

UNITED NATIONS

UN LIBRARY

JUN 13 1972



UN/EA COLLECTION

SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-SEVENTH YEAR

1629th MEETING: 29 JANUARY 1972

ADDIS ABABA

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1629)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Consideration of questions relating to Africa of which the Security Council is currently seized and implementation of the Council's relevant resolutions ...	1

SIXTEEN HUNDRED AND TWENTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Africa Hall, Addis Ababa, on Saturday, 29 January 1972, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Abdulrahim Abby FARAH (Somalia).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Argentina, Belgium, China, France, Guinea, India, Italy, Japan, Panama, Somalia, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Yugoslavia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1629)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Consideration of questions relating to Africa of which the Security Council is currently seized and implementation of the Council's relevant resolutions.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Consideration of questions relating to Africa of which the Security Council is currently seized and implementation of the Council's relevant resolutions

1. The PRESIDENT: I should like to suggest that, because of the configuration of the plenary hall in which we are now sitting, the Security Council dispense during the remainder of the meetings in Addis Ababa with its usual practice of extending invitations to participate in the discussion anew at the opening of each meeting. Instead, I would propose that the invitations to take places at the table behind the Council table that we extended yesterday [1628th meeting] to the representatives of three United Nations bodies and of 20 Member States be regarded as of continuing validity throughout the course of our meetings here in Africa devoted to the item at present on the agenda.

2. At the close of our meeting yesterday I mentioned that a letter had been addressed to me by the representatives of Guinea, Somalia and Sudan containing a request that representatives of a number of African liberation movements be invited to address the Council in conformity with rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. The three signatories have now submitted a revised text [S/10602/Rev.1] and the Council will be in a position to take up the request after the revised version has been circulated.

3. I now call upon the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kenya to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

4. Mr. MUNGAI (Kenya): On behalf of my President, His Excellency Mzee Jomo Kenyatta, his Government and the people of Kenya, I wish to congratulate the Security Council for holding its first-ever series of meetings on African soil. The Ethiopian capital, Addis Ababa, is not only the headquarters of the Organization of African Unity but is also a centralized place of United Nations activities through the location here of the Economic Commission for Africa. It is also representative of the rich African cultural heritage. The symbolic importance of the meetings of the Security Council being held in this splendid city of Africa in its moment of destiny is that this series of meetings is designed to deliberate on the African issues.

5. I wish at the outset to declare my Government's support for the illuminating statement made to the Security Council yesterday [1627th meeting] by His Imperial Majesty Emperor Haile Selassie I of Ethiopia, highlighting the plight of Africans under colonial servitude. Equally, I wish to associate my Government with the views on the African issues so eloquently expressed at the same meeting by His Excellency Mr. Ould Daddah, President of Mauritania, who is also the current Chairman of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity.

6. In the Africa of 1972 vast territories are held in bondage, under white racist minority. Over 30 million Africans are subjected to humiliation and colonial servitude that defy description. Exploitation of African resources is feeding the economic and political ambitions of the oppressors. In South Africa the odious doctrine of *apartheid* reigns supreme. Through the conspiracy of the wealthy nations the Portuguese are successfully maintaining their strong hold over Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). The expansionist South African ambitions have jeopardized the political destiny of Namibia. In Zimbabwe a clique of rebels sustained by the vested interests of foreigners has spelled doom and disaster for the overwhelming majority of Africans there.

7. These incontrovertible facts mean denial of fundamental basic rights and self-determination to the Africans. They imply the most serious threats to international peace and security. Countless millions, held to ransom by the evil machinations of the rebels, promise racial conflagration of indeterminate proportions, as indeed has already been demonstrated in the last few days. Yet the conscience of mankind has not been fully galvanized into action against such odious developments.

