist countries, and which enjoys the active support of the peoples and Governments of the non-aligned and socialist countries. The African National Congress sees it as proof of Africa's determination, at this decisive stage of our struggle, not to remain idle in the face of Vorster's unfolding programme of repression in South Africa and aggression beyond its borders, in preparation for what he described in the ultimatum he put in 1974 to the international community to accept Pretoria's *apartheid* or face an alternative "too ghastly to contemplate", as well as what he threatened in the wake of the 1967 Israeli aggression, when he declared: "Israel ate up the Arabs before breakfast; we can eat up black Africa before lunch".

73. The gravity of the subject before the Council today is without parallel. The closest example one can think of can only be of a hypothetical nature: humanity would probably have been saved from the holocaust into which it was plunged during the last world war if, in the 1930s, Adolph Hitler had dared to throw down so open a challenge to the international community as John Balthazar Vorster has done. For the benefit of those who might be inclined to find this equation an exaggeration, it is important to recall not only the ideological affinity and alliance of these racial bigots, but also that, if Hitler was better armed, his arsenal was not half as sophisticated as Vorster's and definitely excluded nuclear weapons. Vorster's internment for his part as the General of the Ossewa Brandwaag, a secret fifth-column organization with a membership of 250,000, as well as his statement in 1942 that his organization stood for Christian nationalism—called fascism in Mussolini's Italy and national socialism in Hitler's Germany—must be borne in mind in considering the urgency of the action to be taken by the Council.

74. Like Ambassador Mahmoud Mestiri, the representative of Tunisia and spokesman of the African Group, I do not intend to dwell on the countless barbarous crimes that have been committed and continue to be committed by the Vorster régime in the alleged defence of Christian, Western and white civilization and as the alleged bulwark against the so-called penetration of communism in Africa, as Vorster

⁵ A/AC.115/SR.353.

never tires of claiming. However, it is important to note that this series of Security Council meetings provides the opportunity to those countries—especially the United States, France, Great Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Israel and others whose record of collaboration with the *apartheid* régime is well known—to abandon this policy instantly and make common cause with the peoples and Governments of the world, in order to complement the efforts of the liberation movement to crush this cancerous system of *apartheid* and thus help prevent the poisoning of race relations for decades to come. The time is long overdue for them to demonstrate—not in words, not in rhetorical declarations intended as opium, perhaps, for the exploited, but by immediate and concrete action—that Hitler's erstwhile disciple, today the hangman of the South African and the Namibian people, the co-oppressor of the people of Zimbabwe, the aggressor of the Angolan and other States in the subcontinent, is not their regional gendarme. It is time to renounce by deeds statements made by some Western statesmen and strategists that the West cannot afford to go beyond verbal condemnation of *apartheid* because it is dependent on South Africa for trade, raw materials and strategic arrangements.

75. In sounding a warning to the Western countries that to this day are still trying to adjust to the situation in Angola and Mozambique, where they backed the losing horses by supporting Portuguese colonialism and later the puppet organizations, I shall quote our President, Oliver Tambo. Addressing the World Conference for Action against *Apartheid* held at Lagos, he declared:

“The racists and Fascists in southern Africa for the time being enjoy the support of what they regard as powerful forces. However, we are armed with a just cause and a will to be free. Behind the struggle of our people for the seizure of power we have the peoples of the world represented at this Conference, the invincible concerted international support of the anti-racist, anti-imperialist and anti-Fascist forces of the world, composed of the democratic, socialist and progressive peoples and States.”

76. I should like at this stage to affirm, in the name of the African National Congress, that support of our organization is support for the establishment of a democratic and non-racial South Africa, as enshrined in the Freedom Charter. The Freedom Charter, which I request the permission of the President to circulate to members of the Council [see S/12425], was adopted by the oppressed people for the establishment of a just and equitable society. It states, among other things, that South Africa belongs to all those who live in it and that no government can justly claim authority unless it is based on the will of all the people.

