

**SOUTHERN AFRICA
RECORD**

Number One

The South African Institute of International Affairs



SOUTHERN AFRICA RECORD, which will be issued by the Institute from time to time, will contain, without comment, the original texts of, or extracts from, important statements by political leaders and government representatives concerning international relations in the southern region of Africa. In addition to statements on issues of current concern, such as those reproduced in the first number of the *RECORD*, it is intended to include in future numbers some significant statements made in the past, and it is hoped these will be of use for information and reference purposes, not only to students, but to all who are concerned with the relations, political and economic, between the countries of Southern Africa.

Statements will be reproduced if and when texts become available (not in chronological order), and it must be pointed out that the selection of statements included in *SOUTHERN AFRICA RECORD* should not be regarded as exhaustive or even representative. Nor should the selection be regarded in any sense as indicating a viewpoint as to the relative importance of one or other statement over another not reproduced or reproduced in a later number of the *RECORD*. The Institute is in any case not responsible for the views expressed in any of the statements reproduced.

S O U T H E R N A F R I C A

R E C O R D

Number One

The South African Institute of International Affairs
Die Suid-Afrikaanse Instituut van Internasionale Aangeleenthede

Jan Smuts House / Huis Jan Smuts
P.O. Box 31596 / Posbus 31596
2017 Braamfontein
(Johannesburg)

March / Maart 1975

SOUTHERN AFRICA RECORD

Number One

CONTENTS / INHOUD

	<u>Page</u>
STATEMENT BY THE SOUTH AFRICAN PRIME MINISTER, THE HON. B.J. VORSTER, IN THE SENATE, CAPE TOWN, ON 23 OCTOBER, 1974	1
STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR R.F. BOTHA, PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF SOUTH AFRICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS, IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL ON 24 OCTOBER, 1974	9
STATEMENT BY UNITED STATES AMBASSADOR JOHN SCALI IN THE U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL ON 30 OCTOBER, 1974	32
UITTREKSELS UIT 'N TOESPRAAK DEUR DIE EERSTE MINISTER, SY EDELE B.J. VORSTER, TYDENS 'N VERGADERING TE NIGEL OP 5 NOVEMBER, 1974	37
STATEMENT ON NAMIBIA ISSUED BY THE UNITED KINGDOM GOVERNMENT ON 4 DECEMBER, 1974	52

*STATEMENT BY THE SOUTH AFRICAN PRIME MINISTER,
THE HON. B.J. VORSTER, IN THE SENATE, CAPE
TOWN, ON 23 OCTOBER, 1974.*

Mr. President, Africa and Southern Africa as well, and obviously therefore South Africa itself, are in the news today. It is true that many questions are being asked, that there is a great deal of speculation in progress, that sometimes many misgivings are expressed, and for that reason I have seen fit to enter this debate, and I think that it would be a good thing for me to say a few words about this matter in this hon. House.

.....

Let me say at once that what is of course involved here in the first place is South Africa, our fatherland. If I were to be asked what my view is of the future of South Africa, of the future of Southern Africa and, for that matter, of Africa as well, then I want to say that it is my heartfelt conviction that I have a great deal of confidence in and that I am optimistic about its future. But I believe it is a good thing, on an occasion such as this, to project South Africa against Africa for a moment, and, because time will not allow one to do this at too great a length, to give attention for a while to its future problems and its future possibilities. I think it is a good thing to glance for a moment at Africa itself and subsequently to give attention, for a moment, to Southern Africa.

When we take a look at Africa, all of us know that it is a developing continent, that on that continent are to be found countries in various stages of development, that there is probably a tremendous potential in the way of unexploited ore and raw materials, but that it is to a very large extent still unprospected. Apart from its probable potential, it is also a fact that this of course also brings problems in its wake, that it has a very high growth rate as far as its population is concerned. If one should want to draw up priorities for Africa, taking this into consideration, then I think hon. Senators will all agree with me that the highest priority one could set for Africa today would be development. That is what it needs most; development which could result in work opportunities for its growing population.

If the reports on certain countries of the world derived from authoritative world sources are read, however, then I think you would also agree with me that one of those priorities is food for its people, for food is becoming a problem in this world in which we are living.

If you were to ask me, or anyone else for that matter, what Africa's greatest need is, then it goes without saying, because it has to develop and cannot at this stage generate the capital for that development itself, that capital for development, capital for exploitation is necessary.

In the second place I believe that everyone would also agree with me that what is necessary is knowledge to guide that development and knowledge so that Africa can train its own people to occupy their rightful place in that course of development.

In the third place - I have no doubt at all about this, nor do I believe that hon. Senators doubt it - it is necessary that there should be stability, for without stability the other aspects to which I referred can most certainly not prosper.

We know the present-day world, and we can foresee that in view of the present high prices prevailing throughout the world, the increasing unemployment which is discernible in developing countries and the monetary problems with which the world is struggling at the moment, it could happen that Africa's position on the world priority list in respect of development aid could very easily be affected. And even if it were not affected by these things, it goes without saying that the high prices to which I have referred, which affect any developing country, are affecting Africa to a greater extent than other already developed continents.

For that reason I believe that we have reached the stage where Africa should give serious consideration to itself and its future, where Africa should in all earnest ask itself where it is going and where it wants to go, particularly if we take cognizance of what is happening at present in the Indian Ocean and of the disturbances which are being caused by that. And if I am reading the signs of the times correctly - I do not doubt that hon. Senators will agree with me on this score - then we are entering on a

period in which countries and continents are to an increasing extent going to look after their own interests in the first place. I therefore believe that Africa owes it to itself to look after its own interests as well. And if this is the case with Africa it is most certainly the case in respect of South Africa as well.

South Africa, as a country in Southern Africa, is of course in the first place - I do not think there is much argument about this - the most developed country, or at least one of the most developed countries.

In the second place, I want to reiterate here, on behalf of South Africa, that we in South Africa harbour no aggressive intentions against any country in Africa or any other territory in the world. On the contrary, our standpoint has always been - we have maintained it to the best of our ability - that we do not intervene in the domestic or other affairs of any other country, and that we do not gaze with covetous eyes at the possessions of any other country in Africa. In fact, Mr. President, you will recall that we are on record as having said that we are prepared to conclude a non-aggression pact with any country that should request this and which may perhaps harbour any misgivings on that score.

Therefore I think it is necessary for me to reiterate my statement here today that South Africa harbours no aggressive intentions against anyone, but it goes without saying - this I must also add - that if South Africa should be attacked, it naturally has the elementary right which any other country has, and it will exercise that right, to defend itself with all the power at its command, and South Africa's power in that regard is not inconsiderable. I therefore wish to spell it out clearly that although no incidents will be provoked on the part of South Africa, no problems will be caused, it cannot be taken amiss of South Africa or, for that matter, of any other country in the world for its finishing what other people started if it originated with them.

In addition, I do not think the fact can be over-emphasized at this juncture, that the Whites of South Africa - this also applies to the Coloureds and to the Indians - are as much of Africa as any other person or any other state of Africa. As far as we are concerned, we do not begrudge our own Black peoples development in

the political, economic and all other spheres, and it is clear that this policy is being implemented in ever-increasing earnest.

I make no apology for returning in particular to the position of the Whites. The Whites have been established here for centuries. They have the right to demand for themselves the preservation of their identity while, on the other hand, granting this to all other peoples, the preservation of their identity along a course of differentiation which they are not only adopting today, but which they have been adopting for a very long time.

Lastly, I want to say that South Africa is prepared, to the extent to which this is asked of it, and to which it is its duty, to play its part in and contribute its share towards bringing and giving order, development and technical and monetary aid as far as this is within its means, to countries in Africa and particularly to those countries which are closer neighbours. Africa has been good to us, and we are prepared, as far as our means allow us, to return to Africa a measure of what we have so generously received over the years.

On considering Southern Africa on this occasion, it is clear to all of us that for a decade or more Southern Africa has unfortunately been characterized by violence and strife. Violence and strife do not necessarily bring development and progress in their wake. On the contrary. In most cases they have precisely the opposite effect. The best example, I think, which we can find in this regard is Mozambique.

Therefore, I believe that Southern Africa has come to the crossroads. I think that Southern Africa has to make a choice. I think that that choice lies between peace on one hand or an escalation of strife on the other. The consequences of an escalation are easily foreseeable. The toll of major confrontation will be high. I would go so far as to say that it will be too high for Southern Africa to pay. If one adds to that the threatening economic problems which could assume major proportions, then Africa and Southern Africa should guard against its heading for chaos.

However, this is not necessary, and I think hon. Senators will also agree with me that it is not necessary, for there is an alternative, there is a way. That way is the way of peace, the way of normalizing of relations, the way of sound understanding and normal asso-

ciation. I believe that Southern Africa can take that way. I have reason to believe that it is prepared to prefer to take that way, and I believe that it will do so in the end. In fact, I want to repeat what I said at the beginning, that as far as I am concerned, I have never been more optimistic that the climate and the will to do so is there, in spite of what is being done and said, in spite of everything that has happened.

It goes without saying - as a realist one has to admit this - that there are stumbling-blocks. It is true that there are contentious issues. It is true that there are problematical situations and one cannot escape these. One should refer briefly in passing to a few of those problematical situations.

There is the question of Mozambique. The position is that my colleagues, namely the hon. Ministers of Defence and of Foreign Affairs and I, have stated our standpoint in regard to this matter very clearly. I refer *inter alia* to an interview I had with the publication *Newsweek*, which I do not wish to quote here now. We stated our position very clearly and for that reason I do not wish to elaborate on it, but I just want to refer to this matter in a recapitulatory manner.

We take cognizance of what has happened in recent times, and we have read the reports, and I believe there is not one single hon. Senator who will not agree with me when I say that order should be effected in that part of Southern Africa. It is in their interests; it is in the interests of all of Southern Africa that order should be effected there. If any value is attached to development - and I believe that value is in fact attached to it - sources of revenue must be protected and order must be restored fully in that territory as soon as possible.

I believe that it is in the best economic interests of that territory, and therefore in those of Southern Africa as well, that the ports of Nacala, Beira and Lourenco Marques be kept open for South Africa, Rhodesia, Malawi and Zambia, and that normal traffic should continue, not only in the ports but also on the railways.

I believe that it is in the highest interests of Mozambique

that the Mozambique labour agreement be upheld. I believe that it is in the highest interests of Mozambique that the power of Cabora Bassa take its course to South Africa.

These three things to which I have referred are major sources of revenue to that territory, and I should like to accept that they will also be viewed in that light by those holding the reins of government there.

Another problem with regard to Southern Africa is, inevitably, South West Africa. It has been a controversial question for years, and this is still the case today. I have not only devoted a great deal of time and attention to this matter, but this is a matter which, in the course of years, we have discussed at great length with the Secretary-General of the U.N., his representative and others, and I am convinced that there is only one solution to this problem, namely that the peoples of South West Africa be allowed to decide their own future without being hampered or disturbed. I believe that if outsiders should be involved, whoever they may be, this could only lead to greater confusion instead of greater clarity being brought about in regard to this matter.

I still believe today, as I put it to both Dr. Waldheim and Dr. Esscher, that one of the top priorities as far as South West Africa is concerned, is that the peoples of that territory should be afforded the opportunity, as indeed they are being afforded now, to gain experience so that they may eventually exercise their right of self-determination.

You have taken cognizance not only of the new initiative that has originated with the governing party of the Whites in South West Africa, but also of the initiative of the Owambo people with regard to their proposed election. You have taken cognizance of the standpoint that the right of lawful political activities should be granted to all people, provided that it is not attended by threats of violence or by violence. You have taken cognizance of the standpoint that everybody who wants to assist in solving this problem in a peaceful manner has been invited by the government of Owambo to lend a hand in reaching that peaceful solution to the problem. However, it goes without saying that any breaking of the law, any disturbance of order, cannot be permitted under any circumstances.

I believe, therefore, that the peoples of South West Africa and those who want to co-operate in a peaceful manner should be afforded the opportunity of solving the problems of that territory.