8. A land of 5 million Africans and a quarter of a million imported settlers and immigrants has been converted into a white, unrepresentative, racist rebel stronghold. Through six years of British inaction the whites under the racist flag of Smith have been allowed to raise a successful rebellion against the British Crown. Knowing no armed intervention would take place in case of rebellion, Smith moved with swiftness and confidence to a unilateral declaration of independence. Later, attempts to settle the issue of independence for Rhodesia in a half-hearted manner were doomed to failure even before they got off the ground. Successive British premiers met the rebel leader to legalize independence. All these endeavours proved fruitless. The latest move in this direction is the Anglo-Rhodesian proposals for a settlement recently worked out between Her Majesty's Secretary of State for Commonwealth and Foreign Affairs and Smith,¹ a settlement which all the democratic nations of the world have called a sell-out of the vital interests of the Africans of the land.

9. The Kenya Government—and, indeed, most African States and freedom-loving peoples throughout the world—condemned the settlement as unjust and undemocratic. Before the British Government, in a desperate bid to save the situation, sent the Pearce Commission to Salisbury, the Kenyan Government had warned that the settlement would never see the light of day. The reasons were not very far to seek.

10. The well-understood position of “no independence before attainment of majority African rule” was thrown overboard. It was replaced by the uncertain, unacceptable and unsatisfactory position of unimpeded progress towards eventual majority rule at an unspecified future date. There can be no conceivable justice in the concept of representational parity and a system in which 228,000 whites would have an equal voice with 5 million Africans. By the most optimistically exaggerated estimates this parity will take several generations to come about—assuming that Smith and succeeding Rhodesian administrations will adhere to the terms of the settlement. The untrustworthy and wily white régime will dictate when parity will take place and under what conditions. Little wonder that this treacherous settlement was described by the Chairman of the African National Council, Bishop Muzorewa, in the following terms:

“The test of acceptability was the Rhodesian Africans’ first and last opportunity to say whether they wished to participate in their own auction at the hands of the British political merchantmen.”

11. The entire Anglo-Rhodesian settlement was worked out without the slightest participation of the overwhelming majority of the African population or its leaders. In this case the British, traditionally renowned for respect for the rule of law, democracy and justice, betrayed these time-honoured values to placate the racist and expansionist whims of Smith and his henchmen. The interests of the Africans were sacrificed on the altar of political ex-

pediency. The African leaders were incarcerated, to languish in Smith’s prisons. Organized African political will was throttled into silence by systematic techniques of terror. Contrary to the democratic traditions, it was agreed that a commission to test public opinion in Rhodesia would be a just substitute for a democratic process through a ballot based on the principle of one man, one vote. When in the long and expansive history of the British Empire has this been resorted to as a just or successful political device?

12. Successive British Governments maintained that no settlement with Smith would be concluded without, *inter alia*, annulment of discriminatory legislation. This was evidently recognition of the inalienable rights of the Africans to equality and eventual sovereignty through self-determination. However, in actual practice it was agreed that an independent commission be appointed to examine the question of discrimination, to consider the existing legislation and to make recommendations to the rebel régime on ways and means of making progress to end it. This vagueness is clearly not obligatory for Smith or consistent with earlier British undertakings.

13. The Anglo-Rhodesian settlement, instead of enfranchising Africans on a common roll based on the principle of one man, one vote, irrespective of racial background, effectively places them outside the ambit of the electoral laws by raising to an unjustifiably high level their educational and property qualifications.

14. This actually has the result of entrenching deeper—and with official British sanction—the minority racist régime in Rhodesia. By no stretch of the imagination can this be regarded as a just, democratic or equitable solution for the Africans of Rhodesia. No such constitutional arrangement would be deemed fit for the British electorate. The British Government has failed to realize that what is good for its own citizens in Britain is equally good for the Africans in Rhodesia.

15. The settlement provides for a declaration of rights enforceable in the Rhodesian courts. This constitutional device is a travesty of justice because its terms are subject to suspension through the invocation of considerations of an overriding character as determined by Smith himself. Much of the existing legislation is exempted from appeal under the declaration. Rhodesian courts, manned by Smith’s nominees, have their hands bound by the discriminatory legislation and racial justice they must dispense. Since the present political power and social structure are specifically based on the negation of fundamental freedom and human rights of the Africans, justice can hardly be expected. Furthermore, provisions against retrogressive constitutional amendments are unworkable, because once independence has been granted there is nothing to prevent Smith from annulling the settlement.