77. If the murder of Steve Biko, the detention of Percy Qoboza and Donald Woods and the banning of all non-violent organizations known to some leading Western diplomats do not prove the Fascist character of the Vorster régime, I can only repeat what I once said to Ambassador Andrew Young, that is, that if his activities as a civil rights leader in the South had been carried out in South Africa against *apartheid* he would have been incarcerated in Robben Island, convicted under either the Suppression of Communism Act or some other Draconian legislation. For,

according to the régime's legislation, any person who strives for social, political and economic change is a Communist.

78. The United Nations has been paving the way for action against the *apartheid* régime since 1960 when, in the wake of the Sharpeville massacre, the Security Council called upon the South African régime

“to initiate measures aimed at bringing about racial harmony based on equality in order to ensure that the present situation does not continue or recur, and to abandon its policies of *apartheid* and racial discrimination”. [Resolution 134 (1960).]

79. In 1963, in its resolution 181 (1963), the Council did not stop at strongly deprecating the policies of South Africa in its perpetuation of racial discrimination but went further and called upon it to liberate all persons imprisoned, interned or subjected to other restrictions for having opposed the policy of *apartheid*. It also solemnly called upon all States to cease forthwith the sale and shipment of arms, ammunition of all types and military vehicles to South Africa.

80. In the same year, in its resolution 182 (1963), the Council expressed the conviction that the situation in South Africa seriously disturbed international peace and security.

81. In its resolution 282 (1970), after recalling its resolutions on the arms embargo, the Council expressed the conviction that the situation resulting from the continued application of the policies of *apartheid* and the continued South African acquisition of arms and military equipment from a number of Member States and by local manufacture of arms and ammunition under licences constituted a potential threat to international peace and security. Further, it recognized that the extensive arms build-up of the military forces of South Africa posed a real threat to the security and sovereignty of independent African States opposed to the racial policies of the South African régime, in particular the neighbouring States.

82. In its resolution 311 (1972), the Council recognized the legitimacy of the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa in pursuance of their human rights as set forth in the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and called upon all States to observe strictly the arms embargo against South Africa.

83. Finally, in its resolution 392 (1976), the Council strongly condemned the South African régime for its resort to massive violence against and killings of the African people including schoolchildren and students and others opposing racial discrimination, and reaffirmed that the policy of *apartheid* was a crime against the conscience and dignity of mankind and seriously disturbed international peace and security.

84. The countless condemnations of and appeals to the South African régime by the international community through the United Nations have been ignored with impunity. The same goes for the appeals to some States which have continued their economic, diplomatic and

military collaboration with the Pretoria régime. The result has been the intensification of repression and repeated massacres, as well as the aggression against Angola, the continued occupation of Namibia, economic and military support for the Smith régime, economic aggression against Lesotho, the repeated violation of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of land-locked States such as Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland, and the blessing of the repeated acts of aggression committed by the Ian Smith régime against Mozambique and Zambia.

85. To the overwhelming majority of Member States—except for the major trading partners, some of whom have increased their military collaboration with the Pretoria régime by furnishing it with licences which enable it to be virtually self-sufficient in the production of war equipment and supplying it with the technological know-how for producing atomic weapons—the South African régime constitutes a threat to peace and international security. This position of the Western countries has become indefensible in the light of the régime's new Defence Act, in terms of which it arrogates to itself the right to intervene militarily in all African countries south of the equator. Its bellicose position, which went to the extent of dismissing the President of the United States as irrelevant, and indeed saying this of all the countries that have hitherto delayed action by the international community on the basis that they have the collective leverage to exert pressure on Vorster, must be seen against the background of its nuclear capability. It is now up to the Western countries to take the initiative by expanding the punitive measures provided for in the four draft resolutions submitted by Benin, Libya and Mauritius on 29 March this year [*S/12309 to S/12312*].