On this occasion I want to put, in conclusion, this one question to those who insist that South Africa withdraw from that territory : What chaos would not result if South Africa should accede to that request? The chaos which resulted in other parts of the world will be child's play in comparison with the absolute chaos which would manifest itself if South Africa were to withdraw from that territory.

Then there is the question of Rhodesia. Hon. Senators will realize that I have no brief whatsoever to argue this case on behalf of Rhodesia or anybody else. It must also be fully understood that I do not want to interfere in any way in the internal affairs of Rhodesia. Nothing that I might say this afternoon must be so construed.

I believe that, with goodwill, this matter can be settled, and I believe that an honourable solution can be found. What is more, I believe it is in the interests of all parties to find a solution. I know and hon. Senators know that attempts have recently been made by Mr. Smith and his Government, but unfortunately these attempts, judging from reports, have failed. But I do know that as far as the Rhodesian Government is concerned, this matter is of the highest order on their priority list.

However, I must also say that I know it is being said in some quarters, on the one side, that South Africa is holding the Rhodesian Government back. In fact, this accusation has been made, and will be made more and more, and I want to say that that is not so, as anybody in Rhodesia, or elsewhere, who knows anything about this position, will be able to tell.

On the other hand, there are ZANU and ZAPU leaders outside Rhodesia who are suspected - I am not putting it higher than that for the purposes of my argument - of exerting influence on Black Rhodesians not to come to terms.

I believe that now is the time for all who have influence to bring it to bear upon all parties concerned to find a durable,

just and honourable solution, so that internal and external relations can be normalized. Africa, and for that matter Southern Africa, must not become a trouble-torn continent or sub-continent. It must, if it can be avoided - I sincerely believe that it can be avoided - not become an area of conflict.

There are no doubts in my mind, nor in that of any authority on South Africa, about South Africa's ability to grow and to develop further. South Africa's fundamentally sound position, its future possibilities and its potential are held in high repute by the outside world. Therefore I believe that as far as South Africa is concerned, we shall have that growth and that fine future.

Nor do I have any doubt - once again in spite of what is being said and in spite of attempts that are being made by ill-disposed persons to wreck this - that the Whites, the Brown people, the Black people and the Indians can find a solution to every problem as far as South Africa is concerned. Just as independent states and peoples can live here in their own right, in this territory which is known today as the Republic of South Africa, just as these various independent Black peoples will take their place next to us in due course, so, I believe, the politically independent peoples of South Africa can live next to one another in peace.

Therefore I also believe that it is not inappropriate that Southern Africa can create its own, not U.N.O., but P.P.D., which will stand for peace, progress and development. Towards that end I believe that South Africa is keen to co-operate, and to that objective I commit myself and my Government as far as the future is concerned.

*STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR R.F. BOTHA, PERMANENT
REPRESENTATIVE OF SOUTH AFRICA TO THE UNITED
NATIONS, IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL ON 24 OCTO-
BER, 1974.*

Our position in regard to Article 2(7) of the Charter is well known to this Organisation. It is on record and I need therefore say no more than that our participation in these proceedings, in so far as they relate to the internal affairs of South Africa, should not be construed to mean that we have changed our position in regard to that Article, but should be seen as flowing from our willingness to discuss our differences with other countries which are genuinely interested in a constructive solution of them and are prepared to talk with us openly and objectively.

It is particularly to these countries that we address ourselves - and more especially to the States of Africa. For we are an African State. It is in Africa, where we live and where we belong, that our destiny lies. We have an important identity of interest with the other States of Africa. It is with them that we must talk and we firmly believe that all of us in Africa can only gain by communication with one another.

Let us not beat about the bush. The only choice we have before us is either to continue on the present sterile course of confrontation and recrimination, or to make a sincere endeavour to get together, to listen to the other man's point of view with an open mind, and to try to break through the suspicions, the misunderstandings and the misconceptions which have for so long divided us. Communication - or confrontation? Harmony - or the escalation of strife? That is our choice. Our only choice.

I shall speak frankly here today. And I do so in the belief that the African and other members of this Council and Organisation will appreciate frankness from me in the same way that I appreciate it from them. In that spirit, I believe, we may yet come together, even if we do not agree. Let us not delude ourselves - there are no easy solutions. But my Government stands ready to explore all avenues which may bring about an

understanding amongst us.

The Council has been asked to review the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa in the light of our alleged violation of the principles of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

What valid reason can be advanced for singling out South Africa's relations with the United Nations for review by the Security Council? There is none. This is really just a political move in the vendetta being conducted by certain members of the United Nations against my Government.

I ask you to consider briefly some of the developments in the world in the period since the United Nations has been concerning itself with South Africa's affairs. Several wars have been fought on four continents; numerous governments have been forced from office by unconstitutional means, frequently involving violence and bloodshed; countries have been occupied by the armed forces of foreign powers; population groups in a number of countries have turned on each other with ferocity, and so on. In the most important spheres of human life the world is faced with a number of crises - underdevelopment, illiteracy, famine, pollution and many related socio-economic problems to which the world's most responsible and best qualified commentators foresee no immediate or viable solution. Many think we may be on the brink of a world economic catastrophe of unprecedented proportions and incalculable consequences, political as well as socio-economic.

It is towards such situations and matters that one would expect this Council to turn its urgent attention - not towards South Africa which in no way constitutes a threat to international peace, and where, although we have our problems, we are well on our way to solving them in a peaceful manner.

It is said that we have disregarded resolutions of United Nations organs. But next to nothing is said of the nature and quality of the information and documentation upon which those resolutions were based. Closer analysis will show that the material in question was unbelievably one-sided, that it is uniformly hostile to South Africa, that it was often completely unsubstantiated, and that much of it emanated from persons

and bodies known for their biased opposition to South Africa's policies. Information favourable to South Africa was simply ignored.

In consequence, the resolutions in question were based on inadequate, prejudiced and often grossly distorted information - information which was certainly not tested and objectively weighed in order to separate facts from ignorant or malicious misrepresentations. To say this is not to suggest that conditions in South Africa cannot be improved, or that we have not made mistakes, or that there is no need for change there. But it does point up the complete onesidedness of the virulent attacks made upon us in this Organisation.

Members of the Council will better appreciate my point if I illustrate it. If one's only source of information is the reports of the Special Committee on Apartheid, and those other U.N. bodies which are continually discussing South African affairs, one must inevitably be left with the impression of an absolute tyranny by whites over blacks in South Africa; white South Africans dedicatedly pursue policies of genocide, slavery, torture, terror, persecution, hatred, forced-labour, unmitigated racism, starvation and inhumanity against black South Africans. Everything the South African Government does is inherently evil. The policy of the Government is an international crime and a threat to peace; it degrades the black man, it consigns him to a destiny of poverty, want and illiteracy. It holds out no prospect of improvement; no political rights; it has no regard for human rights of any kind; the whole system is cruelly enforced by a secret police force and a powerful army; and it has as its object the perpetual entrenchment of white superiority.

It is no exaggeration to say that this is the picture which emerges from the sources to which I have referred. But surely not even the most prejudiced members of the United Nations can believe that a picture of such unmitigated terror and oppression can really be true. For how can such a picture possibly be reconciled with the observable conditions prevailing in South Africa, with readily available and indisputable facts and figures, many of which emanate from technical and statistical documentation of this Organisation itself?

Why is it, if the position of the blacks in South Africa is really so intolerable, that hundreds of thousands of black workers from other countries of Africa voluntarily come to South Africa for employment - many of them entering the country illegally for that purpose?

Why is it that according to figures as at 1 January 1972, released by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, there were a mere 300 refugees from South Africa out of a total of 988,000 refugees in Africa?

Can it be denied that the wage gap between black and white is being continually narrowed and that it is the Government itself which is taking an active lead in the matter? The figures will show it.

It is denied that black leaders, chosen by majorities of their own people, freely and often criticise the South African Government, in public and in private, on many aspects of its policies? This Organisation seizes upon such criticism. But let such a leader come to the General Assembly as a member of the South African delegation, and he suddenly becomes a "stooge" or a "puppet".

Is it not manifest that millions and millions of rands are spent in South Africa to provide free or virtually free medical services to the blacks? In the financial year 1972/73 \$282 million was expended by public undertakings on health services for the Black, Coloured and Indian peoples.

Need it be recorded that South Africa has never experienced famine? South Africa is virtually self-sufficient in foodstuffs of a quality comparable with the world's best.

The school enrolment figures for black pupils more than doubled from 1950 to 1960 and more than doubled again from 1960 to 1973, so that, even in a period of rapidly-increasing population, the percentage of children of school-going age increased from 45% in 1954 to 75% in 1974.

The combined rate of population growth of the black peoples of South Africa is 3,23%, which is among the highest in Africa.

We are accused of defying the United Nations and world opinion, of paying no heed whatsoever to resolutions of this Organisation - indeed, of adopting a provocative and challenging attitude towards the world body. This is just not so. We are receptive to constructive criticism or suggestions from any country or body in the world which is genuinely interested in the welfare of the peoples of South Africa - and that includes the United Nations.

But would any Government anywhere react positively to the flood of accusations and condemnatory resolutions of the nature that I have mentioned, when it must be realised, even by circles in this Organisation itself, that the allegations on which they are based are exaggerated, untrue and even willfully misrepresented?

Not for a moment do I wish to pretend that everything in our country is right. But to accuse us of the most evil designs and practices, when we have improved the living conditions of all our peoples to the extent that we have, when my Government is making sincere and positive attempts to improve and develop the economic, social and political conditions of all these peoples - not just some of them - and to safeguard their future, engenders the strongest suspicion that what some members of this Organisation aim at is not so much the advancement of the peoples of our region but the pursuance of their own selfish political ends. It is in regard to these very real efforts of ours that we consider that members of this Organisation, and in particular many of our fellow African States, have displayed towards us an unjustified antagonism and a lack of tolerance, of interest and of understanding in our ultimate objectives. They have, we feel, not responded to, nor given us any credit or recognition at all for what we are trying to do in order to give to every person in our country, black and white, a fair deal from life. On the contrary, many of these members simply ignore the important changes which have occurred and are occurring in South Africa - information about them seems sometimes to be deliberately suppressed.

I would be naive to pretend that I do not know why it is that members of this Organization, especially the African members, display towards us this antagonism, this lack of goodwill.

It is basically because these members think that the whites of

South Africa have some inborn hatred and prejudice against the blacks, that they consider themselves to be superior to or in some way better than the blacks, and that on these grounds they discriminate against them in order to deny them fundamental rights and freedoms.

I shall return to this point; for the moment let me just state categorically that whatever the attitude of the white man to the black man in the past might have been, that is not the attitude of the vast majority of white South Africans today.

I would first like to outline how our policy of multinational development came about and on what it is based. I do so in order to put our policies in proper perspective.

Towards the middle of the 17th century the white and black peoples of Southern Africa converged in what was then an almost uninhabited part of the continent. On the whole the tendency was for the white people as well as the various black peoples to settle in distinct parts of the country. They were at different stages of development; all had their own institutions of government, land settlement and land ownership, traditions, cultures, languages and economies and for almost 150 years there was virtually no contact between black and white.

During the 19th century, when the Cape of Good Hope had become a British Colony, the black areas of the eastern Cape were annexed by the British authorities and the nations concerned were henceforth administered separately and not as integral portions of the Cape Colony. This basic position remained virtually unchanged until these nations were given more and more powers of self-government by the South African Government. One of these nations, the Transkei, has recently formally requested the South African Government to set in motion the constitutional machinery to bring that country to full independence within five years, and that has been done.

A historic movement called the Great Trek started in 1836 when white farmers of the Cape Colony moved northwards passing around the southernmost Black peoples and crossing the Orange and Vaal Rivers until they reached the Limpopo River in the north, the Kalahari desert in the west and Natal in the east.

The areas through which they trekked were for the most part completely uninhabited. This was due to what the Blacks of South Africa still call the "mfekane" which means "the crushing". Over a period of fifteen years from approximately 1820 terrible devastation of these areas had taken place as a result of wars between the various Black peoples. Mzilikazi, a lieutenant of the Zulu King Shaka, who had fled from his former master, subsequently completed this devastation and annihilated the African tribes living there.