16. In order for this settlement to be made attractive and palatable to African sensibilities, an advance of £15 million for development in African education and tribal trust lands had to be made. However, this amount is too small to bring the masses of Africans anywhere near the standard required in the complex electoral process under the terms of the settlement. Furthermore, the terms provide for “appro-

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971*, Document S/10405.

priately matching contributions" from the Rhodesian side without specifying what may be appropriate. The conditions attached are intolerable and are designed to make the entire offer a farce. Which authority will administer the funds is deliberately left vague. It is an open invitation to Smith to consolidate his oppressive régime and to improve his economy.

17. The settlement having been worked out, the Pearce Commission was appointed to conduct the tests of acceptability of the settlement among the population of Rhodesia as a whole. Whatever this was intended to be, the Commission's value has been torn to shreds because the overwhelming majority of Africans in Rhodesia have declared their massive rejection of the settlement terms.

18. The Rhodesian Government had undertaken that during the stay of the Pearce Commission in Rhodesia political normalcy would be restored to allow Africans to express their views on the terms of the settlement. However, political detainees languishing in Smith's prisons have not been released. Terror has been unleashed against those expressing dissent against the Anglo-Rhodesian settlement. To date 15 Africans, and perhaps more, have been shot dead, hundreds have been injured and an unknown number placed under detention. Shooting and rioting have occurred in various places—Shabani, Bulawayo, Umtali, Salisbury, Port Victoria and Gwelo are just a few instances picked at random. Liberal elements have been swiftly placed in protective custody. Draconian measures under the Maintenance of Law and Order Act have been invoked to silence the defenceless and innocent and betrayed Africans. The African National Council, the non-political body which has united the supporters of ZAPU (Zimbabwe African People's Union) and ZANU (Zimbabwe African National Union) under its banner to express united opposition to the settlement proposals, has been hindered from carrying out its activities. It has been denied access to mass media and other facilities necessary to communicate with the people. In short, because of the lack of freedom of expression, the Africans are incapacitated in expressing their views. This reinforces the fear expressed earlier by the Kenya Government that Smith would not allow the Commission to carry out its work in conditions of political normalcy. His actions, utterances and past record throughout the rebellion clearly prove that he cannot be trusted, that he is contemptuous of world opinion and that he will use the settlement as a springboard for consolidating his régime for the perpetuation of white minority rule in Rhodesia.

19. I wish to comment briefly on the Commission itself. Lord Pearce, its Chairman, is indeed a man of integrity and learning. However, it may be recalled that in the test case of 1968 the Privy Council admitted that the Smith régime was illegal, but Lord Pearce maintained that the nefarious detention laws were necessary and valid to preserve law and order in Rhodesia. This amounted to a grant of legitimacy to the Smith régime. Hence, Africans have to question his acceptability as leader of such a Commission.

20. The 16 assessors serving the Commission are all colonial civil servants, without a single exception. Hence, they cannot be expected to gauge African opinion without bias in one of their own colonies. In the past it has been

traditional practice for the colonial service to regard such great nationalists as Nehru, Gandhi, Kenyatta, Kaunda, Nyerere and others as unrepresentative upstarts of their people. Is it not likely, therefore, that the present colonial assessors are tainted with the same brush of prejudice against the Africans in Rhodesia, whose opinion they are to test?

21. There was neither rhyme nor reason in having the Commission appointed. A referendum of the people or national elections under the supervision of the United Nations would have been the ideal solution. In any case, representatives of the Africans, of the universities, of the churches and of the United Nations would have commanded more respect and co-operation than has the Pearce Commission.