86. We welcome the proposals made by Ambassador Mahmoud Mestiri and other speakers, such as the representative of Benin, that nothing less than the immediate imposition of economic sanctions and a mandatory arms embargo, as well as the oil embargo, would be an adequate response to the challenge facing the international community. As Ambassador Mestiri has correctly pointed out, despite the fact that the Vorster régime has launched a war of aggression against the oppressed South African people, relying upon weapons from the West, we are not asking the Western countries to send troops to South Africa. As our President said at Lagos:

"Our people, under the leadership of the African National Congress, recognize and accept the challenge with which history has confronted us. Our revolution can only be the product of our own efforts and we shall not shirk our duty. The assistance and support we ask of the world, by implementing these proposals, can help create more favourable conditions for victory which cannot be denied our people."

87. In conclusion, I wish to say that today the attention of the world is focused on the deliberations at this meeting, and we are confident that the Council will rise to the expectations of progressive mankind.

88. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): I had not planned to speak this morning, but I listened very attentively—as I always do—to the statement of Ambassador Baroody of

Saudi Arabia whom I have always considered to be my mentor. However, I did not quite grasp exactly what he proposed regarding a transfer of population from South Africa to Namibia. Was he referring only to political prisoners held by the racist régime of Pretoria, or was he referring to the 20 million indigenous and other non-white people of South Africa? In any case, I do not believe that the Charter of the United Nations provides for any such solution as that suggested by Ambassador Baroody. On the other hand, the four draft resolutions submitted by the African members of the Council do fall within the provisions of the Charter; they contain peaceful measures.

89. Incidentally, I wonder why Saudi Arabia, whose wealth, resources and size are not by any means unequal to those of Namibia, has not yet offered a homeland to the Palestinians? Such an offer would perhaps solve a rather thorny problem. Perhaps, also, overpopulated areas of the world, like India for example, could be relieved by installing Indians in larger, wealthier and less populous countries like the United States, for example.

90. I agree that there is a maldistribution of wealth, land and population in the world. In that respect the proposal made by Ambassador Baroody—if I understood him correctly—makes some sense. But I wonder whether the United States and European countries would wish to harbour indefinitely in their respective territories an army of African liberation fighters determined to topple the racist régime of Vorster and to regain possession of political power in their native homeland?

91. I believe that Ambassador Baroody's proposals are wise but, to my mind, they are far from practical. I would welcome an opportunity to discuss this matter privately with him.

92. The PRESIDENT: As members of the Council are aware, Ambassador Baroody did reserve his right to make a further statement. I invite him to take a place at the Council table to address us in continuation of his earlier statement.

93. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I have asked to be allowed to exercise my right of reply because certain things have been attributed to me that I did not say.

94. I am addressing myself to the gentleman, the freedom fighter, from South Africa and to my good friend Ambassador Ramphul.

95. I said that there should be an independent black African State inside South Africa and that we should start with Namibia, because some people would want to seek their fortune in Namibia. I did not say that all the blacks in South Africa should go to Namibia. I said anyone who was disgruntled in the meantime could go there.

96. If Ambassador Ramphul read the record he would not be so sarcastic as to mention the Palestinians, nor should the other gentleman have spoken as if I were taking Vorster's side. On the contrary, I said that, as a first step to show its goodwill, the Vorster régime should liberate Namibia and that if anybody was disgruntled he could go there and perhaps work for the liberation of the other

blacks. I did not say exactly that. I did not say that he should go and work, lest I frighten Vorster and his ilk more than they are frightened already.

97. Ambassador Ramphul, show me where I said that the blacks in South Africa should all go to Namibia. My dear friend, you are just playing politics with that gentleman who addressed us before you and who spoke as if I wanted to see all the blacks sent to Namibia. I never said that. Why have you attributed that to me? I am not that simple. I know that there are millions and millions of blacks who would not want to leave South Africa, and they have a right to stay there.

98. But what about 1848 in Europe? Many in Europe were disgruntled and came to the United States. Does that mean that everybody who was disgruntled should have come to the United States?

99. Incidentally, between 1815 and 1848 there was détente, a bogus détente; things were brewing in the United States. Talleyrand and Metternich created a sort of détente and many people thought it was just to calm them down. They had a series of revolts, and many Europeans left for the United States. Does that mean that they should not have left? Does that mean that, once Namibia has been granted independence, if some in South Africa want to go to Namibia, they should not be allowed to go there if they find that the white régime still lords it over them? Why distort the facts—just because you want the situation to continue? But with what result? With your resolutions, with all due respect?