The Trekkers did not by force or otherwise drive Blacks away from land occupied by them except in the case of Mzilikazi and his Matabeles who fled to and settled in the present Rhodesia. In cases in which there was any doubt as to claims to land, the Trekkers, and later the Governments of the Orange Free State and the Transvaal Republics, negotiated with the peoples concerned.

Thus the foundations were laid for future political developments. In the Transvaal a Convention was signed in 1852 between the British and Boer leaders acknowledging the latter's independence. A Convention of 1854 granted independence to the Republic of the Orange Free State.

In 1899 war broke out between Britain and the two Boer Republics. For almost three years South Africa became the scene of one of the fiercest struggles ever waged on the African Continent. When peace came in 1902, the two Republics had lost their independence. Almost 35 000 Boer men, women and children died in that war while Britain suffered 98 000 casualties. The two Republics were in ruins, the cost of the war to friend and foe was immense. This is not the sort of conflagration we ever want to see repeated.

Thus, at the beginning of the 20th century, the whole of the southern part of the African continent came under the jurisdiction of one power. It comprised the Cape and Natal colonies, the two conquered Boer Republics of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State as well as three Black protectorates, Swaziland, Bechuanaland and Basutoland. British South Africa, as it was called, spread over the whole subcontinent. This huge area was then the home of a number of peoples differing in ethnic composition, language, culture and history. The total surface area was over 1,8 million sq. km. which is larger than the

United Kingdom, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Portugal, Switzerland, Austria, Denmark, the Netherlands and Belgium combined.

In 1910 the Union of South Africa was created when an Act of the British Parliament united the four colonies of Natal, the Transvaal, the Orange Free State and the Cape. The British Act noted the fact that the three protectorates of Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland formed an economic and geographic whole with the new Union. In fact it was generally expected that the three territories would one day become part of the Union. Constitutionally this Union was to a large extent an artificial creation. Excluded were the three protectorates, but included were nine other Black peoples and their territories, as well as the Whites.

In regard to the remaining Black territories within the Union, an Act was passed in 1913 to define and schedule some 8,9 million hectares of land in the four provinces as inalienable Black areas. This was the recognition of a historical fact - it was not done for ideological reasons - just as Lesotho, Botswana and Swaziland were not created for ideological reasons. In 1936 a further 6,3 million hectares of land were earmarked for addition to the Black territories.

It is true that the Black territories consists of only about 13% of the land area of the present South Africa but it is also true that this area includes nearly half of the country's most fertile soil. And it is further true that if the total area of the former British South Africa is taken into consideration, Black Territories comprise almost 50% of that area. The Black Africans, for example, never occupied the more than 250 000 square km. of arid and semi-desert areas known as the Karoo. The Karoo contrasts strikingly with, for example, the Tugela River system, which flows for a considerable distance through the areas of South Africa's largest nation, the Zulus. It has been estimated that this river system has sufficient water to supply 14 cities the size of Johannesburg, leaving enough at the river's mouth to meet the needs of a city the size of Greater London. For a country like South Africa whose water is scarce, this is considerable.

Large areas of the Black Territories fall within the rich

mineral belt ranging from the northern Transvaal to the north-western Cape. In fact, most of the Black territories are reasonably well endowed with a wide range of valuable mineral resources. Though the Xhosa areas of the eastern Cape are less fortunate in this respect, they have considerable agricultural potential.

On the basis of rainfall and climate, 100 hectares of land in the Black territories have an average potential of 147 hectares in the White part of South Africa.

In the light of these facts of history and geography how, I ask, do Members of this Organisation reconcile the charges against my Government that the South African Government has driven the Black peoples into barren and desolate reservations in pursuit of a policy of racial oppression?

I mention these facts in bare outline. To really grasp South African circumstances would require a far longer exposition of history. I mention these facts merely to indicate something of the historical background to our problems.

The divisions which exist in South Africa today thus came about naturally and historically, through sociological affinities and not as a result of any ideology. We believe that the objective of self-determination for all our peoples will not be best achieved by attempting to force all of them into an artificial unity. Too often has the world seen the tragic consequences of attempts to force unity upon two or more divergent peoples and we see it still today.

A policy such as ours, which is designed to avoid disaster, to eliminate friction and confrontation between different peoples, to eliminate domination of one group by another, and to give to every man his due, can surely not be said to run counter to civilized concepts of human dignities and freedoms.

Our policy is not based on any concepts of superiority or inferiority but on the historical fact that different peoples differ in their loyalties, cultures, outlook and modes of life and that they wish to retain them.

Nor is our policy inflexible - it postulates a certain broad direction the end of which is sovereign independence for the peoples concerned. There is no question of forcing together peoples who do not wish to be joined. Equally there is no question of keeping apart peoples who wish to come together. The real point at issue is therefore not one of objective, but of method: the best practical way of ensuring self-determination and human development. We believe, particularly in the light of events elsewhere in the world, that our approach is better calculated to achieve the common objective than the alternative of forcing the different peoples of South Africa into an artificial entity which will lead to friction and strife, not only between white and black but also between black and black.

Let me put it very clearly: the whites of South Africa, as well as the Government of South Africa, are as much concerned about the implementation of human rights, human freedoms, human dignities and justice, as any other nation or government of the world. We fully realise that the well-being of the black man is as essential to the stability of southern Africa as that of the white man.

We are constantly charged with a callous disregard for the feelings and the welfare of the peoples - even a hatred of him. As I have shown, South Africa is presented in this Organisation as a racial cauldron where the whites are obsessed with animosity towards the blacks, where the whites dehumanize and degrade and ill-treat the blacks.

I do not deny that unsavoury and reprehensible incidents between black and white do occur in South Africa, incidents which no civilized man can defend, incidents which I cannot condemn too strongly. These incidents receive prominent attention in the South African press and, through the South African press, in the outside world and they are often seized upon by this Organisation to further its campaign against South Africa.

I leave aside the ironical fact that this refutes another popular accusation against my Government, namely that it does not allow freedom of expression. There are not many countries in this Organisation where the press comments on

and criticises local conditions and Government as freely as it does in South Africa.

Be that as it may, the picture presented in this Organisation of racial relations in South Africa is distorted out of all proportion. Of the real position we read and hear nothing in the United Nations.

Our detractors purposely seek to conceal the goodwill which exists between black and white in South Africa in their day to day contact. They never mention the numerous incidents which attest to this goodwill. They never mention the appeals made by my Government and my Prime Minister for harmonious human relations between the black and white peoples of South Africa. The Prime Minister has frequently and forcibly condemned incidents between black and white which involve bad manners or humiliating treatment and has appealed to all South Africans to respect the dignity of every person irrespective of his race or colour.

And for every unsavoury incident which may occur there are many more which negate the accusation that the whites of South Africa have a callous disregard for the dignity and feelings of the blacks. Had anyone here heard the spontaneous and resounding ovations which black athletes received from thousands of white spectators at the last South African Games, or the cheers for black South African boxers fighting white opponents from overseas, he would at once have known that allegations that the whites in South Africa hated the blacks were just so much rubbish.

Let me get away for a few moments from political matters - let me talk on the level of ordinary human relationships. I shall mention just a few incidents which speak for themselves. I do not say there is anything unusual about them nor do I in any way exaggerate their importance. On the contrary - they are ordinary manifestations of the goodwill between blacks and whites which may be freely seen in our country - and even beyond our borders.

I wonder how many members of this Council are aware of the many instances where whites have risked their lives to save the lives of blacks and vice versa? I could give you many

examples - instead I merely ask: do you really risk your life for somebody you despise or hate?

In 1968, 82 white South African farmers, in a voluntary human gesture, loaned 230 tractors to plough the lands of nine border villages in Lesotho shortly before the maize season. And South Africa has on several occasions come to the help of her neighbouring countries when famine has threatened them. Newspaper reports of a person in need of help or a victim of disaster often bring forth a flood of generous and sympathetic assistance - and it matters not at all whether the person is black or white.

White South African businessmen some years ago introduced visiting health services to Swaziland and Lesotho which operate by air from various centres of South Africa. The services were recently extended to the Transkei. Under these schemes white medical practitioners, specialists, surgeons and nurses voluntarily give up their weekends and work extra-long hours treating and operating the peoples of these countries. All travelling and subsistence allowances were paid by the businessmen concerned.

In our largest Province, the Transvaal, it was decided to introduce an African language as a compulsory subject in white primary schools, in the belief that this would contribute to better understanding and co-operation between white and black in South Africa.

These are only a very few isolated examples, but I think they show clearly that it is very far removed from the truth to say the whites of South Africa hate the blacks, that they are devoid of feelings of common humanity towards them, or that they are brutal - as is so often alleged here. The fact of the matter is that we are all human beings and, with the exception of certain elements which you will find in any country,

white South Africans have the same feelings of humanity towards a black person as they do to any other person.

Despite this, I know very well that many members of this Organisation will say to us: well, that all sounds very fine, but if you really feel as you say you do, why is it that the policies of your Government are discriminatory? Why is it that your legislation, or some of it anyway, distinguishes between persons on the grounds of colour and race?

We do have discriminatory practices and we do have discriminatory laws. And it is precisely because of this that the greatest misunderstandings occur and our motives are most misrepresented. But that discrimination must not be equated with racialism. If we have that discrimination, it is not because the whites in South Africa have any "herrenvolk" complex. We are not better than the black people, we are not cleverer than they are. What we can achieve, so can they. Those laws and practices are a part of the historical evolution of our country - they were introduced to avoid friction and to promote and protect the interests and the development of every group - not only those of the whites.

But I want to state here today very clearly and categorically: My Government does not condone discrimination purely on the grounds of race or colour. Discrimination based solely on the colour of a man's skin cannot be defended. And we shall do everything in our power to move away from discrimination based on race or colour. May I refer to just one example - the field of sport. To use the words of my Minister of Sport - if by apartheid in sport is meant discrimination on grounds of colour or race, then apartheid is disappearing and will disappear from sport in South Africa.

I would mislead you if I imply that this will happen overnight. There are schools of thought, traditions and practices which cannot be changed overnight. But we are moving in that direction. We shall continue to do so.

South Africa and the United Nations have for a long time been at odds on the question of South West Africa. The United Nations has sought to create the impression that South Africa has adopted an obdurate and intransigent attitude to the question. Let us look at the facts:

In 1951, South Africa proposed a new agreement, in place of the Mandate, with the remaining Principal Allied and Associated Powers. This was rejected by the General Assembly.

Despite this, South Africa reconfirmed her willingness to arrive at an amicable arrangement; and towards the end of 1952, a United Nations Committee could report agreement in principle on five points. The Committee itself expressed its appreciation of South Africa's efforts, but regarded itself bound by its terms of reference to the extent that it could accept nothing less than South Africa's accountability to the United Nations.

Still South Africa did not close the door to finding a basis for negotiations. In 1958 we invited the members of the United Nations Good Offices Committee to visit South Africa and South West Africa. The Committee expressed its appreciation towards South Africa for her frankness, friendliness and desire to find a mutually acceptable basis of agreement. Suggestions of the Committee in its subsequent report were, however, again rejected by the United Nations.

Although a deadlock appeared to have been reached, South Africa remained willing to find a basis for discussions, and received the Carpio-Martinez de Alva mission in 1962. That history is still in our memories and I need not go into details. We all know how the United Nations reacted to the joint communique issued at the conclusion of their visit, which refuted charges, often heard in the United Nations in those days, concerning a threat to international peace, genocide and militarization in the Territory. The communique was not to the liking of the majority of the members of the United Nations and, therefore, was received with shock and disbelief.

The International Court of Justice's judgment of 1966 which was generally in South Africa's favour

was simply relegated to the wastepaper basket. Instead the majority in the Assembly, again ignoring the wealth of fact and legal argument presented to the Court, proceeded to take the law into its own hands.

More recently there were the contacts with the Secretary-General. They held promise. More was achieved in the fourteen months of the contacts than had been achieved in all the years that this issue has been on the Organisation's agenda.