22. Smith has claimed that the Council of Chiefs has approved the terms of the settlement. Those Chiefs are paid by Smith. They hold office at his pleasure and they are under coercion to accept his orders. On the other hand, there are Chiefs who have had the courage to express their opposition to the terms of the settlement, even when they are dependent on Smith's dole. At Goromonzi, 30 State-paid Chiefs, headmen and councillors went along with the other Africans and rejected the settlement. This is the pattern being repeated daily in outlying areas of Rhodesia. This is convincing evidence of African opinion, if indeed any were needed.

23. From all available evidence, the Pearce Commission has not made any headway and it cannot come out with any findings acceptable to the Africans under its terms of reference. Therefore, its work can just as well be regarded as terminated and rejected. The British must come up with another solution for Rhodesia.

24. Any new settlement must take into account the following points.

25. First, it is clear that without a system of guarantees enforceable through British military presence in Rhodesia the settlement is a paper commitment to enable both sides to get off the hook. The armed forces of Rhodesia are white-led, white-organized and composed so as to exclude Africans from positions of command.

26. Second, African representation in the armed forces at the decision-making level is absolutely necessary now if the Africans are ever to safeguard majority rule in Rhodesia at any later stage.

27. Third, Africans should similarly be given top executive jobs in the civil service, industry, academic institutions and the protective and security services.

28. Fourth, the South African police and army personnel in Rhodesia, which ostensibly are there to maintain law and order but which are actually engaged in holding this territory under the supremacist régime in perpetuity, must be withdrawn. If South African forces can be stationed in Rhodesia to maintain law and order, why cannot British troops be in Rhodesia to maintain law and order in their own colony?

29. Fifth, the settlement should guarantee under international supervision complete freedom of movement and organization to the African majority.

30. Sixth, the terms should specify the programme for common vote rolls and the attainment of African majority role which is acceptable to the Rhodesia Africans.

31. Seventh, Kenya proposes the convocation of a round-table conference of Rhodesian whites, Zimbabwe Africans and the British administration, under the aegis of the United Nations, to work out a realistic and equitable settlement.

32. Eighth, in the meantime the United Nations in general, and the Security Council in particular, must insist on the continuation and strengthening of sanctions until a new settlement acceptable to Africans is worked out.

33. In the name of justice and fair play we demand an unequivocal reply from the British Government as to what the alternatives to the Pearce Commission are to be. The British response should be urgently conveyed to the Security Council at its current series of meetings. Otherwise, there is a real danger of African impatience and frustration in Rhodesia breaking out openly into hostile confrontation. The future of 5 million people is at stake. We cannot just stand by and turn a blind eye to their predicament. This is one single situation where the United Nations must act decisively if its aims and objectives are to have any meaning. And the United Nations can act effectively only through the Security Council. It therefore carries a heavy responsibility on its shoulders.

34. To the Africans in Rhodesia I wish to say that we African countries shall stand by their side in this hour of struggle. We pledge every form of assistance—moral and material—that we can give. Their just cause will triumph in the end. Their relentless struggle and sacrifice and our unswerving support shall ensure the ultimate political destiny of Zimbabwe.

35. In South Africa the doctrine of *apartheid* has been raised to a religious doctrine, which sanctions discrimination on grounds of colour. It is enforced through rigid laws and police terror, with the intention of destroying the identity and culture of the African and ensuring his perpetual subjection. To an African, *apartheid* means the stamping out of all personal liberties and freedoms. It means the absence of the rule of law and the snuffing out of all democratic practices and judicial safeguards. It stands for abuse of discretionary powers and the use of arbitrary methods to enforce large-scale African evictions from settled areas to make way for whites, most of whom are drawn from the unemployment pools of European countries. A total of 4 million whites brutally dominate 14 million Africans; 87 per cent of the best land is reserved for 4 million whites and 13 per cent, where development has yet to begin, for 14 million Africans. The racists have chosen for themselves areas which contain almost all the immense natural resources of South Africa. The African areas, on the other hand, are reservoirs of unemployment and frustration.