100. Why does my good friend from Mauritius of all people say that I implied that all the blacks from South Africa—as though I said all the blacks—should emigrate to Namibia? I said that, to show the régime's goodwill, the first thing we should now do is liberate Namibia and that anyone who is disgruntled should go there and work for the liberation of the blacks who are there.

101. Will you take the blacks in Mauritius if we try to liberate them? I do not think you would dare, because you are afraid they would upset your régime.

102. Why drag in the Palestinians? That was an ill-chosen illustration. The Palestinians had a home and a State, and they will fight for it till doomsday. If I "got hooked" on the United Nations—I came only to organize the Mission of Saudi Arabia, after which I was to go back to my *métier*—the thing that "hooked" me was the Palestinian question, because I thought it was an unjust situation. And you say Saudi Arabia should open its doors. Open your doors to the freedom fighters of South Africa. No, you do not dare. Please, next time—all of you—take care what you say when I make a statement. You cannot take it out of context. Although you are my friend—even if you were my brother, from my own mother—I would take issue with you. Who do you think you are?

103. I knew King Faisal for 42 years. He was a torch-bearer of black African freedom. The white South Africans wanted to have an office for the pilgrims in Juddah, and they pleaded with me to tell King Faisal to have Moslem blacks open an office—under the aegis, of course, of South

Africa. He refused, and I said "You are right to refuse; they could get their visas somewhere else." Why drag my Government, why drag a torch-bearer of liberty, the late King Faisal into this? Why drag the Palestinians into this? I will settle scores with you outside. You will still be my friend, but I will settle scores with you. And I reject vehemently any insinuation that I said that Namibia could take all the South Africans. If you do not take this as my answer, God help you.

104. The PRESIDENT: I think it might be desirable for all of us to read the verbatim record of the statement made by the representative of Saudi Arabia before rushing in to reply to him.

105. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): I can assure Ambassador Baroody that I meant no sarcasm, because I feel for the Palestinians as strongly as does Ambassador Baroody. I am relieved that my misgivings have been dispelled. As I said at the beginning of my statement, I did not quite grasp what Ambassador Baroody was actually expressing. I am grateful to him for having clarified the point.

106. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia.

107. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I think, Sir, besides your being President—and a wise one at that—your advice is the best: people should not rush to conclusions before they read the verbatim record. But I must repeat again and again and again that I never insinuated or intimated that the South African blacks should be herded into Namibia, according to the impression that was formed by some. I was thinking of the freedom fighters, but I do not have to mention everything that they could do in Namibia. They could work, and they could also fight for those compatriots of theirs who are still there clinging to their rights.

108. If I spoke in an unorthodox fashion, it is because the orthodox fashion has not got us anywhere. I was trying to make a breakthrough. And remember that we are all committed to the Charter; we are not merely representatives of our respective countries. We should be loyal to the Charter. I spoke as a Member of the United Nations, not only as the representative of Saudi Arabia. I guess this is why we applaud Ambassador Young whenever he gives us a piece of his mind that may not perhaps conform to the well-tailored sartorial fashions of his Government. We applaud him. And now I am not imitating Ambassador Young: I preceded him in giving my views, long before he was appointed Ambassador. But because Ambassador Young represents a big country, you only whisper. Why do you not take issue with Ambassador Young? You take issue with a friend of yours. "I put you behind me on the horse." That is an Arabic proverb. If you want, you can see what there is in the saddle and take whatever you want, but do not throw me from the horse. You cannot do that, any one of you, even Mr. Ramphul: I know how to ride the horse. I knew what I was talking about, so do not insinuate. I am for the freedom of the blacks of South Africa, but I have been trying to "break the ice"; I have the right to do so as a representative of a State Member of the United Nations. And no hard feelings: I forgive you.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة
يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استلم منها 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.