But it seemed that South Africa was required by certain United Nations members to do all the compromising - that South Africa was expected to abandon its position completely without the United Nations conceding anything. Some progress was made. That is apparent from the Secretary-General's three reports on the contacts. But the attitude of a majority of the United Nations was uncompromising and even before this Council met in December of last year, calls were being made to terminate the contacts.

Nevertheless, as a result of those contacts, an Advisory Board of representatives of all groups in the Territory, under the chairmanship of the Prime Minister, was established to advise the Government on matters of concern to the whole Territory. And recently, the Executive of the ruling National Party in South West Africa took a further initiative by deciding that the whites of South West Africa should now take more positive action to hold discussions with representatives of other groups in the Territory, with the aim, firstly, to promote, in a spirit of voluntary co-operation, a better mutual understanding on one another's views on the political future of the Territory, and flowing from this, to conduct more positive discussions with a view to the future. It is hoped that these discussions will progress to the point where a final agreement can be reached between all the population groups.

The South African Government welcomes this development which is fully in accord with its view that it is for the inhabitants of South West Africa themselves to decide their own future. Those who have left the Territory and wish to return in order to participate in elections or gain positions of leadership with a

view to participating in the discussions, will have the right to do so provided they do so in peace. It does not matter to what group or party they belong. They will have the rights to propagate any constitutional changes they like - provided only that they do so within the requirements of law and order.

It is on record that during the contacts with the Secretary-General, the South African Government had anticipated that on the basis of developments at that time, it might not take longer than ten years for the population of South West Africa to reach the stage where it would be ready to exercise its right to self-determination. In the light of the new developments in the Territory, the South African Government now believes that this stage may be reached considerably sooner.

The South African Government has always recognised that South West Africa has a distinct international status. We have no designs on it. The administration of the Territory has been directed towards achieving the greatest good for the greatest number of the Territory's peoples, who are exceedingly disparate as to their culture and development. May I just give a few figures to illustrate this:

An Investment Corporation for Blacks has drawn up an economic programme with the object of creating 5 000 employment opportunities for the Blacks during the period 1972 - 1977 entailing a capital investment of R22,5 million.

A total of R139 million has so far been spent on 177 domestic water supply schemes constructed and operated by the State throughout the Territory.

The number of schools for Blacks and Coloureds have increased from 313 in 1960 to 592 in 1973; the number of teachers from 1 310 in 1960 to 3 453 in 1973; the number of pupils from 43 000 in 1960 to 140 000 in 1973.

There are 1 550 Coloured and Black nurses in the Territory.

Total investment in respect of fixed and movable assets of the South African Railways amounted in 1973 to R170 million. Total expenditure on roads from 1953 to 1973 amounted to R243 million. The value of telephone, telegraph and radio installations in the Territory amounted to R35 million in 1973. The total cost of running the Territory now amounts to R341 million per annum. In evaluating these figures it should be remembered that the total present population is only 850 000.

It is not for South Africa nor for the United Nations but for the peoples of the Territory themselves to decide upon their political future. And all options are open to them in this regard.

It is unfortunate that for obviously political reasons few, if any, of South Africa's critics in the United Nations have ever given her credit for her administration of South West Africa. It is also a matter of regret that all of South Africa's efforts towards a solution of this hitherto intractable problem have been thwarted by those elements amongst the membership of the United Nations which are intent upon casting doubt on South Africa's bona fides. Each new attempt on the part of the South African Government to reach an accommodation has been thwarted in turn. In the circumstances, charges that South Africa has adopted an intransigent attitude are quite unjustifiable.

A development of considerable importance to southern Africa was the change of Government in Portugal on 28 April 1974 and the resultant change of Portuguese policy towards its African Territories, particularly Mozambique and Angola. This has been wrongly represented in some quarters as a setback and a threat to South Africa, partly on the basis of a theory that South Africa has hitherto relied for her own security upon a "buffer zone" of States around her borders - a zone which is now disintegrating.

Besides this, a number of irresponsible allegations have been made about South African intentions and activities,

for example that we were fomenting unrest or supporting factions in Mozambique.

This line of thought betrays a lack of understanding of some of the most basic elements of South Africa's policies. In the first place, South Africa has never identified herself with, and holds no brief for colonialism in any shape or form. Indeed, as already indicated, South Africans of an earlier generation were, at the end of the last century, the first in Africa to struggle against colonialism. The eventual success of that struggle after initial setbacks has been the inspiration for our present policies of self-determination and independence for all the Black Nations of South Africa. We understand the drive in Africa for freedom from colonial rule. We were among the first to recognise the new Government of Portugal. A Black Government as such, in Mozambique holds no fear for us. We are surrounded by black governments and we ourselves in the process of creating more, by leading our Black territories to independence. As my Prime Minister has said:

"We are not interested in the personnel of the Government of Mozambique. All we are interested in is that for their sake and ours, they form a stable government."

And expressing concern about the incidence of unrest in neighbouring countries he said:

"Whoever takes over in Mozambique has a tough task ahead of him. It will require exceptional leadership. They have my sympathy and I wish them well."

The Prime Minister also made it clear that South Africa was prepared to help financially and in other ways in the development of Mozambique just as we are prepared to assist other African countries to the best of our ability. South Africa and the people of Mozambique have co-operated, to the advantage of both, in the use of the Port of Lourenco Marques and of the railway line linking it to South Africa since the last century. Over the years, thousands of Mozambicans have worked in or visited South Africa and conversely many thousands of South Africans regularly enjoy Mozambique's outstanding holiday facilities.

More recently, co-operation between us has permitted the realization of the enormous Cabora Bassa power and irrigation project which will open up a vast area of Mozambique for development. South Africa's willingness to buy power to be generated at the dam has contributed to the scheme's feasibility. A co-operative project of a similar order is the Kunene dam in Angola.

I should like to turn to the subject of Rhodesia. On this question, my Prime Minister only yesterday stated in the South African Senate:

"I have no brief whatsoever to argue this case on behalf of Rhodesia or anybody else. It must also be fully understood that I do not want to interfere in any way in the internal affairs of Rhodesia. Nothing that I might say this afternoon, must be so construed. I believe that, with goodwill, this matter can be settled, and I believe that an honourable solution can be found. What is more, I believe it is in the interests of all parties to find such a solution. I know that attempts have recently been made by Mr. Smith and his government, but unfortunately these attempts, judging from reports, have failed.

But I do know that as far as the Rhodesian government is concerned, this matter is of the highest order on their priority list. However, I must also say that I know it is being said in some quarters, on the one side, that South Africa is holding the Rhodesian government back. In fact, this accusation has been made, and will be made more and more, and I want to say that that is not so, as anybody in Rhodesia, or elsewhere, who knows anything about this position, will be able to tell. On the other hand, there are ZANU and ZAPU leaders outside Rhodesia who are suspected - I am not putting it higher than that for the purposes of my argument - of exerting influence on black Rhodesians not to come to terms. I believe that now is the time for all who have influence to bring it to bear upon all parties concerned to find a durable, just and honourable

solution, so that internal and external relations can be normalized. Africa and for that matter Southern Africa, must not become a trouble-torn continent or a sub-continent. It must, if it can be avoided - I sincerely believe that it can be avoided - not become an area of conflict."

Calls have been made in this Council for the expulsion South Africa from this Organization. In other organs of the Organization attempts have been made to prevent South Africa from exercising her rights and privileges of membership - something which is not only manifestly illegal but which sets a dangerous precedent.

But more than that, what, I ask, is to be gained by courses of action of this nature? The short answer is: "absolutely nothing". It will get us nowhere. Who will benefit thereby? Perhaps one or two countries remote from the region who pursue political grand designs on a global or regional scale for purposes of their own; certainly not anyone in South Africa itself and least of all the people in whose name and supposed interests this totally negative action is urged. Both Black and White South Africans emphatically reject it.

As I have shown, the situation in South Africa is changing; moreover it is changing in a peaceful and orderly way. And if the United Nations genuinely wants to see these changes take place, the way to do it is to encourage them by communication - by discussion and understanding - not by threats and a course of confrontation. We believe that every effort should be made to keep open the channels of communication. And if we cannot do it through this Organization, which was created primarily for the maintenance of international peace and security, then that is a very poor reflection on this Organization and its efficacy. No country will respond to threats or to a confrontation carrying with it overtones of serious conflict.

Being an African country we are very much aware of the problems of our region and of our continent. We know, as most African countries would know, that there is hard work ahead for all of us. We are facing severe problems.

We share many problems, many interests. Above all the security of Africa certainly is a matter which demands the common concern of all of us, irrespective whether we are White, Black, Coloured or Arab. The South African Government has clearly indicated its willingness to conclude a non-aggression pact with any African Government. We have in many ways indicated that we consider stability on our continent as a most important factor in achieving development and prosperity for all the Africans.

Physical territorial security and stability are of course not the only aspects of the concept of security but certainly without that there can be no progress at all. Security cannot end there, however. Peace and political stability must be translated into development aimed at increasing our standards of living. We in South Africa are deeply concerned about the many problems facing Africa in this regard. As my Prime Minister said yesterday:

"South Africa is prepared, to the extent to which this is asked for it, and to which it is its duty, to play its part in and contribute its share towards bringing and giving order, development and technical and monetary aid as far as this is within its means, to countries in Africa and particularly to those countries which are closer neighbours."

With specific reference to Southern Africa he stated:

"It is clear to all of us that for a decade or more Southern Africa has unfortunately been characterized by violence and strife. Violence and strife do not necessarily bring development and progress in their wake. On the contrary. In most cases they have precisely the opposite effect. The best example, I think, which we can find in this regard is Mozambique. Therefore I believe that Southern Africa has come to the cross-roads. I think that Southern Africa has to make a choice. I think that that choice lies between peace on the one hand or an escalation of strife on the other. The

consequences of an escalation are easily foreseeable. The toll of major confrontation will be high. I would go so far as to say that it will be too high for Southern Africa to pay. If one adds to that the threatening economic problems which could assume major proportions, then Africa and Southern Africa should guard against its heading for chaos. However, this is not necessary and I think Honourable Senators will also agree with me that it is not necessary, for there is an alternative, there is a way. That way is the way of peace, the way of normalizing of relations, the way of sound understanding and normal association. I believe that Southern Africa can take that way. I have reason to believe that it is prepared to prefer to take that way, and I believe that it will do so in the end. In fact as far as I am concerned, I have never been more optimistic that the climate and the will to do so is there, in spite of what is being done and said, in spite of everything that has happened."

I shall conclude. Are we or are we not conscious of the intractability and gigantic dimensions of the problems with which our world is confronted, and which will have to be solved if mankind is to have a future at all - not to speak even of a future free, or relatively free - from poverty, disease, famine and despair?

Can we afford the time to dissipate our energies in the pursuit of controversial political objectives when the problems of the world are so pressing as to threaten untold misery in the remaining decades of this century? And may I ask sincerely and seriously - if my country is expelled from this Organization, what exactly will have been achieved? Will the Organization then be one step nearer a solution? No, I say it will not. It will merely have made it more difficult for a country equipped and prepared to play a positive role in the development of southern Africa, to do so.

South Africa can be expelled from this Organization but not from the planet. Those who advocate this course serve the interests of neither the Blacks nor the Whites of South Africa.

In the light of the realities of the world today and of the substantial progress we have made in South Africa in the field of human upliftment and in the light of the objectives of my Government's policies, the record of South Africa can be measured honourably against the ideals set out in the Charter. We have not violated them.

We have not waged war against Black Africa or against anyone. We were in fact the first African nationalists. Black Africans need not conduct a freedom struggle against my Government. Being an African country we understand African aspirations. We have stolen land from nobody. We have conquered no people. We threaten no one. We have absolutely no designs of aggrandisement. We wish to live in peace. And in peace we shall solve our problems.

An African Bishop, a wise man, once compared the Blacks and Whites in South Africa with a zebra. If the zebra were shot it would not matter whether the bullet penetrated a white stripe or a black stripe - the whole animal would die.