36. In the face of such a grave situation, certain leading Western and Asian countries have seen fit to bolster the racist régime. Their investments continue to flourish in the so-called white areas, benefiting whites only. Their trade with South Africa is at an all-time high. Their supply of weapons to the racist régime has increased South African military capability for internal suppression and external aggression against the free States of Africa to the north. These leading democracies have aligned themselves with the racists in pursuit of economic lucre at the expense of the Africans' tears and blood. The wealthy nations with enormous investments in South Africa have not even seen fit to invest in African areas in South Africa, to insist on wages and employment benefits being on a non-discriminatory basis and to demand equality of treatment for Africans as well as whites. Such policies have done irreparable harm to the advance of Africans towards freedom and independence.

37. To conceal the excesses of *apartheid* and to break the international isolation of his régime, Vorster has offered to open a dialogue with free African States. However, all peaceful solutions put to him for the democratization of South Africa have been spurned by him. Therefore, no one can blame the Africans in South Africa if they have decided to march on the path of violence in vindication of their inalienable rights.

38. My Government has rejected the call for a dialogue because it is not within the framework of the Lusaka Manifesto on Southern Africa,² which expresses a just and reasonable collective African will for a peaceful solution. Furthermore, it will confer respectability on the obnoxious concept of *apartheid* and imply recognition of Bantustans. These are a mockery of self-determination and an extreme example of institutionalized racialism. Acceptance of the dialogue will be used to oppress the Africans in South Africa even further, with the blessing of the independent States of Africa which agree to the dialogue in its present terms. The dialogue as constituted at present does not assure the repeal of discriminatory legislation or improvement in the political and economic status of the Africans. Dialogue at this stage is bound to disrupt the African liberation effort, lower the morale of Africans within South Africa and give encouragement to the Portuguese fascists and the Rhodesian rebels to hold on to power at the expense of the interests of the Africans there. After all, if South Africa could get away with *apartheid*, so could these minority racist régimes. This will also give a ring of reality to South African expansionist dreams in Namibia. It is further bound to cement relations between the South African supremacists, the Portuguese fascists and the Rhodesian rebels. These consequences will also flow from the continued supply of arms to South Africa from certain Western countries.

39. We condemn these arms sales in the strongest and most categorical terms as an exercise to throttle African self-determination, to bolster racism, to threaten the security of free Africa and to promote the brutalization of

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

vast African populations in southern Africa simply and purely for the economic gain of some countries.

40. The South African presence in Namibia is illegal and constitutes aggression. With the termination of the trusteeship status of Namibia, a United Nations effective presence there is of utmost importance. The whole South African episode of aggression, trials and *apartheid* is being repeated there. This adds to the urgency of the situation, and the Security Council should seriously consider armed intervention there under the terms of the Charter which allow for such action in cases where international peace and security are gravely threatened. The current strike in Ovamboland is one of the many concrete manifestations of the African reaction to oppression and illegal occupation. It is an articulate and forceful demand for equality and sovereignty, which must be heeded by the Security Council.

41. Portugal is maintaining its stranglehold over Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) under the fiction that these colonies are overseas provinces of metropolitan Portugal and through the support it gets from its friends in NATO and outside it. Without this support, Portugal cannot maintain these Territories as its colonies. Its oppressive régime there under the guise of a civilizing mission is doomed to failure. The freedom movements there have dealt devastating blows to the Portuguese colonial defence system. We shall support these heroic efforts to the hilt, and so should the United Nations, not merely by rhetoric but by practical action. We appeal to NATO countries to desist from giving assistance to Portugal unless it stops its colonial wars and oppression in Africa.

42. I am confident that during this historic series of meetings of the Security Council, being held for the first time in Africa, bold and decisive measures will be taken to eradicate colonialism and oppression of the African peoples by the white minority régimes in southern Africa.

43. The PRESIDENT: I now invite the representative of Cameroon to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

44. Mr. DICKO (Cameroon) (*interpretation from French*): Permit me to thank you, Mr. President, and also the members of the Security Council for having been good enough to agree to my request to be allowed to take part in this debate on behalf of my country. For me it is a signal honour and a privilege today to be the spokesman of Cameroon in this august Council.

45. Like previous speakers I wish to say that it is a pleasant duty for me to bid welcome to the members of the Security Council to Addis Ababa, the capital of a country with a glorious history and also the political and economic capital of the African continent. Permit me at the same time to welcome to African soil the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, and to address to him our warm congratulations on the great mark of confidence placed in him.

46. I should like to take this opportunity to express our profound gratitude to His Majesty the Emperor of Ethiopia and to His Excellency the current Chairman of the

Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity for the important statements they made at the opening meeting of this series of meetings of the Council [*1627th meeting*].

47. The highly important decision taken by the Security Council upon the express request of the independent States of Africa which are members of the OAU, as endorsed by the General Assembly, to hold a special series of meetings away from United Nations Headquarters devoted to the problems of the African continent, is undeniably a matter of encouragement and satisfaction for the people of Africa. This important historic series of meetings of the Security Council on African soil is a historic event in the Organization and is entirely in keeping with the present political situation prevailing in Africa and in the world. The whole of Africa, its sons, its valiant fighters and peace-loving defenders of justice and liberty, are fully alive to the importance of this historic decision of the Security Council. The year 1972, like 1960, will remain in the chronicles of mankind as a year of hope for oppressed peoples.

48. The United Nations was created to defend noble principles and to implement the ideal of promoting a better world, free from fear, violence, injustice, oppression, racial discrimination and poverty.

49. In our day there is no lack of challenges, least of all for the African continent, which has been crushed and humiliated by history. It is only, in fact, the African continent which is continuing to undergo and suffer from such brutal racial domination and arrogant denial of the elementary right of peoples to self-determination as continue to exist in the Territories under colonial domination, in Namibia, in the Republic of South Africa and in Zimbabwe, with the complicity of powerful international interests. Without such complicity how could we understand the fact that the backward Portuguese colonialists in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) and the racist minorities of Pretoria and Salisbury continue to relish the persecution and massacre of Africans in defiance of the relevant decisions of the United Nations, and in defiance of international opinion?

50. It is our conviction that by contact with this continent, which has been so badly treated by history, the United Nations, through its Security Council now meeting in Africa, will test the value and effectiveness of the principles which serve as a foundation for its existence. What one might wonder is what could be the meaning of such principles for mankind if they do not help to liberate the oppressed peoples, to bring about equality among all men and to offer to the peoples the best possible opportunities for progress in peace and justice.

51. In spite of these noble and fundamental principles, the dignity of the African continent continues to be trampled upon. Our existence as sovereign and independent States continues to be threatened and indeed called into question. If backward Portuguese colonialism is becoming more and more aggressive, if the minority régimes of domination and racial discrimination are consolidating themselves, it is thanks to both the economic and military complicity of powerful international interests and certain Governments

which are betraying their obligations to the international community.

52. In the light of these facts we are entitled to wonder whether there is such a thing as human nature, whether there is any man who believes in the realities of human considerations. It is rather time, when life has lost its meaning, to cause reason to prevail once again.

53. Racial discrimination and oppression based on the policy of *apartheid*, as practised in South Africa, continue to flaunt their cynicism. However, the numerous relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, calling upon the Government of South Africa to revise its policy by bringing it into line with the obligations and responsibilities incumbent upon it under the United Nations Charter as well as the Lusaka Manifesto on southern Africa approved by the United Nations, have expressed a clear preference for peaceful means in the attainment of the sacred objective of the total liberation of Africa.

54. The arrogant defiance with which the racist minorities of South Africa and Rhodesia and the Portuguese colonialists greeted the conciliatory appeal of Africa for negotiation, confirms their unwillingness to engage in any dialogue which might lead to the achievement of recognition for the people of Africa, who are being oppressed, of their right to equality between the races and the right to self-determination.