*STATEMENT BY UNITED STATES AMBASSADOR JOHN
SCALI IN THE U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL ON 30
OCTOBER, 1974.*

For the past two weeks distinguished members of our organization and individual petitioners to this Council have expressed their opposition to the South African Government's practice of apartheid. In virtually all cases their arguments were predicated on the abhorrence of the unequal treatment of peoples within a society, and a minority that discriminates against the majority on the basis of color. Let there be no doubt or confusion despite the efforts of some about the attitude of the United States concerning apartheid. In simplest terms the Government of the United States opposes it categorically and absolutely. It is evil. It is ugly. The United States shares the indignation of those who during this debate have decried South Africa's persistence in holding on to the iniquitous and callous policy of apartheid.

The system of legislated racial discrimination, and associated repressive legislation that prevails on South Africa is an indefensible affront to the spirit and principles of the Charter and to human dignity around the world. It denies what the United Nations Charter proclaims, the dignity and worth of every person, and the equal rights of all men and all women. It is a matter of profound concern to the United States that the Government of South Africa has ignored calls in the Security Council and in the General Assembly to put an end to its inhumane, outmoded and short-sighted policies.

Despite all warnings and admonitions the South African Government continues to practice apartheid. It continues to uproot non-Whites and to consign them to often barren Homelands in order to preserve the supremacy of the rest of the population who are White. It maintains Draconian restrictions on the movements of non-Whites. It persists in providing to non-Whites inferior education, keeping them in a disadvantageous position. Segregation and inequality in all areas of life are pervasive. Non-Whites are not represented in the government that dominates and intrudes into almost every aspect of their lives. South Africa's denial of basic human rights is compounded in Namibia by its illegal occupation

of that territory. The United States finds it reprehensible that South Africa has failed to honor its obligations under international law to withdraw from Namibia in accordance with General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, and the 1971 opinion of the International Court of Justice. South Africa's continuing occupation of Namibia is made all the more outrageous by the manner in which it administers the territory; the repression of peaceful political activity; the flogging of dissidents by the South African Administration's surrogate, and the division of the territory into so-called Homelands are indefensible and inconsistent with the responsibility that South Africa had assumed as administrator of a mandated territory.

But I am obliged to point out that even in this grievous case the United States continues strongly to adhere to the view that resort to force and other forms of violence are not acceptable means to induce change. This is our view with regard to other serious problems throughout the world and it is our view with respect to South Africa. Armed confrontation is no substitute for communication.

The description of South Africa's transgressions I have just presented is not new. Observers have agreed about the essential facts of apartheid for many years. Some of the words I have just used are borrowed. Members of the Council may be familiar with the statement made in the Special Political Committee of the General Assembly on October 17 on the issue of apartheid by my distinguished co-delegate, Mr. Joseph Segel. This is a personal statement, as well as an official one, delivered from the heart by a man, now serving as a public member, I repeat, as a public member of the United States delegation. It is also a statement to which I subscribe, and to which the United States Government subscribes.

We are heartened indeed by some encouraging words in this chamber voiced by the Permanent Representative of South Africa. On October 24 he, himself, implied that the South African Government is responding not in a vacuum but in reaction to world events, not the least of which has been the condemnation of South Africa's apartheid, Namibian and Rhodesian policies within this international organization. I have noted with special interest that a distinguished African leader, whose bitter experiences in the past make him an impressive leader today, has also found hopeful aspects in the

new South African voices which are being heard.

We believe that a just solution of South Africa's racial dilemma, indeed, lies within South Africa itself. Taking practical steps toward improving the condition of non-Whites and seeking changes through communication seem to us more likely to have impact than some other measures suggested.

American firms in South Africa, for example, have had notable success in improving the pay and working conditions of their non-White workers. They do this as a matter of enlightened policy with the support of the United States Government.

The United States also believes that through its current cultural exchange program, prominent South Africans of all races have gained a new, more accurate perspective of their country's problems and standing as well as a determination to seek a solution of them.

At the same time the United States continues to bar the sale of military equipment to South Africa. In this regard I would like to state flatly that the United States has not collaborated with South Africa on military or naval matters, for over a decade, and has no intention of beginning such cooperation in the future.

The situation in Southern Africa is significantly different now from what it was six months ago. South Africa has no alternative but to re-assess its position in the light of recent events. The United States urges that in doing so the South African Government look at the realities of the future. We call on South Africa to make good the assurances it gave Secretary General Waldheim in April last year to allow the people of Namibia to determine the future of the territory by exercising their right of self-determination, and to withdraw from Namibia. We urge that South Africa simultaneously begin to bring an end to its apartheid policies, and establish the basis for a just society and government where all are equal. We believe that after a quarter of century of warnings it is time for the South African Government to adopt the measures which will lead to a society of equal opportunity, equal rewards and equal justice for all.

We call on South Africa to fulfill its obligations under article 25 of the Charter, to comply with Security Council resolutions on Southern Rhodesia.

Some speakers have argued that the best way to bring the government to accomplish these objectives, to bring the South African Government to heel, is for this Council to recommend to the General Assembly that South Africa be expelled from membership in this United Nations Organization. My government believes that this kind of all-or-nothing approach would be a major strategic mistake, especially at a time when we are hearing what may be new voices of conciliation out of South Africa. These new voices should be tested. We must not be discouraged, as we have been last December when we instructed the Secretary General to abandon his contacts with the South Africans on Namibia.

Many of our colleagues during the past weeks have cited time and time again the poetic reference to winds of change. With the fresh winds of change blowing from an enlightened Portuguese policy toward Angola and Mozambique affecting important and progressive changes in South Africa, the United States believes it is incumbent on this organization not to deflect these very winds as they rush toward South Africa. By doing so we confess that this organization is powerless to influence change there. My government does not accept the view that the United Nations is powerless. Rather we strongly believe that it is both through increased bilateral contacts and the strong will of a determined United Nations that change will occur in South Africa.

The United Nations was not founded to be simply a league of the just, rather in our view it is a unique international forum for exchanging ideas where those practicing obnoxious doctrines and policies may be made to feel the full weight of world opinion. There is, therefore, a clear, positive and indispensable role for the United Nations in bringing change to South Africa. My delegation believes that South Africa should continue to be exposed over and over again to the blunt expressions of the abhorrence of mankind to apartheid.

South Africans could hear this abhorrence only from afar were we to cast them from our ranks, beyond the range of our voices. Our analysis is that expulsion would say to the most hardened racist elements in South Africa that their indifference to our

words and resolutions have been justified. We think it would say to the South Africans that we have not heard, or do not wish to encourage the new voices, the voices that augur hope of change. We believe that the United Nations must continue its pressure on South Africa step by step until right has triumphed. It is self-defeating to fire a single, last, dramatic salvo with only silence to follow. History holds no example of a pariah state that reformed itself in exile. The pariah is by definition an outlaw, free of restraint. There is no record of good citizenship in the land of Nod, east of Eden, where Cain, the first pariah was banished.

My delegation has another grave concern about the wisdom of expelling South Africa, even if this would help thwart the crime of apartheid. Expulsion would set a shattering precedent which could gravely damage the United Nations structure. It would bring into question one of the most fundamental concepts on which our Charter is based, the concept of a forum in which ideals and ideas are voiced and re-voiced along with conflicting views until elements of injustice and oppression are forced to give way to reason. This is the appeal of my delegation. Let us continue to hold the evils of apartheid under the light of world opinion until all fellow human beings have seen it for what it is. Let us continue to press South Africa in this United Nations forum and others to move rapidly toward an era of quality and justice.

Text of statement as issued by the U.S. Information Service, Johannesburg, on 31 October, 1974.

UITTREKSELS UIT 'N TOESPRAAK DEUR DIE SUID-AFRIKAANSE
EERSTE MINISTER, SY EDELE B.J. VORSTER,
TYDENS 'N VERGADERING TE NIGEL OP
5 NOVEMBER 1974.

Ons vergader op hierdie tydstip welwetende dat dit 'n vloeibare wêreld is waarin ons leef, welwetende dat dit 'n wêreld is waarin gebeurtenisse snel op mekaar volg, welwetende dat dit 'n wêreld is waarin moeilikhede opgestapel word een na die ander. Met my koms nog vanaand hierheen het ek nog weer oor die nuus gehoor dat die Sekretaris-generaal van die VVO by 'n kongres-geleentheid vandag gesê het dat die belangrikste aangeleentheid waarmee die wêreld hom op die oomblik kan besig hou, is die poging om die menigtes van die wêreld te voed, om kos to gee aan mense wat dit nie het nie. Dit verbaas my net dat waar die Sekretaris-generaal van die VVO hierdie saak so hoog aanslaan, en hy is reg om dit so hoog aan te slaan, dat hy en sy organisasie soveel tyd mors om Suid-Afrika se sake te bespreek wat daar nie te bespreke behoort te wees nie. Ek dink eerlik die wêreld is nou sat en siek om te hoor hoe sleg Suid-Afrika is, en ek dink die wêreld wil nou 'n slag weet hoe goed is die VVO om die wêreld se moeilikhede en sy probleme op te los.

Ek sê ons vergader onder daardie omstandighede vanaand en ... ek kan ook by hierdie geleentheid vir u vertel van 'n goeie begroting wat ingedien is deur Sy Edele die Minister van Finansies - 'n begroting waarin ruime voorsiening vir alle noodsaaklike dinge gemaak is, ruimer as vorige jare en dit sonder om reedere belasting van u te verg. En ek is dankbaar dat ek hier voor u kan verskyn en dit vanaand met die volle oortuiging vir u te kan sê, dat kyk ons na die wêreld rondom ons dan kan ons mos nie anders as om dankbaar te wees dat ons in Suid-Afrika woon, nie alleen 'n land waar orde en rus is nie, maar 'n land waarin die mense, Blank en nie-Blank, oor die hoogste lewenstandaard beskik wat daar haas in die wêreld is, 'n land wat, Goddank, nie net nou, maar ook in die voorsienbare toekoms, sy mense uit sy bodem kan voed; 'n land wat, Goddank,

as 'n mens die toenemende werkloosheid oor die wêreld in oënskyn neem, werkgeleenthede vir sy mense kan verseker en kan gee; 'n land waarin toekomsgeleenthede vir al Suid-Afrika se mense te vinde is. Dit is oor so 'n land wat ek vanaand vir u verslag kan doen. En ek wil heel aan die begin van hierdie vergadering vanaand vir u sê dat waar ek in die afgelope tyd by verskeie ander geleenthede gesê het dat ek nie 'n persoon is wat my skaar by dié bende wat sê dat dit kwart voor twaalf is nie, maar dat ek seer seker 'n persoon is wat glo dat vir Suid-Afrika dit 'n halfuur voor dagbreek is, 'n halfuur voor dagbreek wanneer dit soms ook baie donker is en soms op sy donkerste, maar jy gee nie om dat dit so is nie, omdat jy weet dat oor 'n halfuur die dag sal breek en niks dit kan keer nie. En ek het by geleenthede gesê dat ek versigtig optimisties is oor die toekoms; ek het nie 'n enkele rede om vanaand af te wyk van daardie tema nie. Inteendeel, ek wil vir u vanaand sê dat ek bereid is om die versigtig voor die optimisties weg te neem, want die boodskap wat ek vanaand vir u by hierdie verslag-vergadering wil bring (en ek wil vir u dadelik sê dit maak nie vir my saak wat mense skrywe in Sondagkoerante nie; dit maak nie vir my saak watter doem-professië daar gemaak word nie; dit maak nie vir my saak watter besluite daar geneem word nie en watter kommentaar daar gemaak word nie) is dat ek glo, en ek het rede om dit te glo, dat daar 'n mooi toekoms vir Suid-Afrika wag. En ek wil dit vanaand vir u sê, dat die boodskap wat ek vir u wil bring is nie net een van opwinding nie, is nie net een wat interessant is soos wat die wêreld nog nooit was nie, maar dit is 'n boodskap van vertrouwe; dit is 'n boodskap van hoop wat ek vanaand hier vir u wil bring; dit is 'n boodskap van verwagting wat ek in u midde wil lê. Dit is in daardie gees wat ek graag vanaand aan u verslag doen.

.....
.....

Ek wil eintlik van hierdie verslagvergadering gebruik maak om oor sekere kardinale sake met u te praat, en ek wil ook van die geleentheid gebruik maak om sekere sake reg te stel wat ek glo reggestel behoort te word. U is almal bewus daarvan, soos u hier vergader is, dat Suid-Afrika vir jare, vir dekades, in die gedrang van die wêreld-politiek is. U is bewus daarvan dat daar 'n vete met dubbele standaarde teen Suid-Afrika vir dekades gevoer is, en u is bewus daarvan dat Suid-Afrika

waarskynlik nooit feller in die gedrang gekom het as juis hierdie jaar en as juis in die laaste paar maande nie. Na aanleiding daarvan wil ek vanaand graag enkele woorde met u spreek oor die gebeure in Mosambiek, oor die debat in die Veiligheidsraad, oor die verhouding van Suid-Afrika teenoor Afrika en Afrika-lande, oor die posisie van Rhodesië en van S.W.A. Oor hierdie aangeleenthede wat ek vir u genoem het is daar bladsye vol geskryf in die afgelope tyd en daar is baie daaroor gepraat. Nou is dit toevallig almal onderwerpe waarvan ek iets weet en, kragtens my amp, glo ek dat ek daar meer van weet as die gewone man en selfs, hoe onwaarskynlik dit ook vir hulle mag lyk, as sekere politieke kommentators.

En ek wil dit vir u baie duidelik stel dat die wêreld-politiek is op die oomblik net so, en 'n mens moet dit eenvoudig net so aanvaar, dat tensy jy oor die kennis kragtens jou amp beskik, kan jy nooit alles weet en sal jy nooit alles weet wat in die wêreld aan die gang is nie; Dit is soos die diplomatie nou gevoer word en dit spreek vanself dat daar baie delikate aangeleenthede is waaroor nie nou gepraat kan word, waaroor nie nou geskrywe kan word, wat nie nou openbaar gemaak kan word nie. Maar ek wil vir u sê dat namate die prantjie hom vorentoe ontvou sal daar sekere dinge vir u duideliker word as wat dit vanaand en vandag vir u mag wees. 'n Mens kan, dit wil ek geredelik toegee, intelligent oor baie van hierdie dinge spekuleer; 'n mens kan soms selfs die regte afleidings van gebeurtenisse maak; maar ek glimlag as ek baie van die berigte sien, as ek sommige van die bespiegeling lees en as ek afleidings lees wat sekere politieke kommentators maak wat doodseker is van hulle feite wat ek eenvoudig weet wat nie bestaan nie. En ek wil, omdat dit so is, omdat dit haas onmoontlik is vir enige persoon wat nie oor die feite beskik nie, wil ek vanaand 'n beroep doen op almal wat skrywe, of dit Engels of Afrikaans is, aan almal wat praat, om Suid-Afrika se belange in ag te neem wanneer jy skryf en wanneer jy praat. En ek wil vir u vanaand sê daar is baie goeie redes waarom dat ek juis op hierdie tydstip hierdie vriendelike beroep wil doen. En ek wil dit duidelik stel, ek vra dit nie vir myself nie, ek vra dit nie vir die Nasionale Party nie, ek vra dit vir Suid-Afrika, want dit is Suid-Afrika se hoogste belange wat in hierdie dae gedien moet word. En ek sal dit waardeer, en Suid-Afrika se mense sal dit waardeer, as hierdie beroep van my in ag geneem word. Daar sal natuur-

lik altyd diegene wees wat uit blote kwaadwilligheid sekere dinge skrywe soos wat ek ook weer die afgelope week gelees het. Ook op hulle wil ek 'n beroep doen. En ek wonder of hulle gehoor sal gee daaraan as ek vir hulle dit sê: Gee vir Suid-Afrika ses maande kans, ek vra nie meer as dit nie, gee vir Suid-Afrika ses maande kans en moenie die pad vorentoe moeiliker maak as wat hy is nie, en as u Suid-Afrika daardie kans gee sal u verbaas wees waar Suid-Afrika na daardie tyd sal staan. Maar ek is dankbaar dat ek ook vandand dit kan sê, al weier u om vir Suid-Afrika daardie kans te gee, dan gaan u nog verbaas wees waar Suid-Afrika oor ses maande en oor twaalf maande gaan staan.

U ken almal die geskiedenis en die omstandighede wat aanleiding gegee het tot die veranderinge wat in Mosambiek gekom het, ek wil nie daarvoor praat nie, u ken dit net so goed as ek. Maar u is bewus daarvan dat reeds in Juliemaand beide mnr. Ian Smith van Rhodesië en myself, ons die standpunt ingeneem het dat ons gaan nie inmeng in die sake van Mosambiek nie. Al wat ons vra en al wat ons reg het om te vra is dat daar goeie en stabiele regering sal wees. En Suid-Afrika het verder, uit die aard van die saak, ook die standpunt gestel dat sekere ooreenkomste wat in swang is tussen Suid-Afrika en Mosambiek, dat daardie ooreenkomste nagekom sal word, want dit is in Suid-Afrika se belang dat die hawens van Beira en Lourenco Marques oop bly en dat die spoorlyn die normale verkeer moet dra. Dit is in Suid-Afrika se belang dat die Mosambiekse arbeidsooreenkoms nagekom moet word; dit is in Suid-Afrika se belang dat die hidro-krag wat by Caborra Bassa opgewek word dat dit deurgevoer word na Suid-Afrika. Ek is bly dat ons versekeringe ten opsigte van hierdie sake ontvang het, en ek is bly dat ek vanaand vir u kan sê dat ten spyte van moeilike omstandighede soos 'n mens kan begryp, daardie ooreenkomste redelik getrou nagekom word. En as dit in die toekoms gedoen word dan voorsien ek dat daar goeie verhouding tussen Suid-Afrika en Mosambiek sal wees; trouens dit is in Mosambiek se belang wie daar ookal aan die bewind mag wees, is dit in hulle belang om goeie betrekkinge met Suid-Afrika te handhaaf omdat die inkomste wat die hawens vir Mosambiek besorg, die inkomste en die werkgeleenthede wat die Mosambiekse ooreenkoms vir die swart mense van daardie gebied bied, en die inkomste wat verkry sal word uit die verkoop

van krag aan Suid-Afrika, dit sal bepaal of Mosambiek lewensvatbaar is al dan nie, dit sal bepaal of hy ekonomies sal ontwikkel, al dan nie, want Mosambiek is vir haas 80% afhanklik van Suid-Afrika in daardie verband. En dit is derhalwe in die belang van beide Mosambiek en van Suid-Afrika dat daar saamgewerk sal moet word. En in daardie verband het u as my kiesers die reg om vir my te vra; Ja, dit is nou alles goed en wel, maar wat is die moontlikheid dat Mosambiek gebruik sal word as 'n afspringplek vir mense wat Suid-Afrika wil aanval en saboteer. Ek het ook ten opsigte van daardie aangeleentheid versekeringe gevra en dit verkry, maar ek het dit ook baie duidelik aan die wêreld gestel wat Suid-Afrika se standpunt in daardie verband is en sal wees. Ek het 'n paar weke gelede, in Septembermaand, 'n onderhoud met 'n joernalis van Newsweek gehad en hy het daardie selfde vraag aan my gevra en ek was dankbaar dat hy daardie vraag aan my gevra het. Because that gave me the opportunity to put South Africa's case, not only to the powers that be in Mozambique, not only to the people of Mozambique, but to put South Africa's case to the wide world outside. The question that this particular gentleman put to me was this: On the other hand it is speculated that once fully independent a Black Government in Mozambique might make its territory available to guerilla forces as base for direct attacks against South Africa. What do you say to that? And my answer, as reported, was the following: Well, I would like to think that that won't happen, but if it does, it will naturally lead to a head-on collision between ourselves and Mozambique. I hope that they won't allow their territory to be used for terrorist action against us, but if it is so used, then naturally the whole world will understand that South Africa has no option but to defend itself to the utmost of its power and strength. I then went on to say: But you can rest assured that we from our side won't start anything - whatever we will do will only be in self-defence. And seeing that there is still speculation about this in certain quarters, let me spell it out again. South Africa's attitude is simply that we will not interfere and we do not interfere in any other country's internal affairs; that we from our side won't start anything at all as far as our neighbours are concerned. But let there be no mistake about it, whatever is started by somebody outside South Africa against South Africa, South Africa will finish it. And I

think it is well that we speak openly and that we speak plainly about this, so that there be no misunderstanding. But I want to repeat from the knowledge I have at this moment, I don't foresee anything of this kind happening, because I think that South Africa's position and South Africa's stand in this regard is appreciated, and therefore I want to accept that things will go on normally, as they went on in the past.

Dan wil ek verwys na die VVO debat en wel die debat in die Veiligheidsraad wat gegaan het oor die lidmaatskap van Suid-Afrika. Ek wil andermaal beklemtoon wat ek dikwels van tevore vir u gesê het, naamlik Suid-Afrika bly lid van die VVO so lank as wat dit in sy belang is om daar te wees, en dit is op hierdie moment in ons belang om daar te wees; en in die tweede instansie, so lank as wat dit verenigbaar is met ons selfrespek. Dit is die twee voorwaardes wat ons oor die jare heen aan ons lidmaatskap van daardie organisasie geheg het. Of course, there were those countries who did their best to bound us out of the United Nations Organisation; one such nation was Australia, and let me say they did not hurt us by adopting that particular stand - they rendered a disservice to their own country and their own people by doing that. And I am pleased to know that the Australian Government in this particular instance did not speak on the behalf of the majority of the Australian people. And the time will come, and of that I have no doubt, when the true voice of the people of Australia will be heard again. Now, I am aware that the United States of America, France and Britain exercised the veto in South Africa's favour not because they condone or subscribe to our policies, but because they are in principle opposed to the ousting of member states and fearful of creating such a precedent. But for whatever reason that they exercised the veto in South Africa's favour, I want to say thank you publicly in my constituency to those three countries tonight. And I want to say to them that their gesture in this regard is not only appreciated by the Government, but also by the peoples of South Africa. And whilst on the subject of the United Nations Organisation, allow me to say, so that there will be no misunderstanding, let me state again that we can never accept that the United Nations Organisation is a super Parliament with the right to legislate for countries or for member states. If South Africa is required to accept that, then I say here and now

South Africa is not prepared to accept that.

Ek kom vervolgens by die verhouding van Suid-Afrika met Afrika en Afrika-lande. U het seker ook al dikwels vir u die vraag afgevra wat ek vir myself gevra het. Het ons in die verlede nie 'n verkeerde uitgangspunt gehad deur onself te sien nie net as komende van Europa nie, maar eintlik te sien as behorende aan Europa. Nadat ek hierdie posisie bekom het, het ek daardie vraag vir myself baie ernstig afgevra en ek het vanaand nie die minste twyfel daaroor, trouens daar is geen ander standpunt soos ek dit insien wat 'n mens kan inneem nie. Om dit duidelik te stel en uit te spel dat ons, soos ons hier sit, en soos ons hier woon in Suid-Afrika, is ons van Afrika net soos enige ander land van Afrika. Dit is in Afrika waar ons wieg gestaan het, dit is in Afrika waar ons graf sal wees. Dit is hier waar ons sal woon, dit is hier waar ons sal werk. Daarom het ek opnuut die standpunt in die Senaat gestel en dit teenoor die wêreld baie duidelik verklaar dat ons seer seker die reg het om te sê dat ons net so van Afrika is as enige ander land in Afrika; maar nog baie duideliker uitgespel het dat ons nie kragtens enige vergunning van iemand hier in Afrika is nie, maar dat ons kragtens ons reg hier in Afrika is.