55. The continuation of the illicit presence of South Africa in Namibia is an illegal act and a flagrant violation of international obligations, after the adoption by a comfortable majority of the members of the Council of resolution 301 (1971) of 20 October 1971, and after the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971,³ particularly the opinion expressed in paragraph 133 thereof.

56. During its meetings in Africa the Security Council should do everything in its power to prevail upon Member States to support and defend the rights of the Namibian people in the framework of resolution 301 (1971), and should use all possible ways and means to prevail upon the racist Government of Pretoria to withdraw immediately from the Territory of Namibia and to effectively replace the occupation and administration of South Africa by that of the international community, in keeping with the provisions of the Charter.

57. With regard to the situation in the Territories under Portuguese administration of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), the General Assembly has unequivocally declared in many resolutions that the subjection of peoples to foreign domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of the fundamental rights of man, is contrary to the principles of the Charter and compromises the cause of

international peace and co-operation. On the basis of these considerations, the Assembly requested that immediate measures be taken with a view to transferring all powers to the peoples of these territories, without any condition or reservation, in keeping with their will and their freely expressed wishes, with the purpose of permitting them to enjoy total independence and liberty.

58. It is not only Portugal, aided by its allies, which continues to ignore these requests that have been repeatedly addressed to it by the international community, but it is now taking the offensive today and proceeding to armed aggression against the independent and sovereign States of Africa. The Security Council should take all the necessary measures to prevail upon the Government of Portugal to proceed rapidly to decolonization through negotiations with the authentic representatives of the liberation movements, as indeed has been done by other colonial Powers.

59. Because it was contrary to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted by the General Assembly in 1960, the Anglo-Rhodesian Agreement was rejected by my Government. Indeed, this Agreement, based on the five principles drawn up by the British Government and negotiated without the participation of the African freedom fighters, with the illegal rebel and racist régime of Salisbury, whose feelings we are well aware of with regard to the progress and emancipation of the people of Zimbabwe, could of course only be condemned and rejected by the people of Africa.

60. The wave of protests and demonstrations which is being unleashed in Rhodesia at the very time when the Pearce Commission is carrying out its consultations constitutes proof of the maturity and the awareness of Africans with regard to their future. In this context, the Security Council should base itself upon the following principles with regard to the future of Zimbabwe: any settlement by negotiation or by consultations should be undertaken with the free participation of representative authentic nationalist movements of the people of Zimbabwe; there can be no independence for Zimbabwe as long as Great Britain, the administering Power, does not undertake direct negotiations with the representatives of the freedom fighters with a view to setting up a government based on majority rule.

61. We remain convinced that the holding on African soil of a special series of meetings of the Security Council devoted to a search for practical and appropriate measures to eliminate colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination by the application of the resolutions of the Council and General Assembly on these vital problems will afford members of the Council and the Secretary-General the opportunity to realize the importance and gravity of this humiliating situation.

62. Today more than ever, the whole world—in particular the peoples of Africa—expect concrete results from the work of these historic meetings of the Council that will contribute effectively to the realization of the fundamental aspirations of mankind for peace, justice and progress, in harmony, better understanding, solidarity, freedom and

³ *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 16.*

respect for human rights, without which there can be no authentic human community.

63. Repeating the unswerving attachment of my country to the noble principles contained in the Charter of the United Nations, the guarantee of collective security and international peace, the only instrument capable of protecting and giving meaning to the human condition, I would express the wish for the work of the Council to be a resounding success which would meet the hopes of mankind.

64. The PRESIDENT: I now invite the Chairman of the Special Committee of Twenty-four to take a seat at the Council table and make his statement.

65. Mr. SALIM (Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples): On behalf of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to the Security Council for the opportunity to address it, in my capacity as Chairman of the Special Committee, at this historic series of meetings away from Headquarters.