It must be understood, and every person who writes about South Africa and who wishes to analyse the position of South Africans in this regard must kindly accept, that we are not temporary sojourners in Africa, we have a right to be here. We are not imperialists and we are not colonialists. Small as we were and poor as we were, we were the first African country to take up stands, first against Dutch colonialism and later against English imperialism. Our whole history stands as proof of that and it is not necessary for anybody to preach to us in this regard. The first Republics came into being in 1795 in Swellendam and Graaff-Reinet, when the people of this country first rebelled against Dutch colonialism. In this regard I want to refer to a lengthy article which appeared in the Financial Times in London on Wednesday the 30th October, 1974, in which a certain lady, Bridget Bloom, commented on my Senate speech where I availed myself of the opportunity to speak to Africa. Unfortunately it is commentators like this particular good lady who does not appreciate the position in South Africa, who is blind to the realities of South Africa, who does not know the bare facts of political life in South Africa, who makes it extremely difficult for South Africa to put its case

across. This is what the lady wrote in this regard; "There is absolutely no indication that Mr. Vorster, any of his Ministers or any of their white constituents are prepared to give up apartheid and to allow black majority rule in South Africa." You see how far it has gone now, that apartheid is now equated with the refusal to allow Black majority rule in South Africa, and the whites are accused - you as constituents and I as a member of the Government - we are now accused that we are not prepared to allow Black majority rule in South Africa. Let me put the record straight, once and for all, for this good lady. There will be black majority rule in the Transkei which is on the point of becoming independent; there will be Black majority rule for all Zulus in KwaZulu; there will be black majority rule for all blacks in Bophuthatswana, in Lebowa, in Venda in the Ciskei, in QwaQwa and in Gazankulu, but in White South Africa it is the whites who will rule South Africa and there will be no black majority rule. Black people have the right to elect their representatives, black people have the right to rule themselves in their homelands. Black people have the right to become independent. Nobody stands in their way in this regard. But in the rest of South Africa it is the whites and the coloureds and the Indians who will remain and they will find a modus vivendi in that which is left of South Africa, make no mistake about it. But if the world, if the world expects us, as this lady does, that in our part of South Africa there must be black majority rule, I say that will never come. Dit is ons reg, dit is ons reg dat ons onself sal regeer maar ons gun ook die reg vir die Xhosa in die Transkei om homself te regeer, ons gun die reg vir die Zoeloe om hom in KwaZulu te regeer, ons gun die reg vir elke swartman om hom in sy tuisland te regeer. Maar omdat die wêreld dit nou vir ons ten laste lê dat dit 'n misdad is in Suid-Afrika as 'n Zoeloe 'n Zoeloe is, en 'n Xhosa, 'n Xhosa, maar dit is nie 'n misdad vir 'n Hollander om 'n Hollander te wees en dit is nie 'n misdad vir 'n Brit om 'n Brit te wees, of vir 'n Fransman om 'n Fransman te wees nie, maar dit is weer die dubbele standarde wat ook in hierdie verband op Suid-Afrika toegepas word. Ek het by daardie geleentheid in die Senaat, het ek as tema gekies die feit, soos ek dit gesien het, dat Afrika, en daarom ook Suidelike Afrika, voor die kruispad gekom het; dat die tyd gekom het dat Suidelike Afrika 'n keuse moes maak en Afrika saam met

hom daardie keuse moes maak. Óf vrede aan die een kant, óf eskalاسie van geweld aan die ander kant, óf samewerking aan die een kant, óf konfrontاسie aan die ander kant, óf vooruitgang aan die een kant, óf vernietiging aan die ander kant, óf ontwikkeling aan die een kant, óf stagnاسie aan die ander kant. In my toespraak in die Senaat as u verteenwoordiger het ek nie alleen my regering verbind nie, maar ek het ook myself verbind om my te beywer vir vrede, vir samewerking, vir vooruitgang en ontwikkeling in Suidelike Africa en Afrika. Afrika het dit nodig, en ons, omdat Afrika vir ons goed was, is ons bereid om ons bydrae tot daardie vrede, samewerking, vooruitgang en ontwikkeling te maak. Ek wil verder gaan om te sê ons het reeds in daardie verband aansienlike bydraes gemaak.

Ek vra derhalwe nie verskoning dat ek vanaand hier voor u staan om vir u te sê dat ek as verantwoordelike mens en leier, vir my beywer vir vrede en vooruitgang, vir samewerking en ontwikkeling in Afrika nie. Terwyl ek dit sê is ek bewus daarvan dat daar ander mense is wat sê nee, jy moet nie vrede soek nie, jy moet oorlog maak. Ek ken daardie mense; as die oorlog kom dan sal u hulle nie sien nie. Ek wil vir u liever sê wat my standpunt is. Ek wil alles in my vermoë doen, en ek sal alles in my vermoë doen om vrede en vooruitgang te probeer bewerkstellig; wat meer is, ek glo dat dit gedoen kan word. Ek is meer as hoopvol dat dit gedoen kan word. Maar as ek misluk, dan sal ek die vrymoedigheid neem om na u te kom en vir u te sê dit het misluk, en ek is realis genoeg om te weet dat daar baie dinge is waarvoor jy jou beywer, veral in hierdie moeilike wêreld waarin jy lewe, hierdie wispelturige wêreld waarin jy lewe, wat mis kan loop. Ek hou daarmee rekening, maar ten spyte van die feit dat ek daarmee rekening hou, sê ek vir u nog ek bring vir u 'n boodskap van vertrouwe en ek bring vir u 'n boodskap van hoop. Maar my standpunt is verder dat ek beywer my vir vrede en ontwikkeling en as dit dan nie kan gebeur nie, as dit afgeslaan word, en as die dag dan aanbreek dat Suid-Afrika werklik voor die spervuur te staan kom, dan wil ek as verantwoordelike man vir Suid-Afrika se mense en veral vir sy jongmense sê ek het alles in my vermoë gedoen wat moontlik is om hierdie ding af te weer. En ek is baie dankbaar vir een ding toe ek dit gesê het in die Senaat, vir een

ding wat 'n sekere politieke kommentator geskrywe het toe hy gesê het: Die Eerste Minister van Suid-Afrika, toe hy hierdie beroep gemaak het, het hy dit nie uit swakheid gedoen nie, hy het dit gedoen uit krag, uit krag van die ekonomie van Suid-Afrika, uit krag van die moreel van Suid-Afrika se mense, uit krag van die slaankrag waaroor Suid-Afrika beskik. Vir vrede, samewerking, vooruitgang en ontwikkeling in Afrika, daarvoor sal ek my beywer omdat Suid-Afrika van Afrika is. Ek het in die Senaat my tot Afrika gewend, en ek wil my waardering op hierdie verhoog vanaand betuig vir daardie state soos Zambië en andere wat reageer het. Uit die aard van die saak gaan ek nie met alles saamstem wat gesê word nie, sal ek nie met alles kan saamstem wat in die toekoms gesê sal word nie. Maar wat vir my betekenisvol is, is dat ek 'n beroep op vrede en vooruitgang gemaak het en dat daardie stem nie op dowe ore geval het nie. Meer betekenisvol is die feit dat President Kaunda daarop reageer het by geleentheid van 'n plegtigheid waar 'n eregraad deur sy Universiteit aan hom toegeken is. Wat ook betekenisvol is, is dat ek op die Woensdag gepraat het en hy op die Saterdag reeds reageer het. Ek het daardie reaksie beskou, sowel as die reaksie wat van die res van Afrika gekom het in die openbaar of andersins, het ek beskou as 'n teken van goeie wil, en totdat dit anders bewys word aanvaar ek dit as 'n teken van goeie wil. Ek glo dat daarin gelees moet word dat Afrika nou vir homself 'n kans wil gee, en as Afrika vir homself 'n kans wil gee, dan wil ek vanaand hier verklaar dan sal blank Suid-Afrika bereid wees om met Afrika in daardie verband saam te werk, op 'n basis van goeie wil, eensgesindheid en op gelyke grondslag.

As state van hierdie kontinent kan ons, as die state van Afrika, saamwerk. Ek glo dat ek ook hierin namens daardie soort state praat wat nog in Suid-Afrika tot stand moet kom in die Tuislande.

Ek het rede om te glo, soos ek hier vanaand voor u staan, dat 'n nuwe bedeling besig is om te kom in Afrika, en ek glo dat as daardie nuwe bedeling kom dit net goed kan doen vir Afrika en vir Suider-Afrika.

U sal vir u herinner dat toe ek verlede jaar gepraat het, toe die Opposisie gekom het met die standpunt van "sharing of political power in South Africa", toe het ek die standpunt ingeneem dat ek glo nie aan verdeelde mag nie, en ek glo vanaand nog minder daaraan as wat ek nog oit daaraan geglo het. Daarom verwerp ek die Verenigde Party. Toe hulle met daardie standpunt gekom het van "sharing of power", toe was my siening dat ek sien dit nie so in Suidelike Afrika nie - ek sien

in Suidelike Afrika die tot standkoming van onafhanklike swart state en dat daar in Suidelike Afrika tot stand moet kom 'n verskeidenheid van politiek-onafhanklike state wat ten nouste ekonomies met mekaar moet saamwerk. Ek het gepraat by daardie geleentheid van 'n ekonomiese magsblok wat hier in Suidelike Afrika tot stand kom, want die wêreld is vandag besig of ons daarvan hou of nie daarvan hou nie, is die wêreld vandag besig om homself in blokke op te verdeel, is die wêreld vanweë die feit dat vervoer al duurder word, dat goedere al skaarser word, is dit 'n feit dat mense in die naaste mark wil koop, dat hulle in die goedkoopste mark wil koop. En daarom organiseer state en lande en nasies vir hulself in blokke en sal hulle dit al meer en meer in die toekoms doen. Toe ek daarvan gepraat het, toe was die politieke kommentaar van die Opposisie natuurlik dat ek weet nie waarvan ek praat nie, dat dit 'n skim is wat jy najaag en dat dit inderdaag nie tot stand kan kom nie. Ek wil vir u sê dat u sal dit nog sien tot stand kom.

Afrika sal die realiteite van die tyd waarin ons woon aanvaar, en Suid-Afrika sal dit saam met hulle aanvaar en daarom is ek optimisties oor die toekoms nie net van Afrika nie, maar daarom is ek optimisties oor die toekoms van Suid-Afrika; daarom sê ek vanaand vir die jonges wat hier is en ek sê dit vir die ou mense, vrees die toekoms van Suid-Afrika nie. Suid-Afrika soos ek sê sal bereid wees om sy rol te speel en om sy bydrae in Afrika te maak.

Ten opsigte van Rhodesië is daar ewe-eens baie dinge die afgelope tyd gesê en geskrywe, en een van die goed wat my ten laaste gelê was in verskeie artikels waarin ek dit gesien het, is dat ek is nou besig om Rhodesië opdrag te gee en dat ek is nou besig om vir Rhodesië voor te skrywe hoe hy sy sake moet beheer en moet bestuur. Nou as u na vanaand se Star kyk dan sal u sien dat daar op die voorblad van die Star 'n foto van mnr. Ian Smith is en dat dit daar geskrywe staan: "Smith speaks on new era, Vorster not putting heat on Rhodesians." Ek wil vertrou dat alle geskrywe oor hierdie saak daarmee ten einde sal kom, want ek is nou moeg om gedurig te beklemtoon dat dit nog nooit Suid-Afrika se beleid was om vir Rhodesië voor te skrywe of om sy arm te draai nie. Wat wel waar is, is dat Suid-Afrika en Rhodesië met mekaar praat. Wat wel waar is, is dat ons mekaar advies gee; wat

wel waar is, is dat ons die realiteite van die dag van tyd tot tyd onder oë neem en dit deeglik beskou; maar Rhodesië is net so van Afrika as ons. Sy huis en sy haard lê ook hier. En ek is bewus daarvan dat die Regering van mnr. Smith en die Rhodesiërs net so begerig is om tot 'n skikking, 'n eerbare en aanvaarbare skikking, te kom as enige ander mens en dat dit by hulle die hoogste prioriteit geniet. Ek wil dit baie duidelik vanaand hier stel, Rhodesië is nie 'n onderhorige van Suid-Afrika nie. Hy ontvang en neem geen bevele van Suid-Afrika nie; die Rhodesiese Regering neem sy eie besluite. Soos ek gesê het daar is wel kontak, daar is wel samespreking, daar word wel advies gegee, maar nooit enige voorskrifte nie. Wat betref die polisie wat op die Zambezi staan en die grens daar bewaak: Ek het die verantwoordelikheid geneem etlike jare gelede om polisie na Rhodesië te stuur; enek het dit daardie tyd gesê, en ek wil dit vanaand weer uitspel - die polisie, en dit is nie die Weermag wat daar aanwesig is nie, die polisie het nie na Rhodesië gegaan om Rhodesië te beskerm en te beveilig nie; hulle het daarheen gegaan om terroriste wat op pad was na Suid-Afrika op die Zambezi in stede van op die Limpopo te beveg. En oor die jare het die Britse Regering die vraag gestel: Hoe lank sal die Suid-Afrikaanse Polisie daar bly, en my antwoord konsekwent oor die jare was, hulle sal daar bly solank as wat die terroriste-bedreiging vir Suid-Afrika bestaan, want hulle is daar om Suid-Afrika se mense en sy belange te beskerm, nie ander mense se belange nie. En ons het ons standpunt baie duidelik gestel dat sodra as wat daardie terroriste-bedreiging nie meer bestaan nie, dan sal die noodsaaklikheid verval vir die Suid-Afrikaanse Polisie om daar teenwoordig te wees. Ek wil derhalwe ook hoop en vertrou dat hierdie saak baie deeglik so aanvaar sal word. Suid-Afrika wil nie sy mense daar ver hou 'n dag langer as wat dit inderdaad nodig is dat hulle daar moet wees nie. Suid-Afrika het baie hoë waardering vir wat sy jong mense in daardie verband doen, en Suid-Afrika wil graag sien dat hulle sou gou as moontlik by hulle huisgenote en by hulle families weer kan aansluit. Suid-Afrika wil vertrou dat dit moontlik gemaak sal word dat dit wel kan gebeur.

Daar is ook in die jongste tyd baie geskrywe en gespeku-leer oor Suidwes-Afrika. Dit is net nodig om weer in

die verbygaan daarna te verwys dat hierdie Regering en die Regerings voor hom het nog nooit weggeskram van die feit dat Suidwes-Afrika 'n internasionale karakter het nie; intendeel ons het dit baie duidelik gestel in die hofstukke wat gelei het tot die 1966-hofuitspraak in Suid-Afrika se guns. Suid-Afrika het hom nog nooit op die standpunt gestel dat hy die grond van Suidwes-Afrika vir homself wil hê of dat hy die rykdom van Suidwes-Afrika vir homself wil inpalm nie. Suid-Afrika het hom nog altyd op die standpunt gestel dat Suidwes-Afrika bewoon word deur verskillende volkere wat verskillende dele van daardie gebied bewoon. En dit was nie Suid-Afrika wat die Ovambo's geplaas het daar waar hulle is nie, en dit was nie Suid-Afrika wat die Okavango's geplaas het daar waar hulle is nie, en wat die verskillende ander volkere geplaas het waar hulle is nie; hulle was so geplaas voordat die Duitsers nog Suidwes-Afrika beset het en lank voordat Suidwes-Afrika aan die sorg van Suid-Afrika toe-vertrou is na die Eerste Wêreld Oorlog. Suid-Afrika, sê ek, het hom nog nooit op die standpunt gestel dat hy die grond van Suidwes-Afrika of sy rykdom vir homself wil inpalm nie, maar Suidwes-Afrika is aan ons opgedra om te administreer; ons het 'n verantwoordelikheid, ons het 'n verantwoordelikheid teenoor elke individu, ons het 'n verantwoordelikheid teenoor elke volk, en daardie verantwoordelikheid sal Suid-Afrika nakom. Dit is Suid-Afrika se beleid, almal weet dit, om die verskillende volkere van Suidwes-Afrika ervaring te gee van administrasie, om hulle ervaring te gee van self-regering, en die hele opset van daardie ervaring wat ons besig is om vir hulle te gee, is om hulle langs daardie weg voor te berei, om dit vir hulle moontlik te maak dat hulle self oor hulle toekoms kan beslis. Ek wil dit andermaal uitspel vanaand. Dit is nie die Regering van Suid-Afrika se taak en funksie om die toekoms vir die volkere van Suidwes te bepaal nie en dit vir hulle voor te skrywe nie. Maar Suid-Afrika sal ook geen buitestaander, land, mens of organisasie toelaat om dit aan die volkere van Suidwes-Afrika te doen nie. En ek dink nie dat dit onbillik is om dit teenoor die wêreld te stel dat ons van hulle vra om te doen wat onself bereid is om te doen nie, naamlik om eenkant te staan, om daardie mense 'n geleentheid te gee om oor hulle eie toekoms te beslis, om hulle eie heil uit te werk en om hulle eie selfbeskikking te soek. Dit het ons langs verskeie weë gedoen en u het kennis geneem van die feit dat

die regerende party, die Nasionale Party van Suidwes-Afrika, in die jongste tyd besluit het dat ook hulle wil deelneem aan hierdie inisiatief om samespreking te hou met die verskillende volkere ten einde te besin oor die toekoms van Suidwes-Afrika se volkere, Dit staan enige indiwidu vry om 'n politieke party te stig en die sake van daardie party te reël, en die Ovambo's het die voortou geneem in hierdie verband om aan uitgewekendes te sê julle kan terugkom en julle kan kom deelneem aan die verkiesing in Ovambo, maar julle moet in vrede kom en daar moet geen afdreiging of geweld daarmee gepaard gaan nie. Want terwyl ons, en ek wil dit baie duidelik stel, die volkere van Suidwes-Afrika die volle geleentheid wil gee om sy eie toekoms te bepaal, kan ons so lank as wat ons vir Suidwes-Afrika verantwoordelik is, en dit is 'n heilige verantwoordelikheid, 'n "sacred trust" was dit genoem, wat aan ons gegee is in daardie verband. - so lank as wat dit ons verantwoordelikheid is, sal ons geen afdreiging of geweld in daardie gebied duld nie. So lank as wat ons daarvoor verantwoordelik is, sal daar orde in daardie gebied gehandhaaf moet word, want waar daar nie orde is nie, kan daar geen ontwikkeling wees nie, en dit is al voorbehoud wat die Suid-Afrikaanse regering in daardie verband stel. En ek wil andermaal 'n beroep op die wêreld doen by hierdie geleentheid vanaand : gee vir die mense van Suidwes-Afrika 'n kans dat die verskillende volkere vir hulle 'n toekoms kan uitwerk; gee vir hulle 'n kans dat hulle hulle eie heil kan uitwerk, gee vir hulle 'n kans dat hulle hul selfbestikkingsreg, as en wanneer hulle voldoende ervaring opgedoen het, dat hulle dit kan uitoefen. En ek glo dat dit wat ek vanaand hier sê dra die goedkeuring weg van elke indiwidu en van elke volk wat dit wel meen met Suidwes-Afrika en sy mense.

Dit het andermaal weer duidelik geword in die loop van die Sitting dat die groot verskil tussen die Nasionale Party en die Verenigde Party daarin geleë is dat dit by uitstek die Nasionale Party is wat vir die Blankes van Suid-Afrika sê, julle het die reg om julle identiteit in Suid-Afrika te handhaaf onder alle omstandighede. Dit is die Nasionale Party wat vir die mense sê die behoud van die politieke mag en die seggenskap oor jouself is jou reg ten alle tye en dit beteken nie vyandskap of miskanning of onderdrukking van enige ander persoon nie. Intendeel, soos die Nasionale Party se beleid ontplooi,

en so het dr. Verwoerd dit in sy tyd voorspel, namate daardie beleid ontplooi, namate die beleid op differensiasie berus, sal diskriminasie verdwyn. Dit was die profetiase siening van dr. Verwoerd in sy tyd. Wat nou gebeur, is dat die veelvolkige beleid van Suid-Afrika al meer en meer na vore kom; volkere wat van mekaar onderskei kan word; tussen wie gedifferensieer kan word, maar volkere wat mekaar help en onderskraag, volkere wat mekaar eerbiedig en respekteer, en volkere wat nie in mekaar se huishoudelike sake inmeng nie. So sien ek die toekoms van Suid-Afrika; dit is op daardie pad wat die Nasionale Party vir u lei, dit is daarvoor wat ek as u verteenwoordiger en leier van die Party vir u sê: baie dankie vir die begrip wat u in hierdie verband getoon het, vir die vertrouwe wat u aan die Nasionale Party en sy leiding gegee het.

*STATEMENT ON NAMIBIA ISSUED BY THE UNITED
KINGDOM GOVERNMENT ON 4 DECEMBER, 1974,
FOR CIRCULATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS
OFFICIAL REPORT*

1. It will be recalled that the Security Council of the United Nations sought the advice of the International Court on the question "What are the Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia Notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276". The principal conclusions reached by the Court in its advisory opinion of 23 June 1971 were -

- (i) By 13 votes to 2, that, the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia being illegal, South Africa is under obligation to withdraw its Administration from Namibia immediately and thus put an end to its occupation of the Territory;
- (ii) By 11 votes to 4, that States Members of the United Nations are under obligation to recognise the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia and the invalidity of its acts on behalf of or concerning Namibia and to refrain from any acts and in particular any dealings with the Government of South Africa implying recognition of the legality of, or lending support or assistance to, such presence and administration.

2. In October 1971 the Government of the day informed Parliament and the Security Council that they did not accept these conclusions.

3. In its opinion the Court examined the legality of Resolution 2145 of 1966 by which the General Assembly purported to terminate the Mandate. One of the underlying questions, to which the Court gave an affirmative answer, was whether the General Assembly had the competence to make such an executive decision. The Charter confers upon the General Assembly powers which, with certain exceptions of very limited scope, are recommendatory only, and in our

opinion the arguments in support of the legal effectiveness of the Resolution are not convincing. Accordingly, we are unable to accept the Court's reasoning on Resolution 2145 and its conclusion that that Resolution operated of itself to terminate the Mandate.

4. However, South Africa has itself repudiated the Mandate and the obligations which it accepted by virtue of the Mandate. The United Nations by Resolutions commanding very wide support both in the Assembly and in the Security Council has adopted the position that, owing to fundamental breaches of its obligations on the part of the Mandatory, the Mandate is no longer in force. In view of South Africa's conduct, by which she has divested herself of any entitlement under the Mandate, and of the recognition thereof and response thereto by the United Nations and the international community, the Mandate cannot be regarded as still alive and operative; and with the termination of the Mandate South Africa's rights to administer the Territory have lapsed. Nevertheless the international status of the Territory still continues, since no lawful basis exists or has ever existed upon which South Africa can or could have unilaterally altered that status.

5. The General Assembly having called the attention of the Security Council to Resolution 2145, the Council adopted Resolutions in 1969 and 1970 of which the essential one was 276 of 1970. This Resolution reaffirmed Resolution 2145, declared the presence of South African authorities in Namibia and all acts taken by the Government of South Africa on behalf of or concerning the Territory after termination of the Mandate to be illegal, and called upon all states to refrain from any dealings with the Government of South Africa inconsistent with this declaration. There was no prior finding under Article 39 of the Charter to found a Mandatory Resolution within Chapter VII; indeed proposals for such a finding were not accepted. Nevertheless the opinion of the Court was that Resolution 276 imposed obligations upon Member States. The Government believe that the course of events in the Security Council and the consultation amongst its Members do not support the conclusions of fact asserted in the Court's opinion. And as a matter of law they remain of the view that the Security Council cannot take decisions generally binding on Member States unless there has been a determination under article 39 of the existence of a threat

to the peace, a breach of the peace or an act of aggression. Consequently they are unable to accept this part of the advisory opinion.

6. However, for the reasons explained above, the Government take the view that South Africa is in occupation without title of a territory which has international status. This occupation is unlawful and South Africa should withdraw. Meanwhile South Africa remains the de facto administering authority. However, in the circumstances there is an obligation on States not to recognise any right of South Africa to continue to administer the Territory. But there is no obligation, in the absence of appropriate decisions under Chapter VII of the Charter, to take measures which are in nature of sanctions. It follows that we do not accept an obligation to take active measures of pressure to limit or stop commercial or industrial relations of our nationals with the South African Administration of Namibia.

Text of statement as issued by the British Information Services, Johannesburg, on 5 December, 1974.