66. I also wish to join with the many distinguished and eminent personalities who have preceded me in expressing our highest appreciation and gratitude to His Imperial Majesty the Emperor and to the Government and people of Ethiopia, for the wonderful reception and outstanding hospitality accorded to us all. The fact that these historic Security Council meetings in the African continent are held at Addis Ababa in Ethiopia is no accident, for this great country's leading contribution to the struggle for freedom, justice, and human dignity is internationally known. And when therefore, we listened with utmost attention to the words of wisdom addressed to the Council yesterday by His Imperial Majesty, we could not but recall the valiant role that he played in the liberation of Ethiopia from the clutches of fascism. We are also aware that following their liberation the Ethiopian people under His Majesty's dynamic leadership have never hesitated or faltered in support of their oppressed brethren elsewhere in the African continent. Thus, both as Chairman of the decolonization Committee and as an African, I consider the decision to hold the Council meetings in Addis Ababa as only logical. And given sincere goodwill on the part of all concerned, the Security Council could not hope for a better location to discuss seriously some of the burning issues facing the African continent.

67. Mr. President, the favourable conditions of this beautiful capital, coupled with your Presidency over the Council in these historic meetings, should assure meaningful results of the Council's deliberations, for all of us are aware of your great talents and dedication to the cause of the liberation of the oppressed peoples.

68. The grave situation obtaining in the southern part of this continent has continued to deteriorate and to pose a

most serious threat to international peace and security and to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a number of independent African States. It is here that over 18 million dependent people still remain enslaved under oppressive régimes of colonizers and racists, under conditions of ruthless discrimination and repression and deprived of the most fundamental human rights. Despite the collective determination of the United Nations to put an end to colonialism in this part of the world, there has been no abatement either in the persistent violation of the inalienable right of the peoples to self-determination or in the repressive measures and activities undertaken by the authorities concerned, in collaboration with one another and in collusion with certain vested interests, against the legitimate struggle of the colonial peoples led by their national liberation movements.

69. In Southern Rhodesia, the illegal racist minority régime continues to defy world opinion and to pursue its policies of oppression of the legitimate aspirations of the Africans. It is a matter of the deepest regret that the sanctions imposed by the Security Council have not been effective in bringing down the illegal régime and that, in fact, that régime continues to enjoy a substantial gain in the volume of foreign trade. The cause for this failure, as all of us here are fully aware lies in the deliberate opposition and continuous non-co-operation of certain Powers and in the refusal of some others to collaborate with the United Nations in the application of effective measures. It is common knowledge that the principal responsibility for the failure clearly rests with the Governments of South Africa and Portugal, which, in open defiance of the Security Council's decisions, continue to maintain relations with the illegal régime and in particular to permit the use of the Territories under their control for the transfer of goods by the régime to its trading partners overseas. The effectiveness of the sanctions was further threatened by a blatant disregard of the sanctions resolutions by a permanent member of this Council in December last—and here I refer to the decision of the Government of the United States, now formalized, to permit the importation of Rhodesian chrome.

70. The Government of the United Kingdom, as the administering Power whose responsibility it is to restore constitutional government in Southern Rhodesia, in the meantime persists in its refusal to take all effective measures to put an end to the illegal racist minority régime. Despite the categorical rejection by the General Assembly of the so-called proposals for a settlement agreed upon between the United Kingdom and the illegal régime as constituting a flagrant violation of the inalienable rights of the African people of Zimbabwe to self-determination and independence, as provided for in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), the Government of the United Kingdom continues to make a mockery of popular consultation by the so-called test of acceptability, resulting so far in the death of no fewer than 14 African nationalists and endangering the lives of untold numbers of African nationalists in Zimbabwe. The demonstrations of protest at Gwelo, Fort Victoria, Salisbury, Umtali and Mrewa, to name a few examples, represent the deep indignation of the African people at the obvious betrayal of their legitimate interests and aspirations by the administering Power.

71. The campaign of terror, involving brutal repression and monstrous murders, unleashed by the racist Smith régime in a desperate attempt to quell the voice of the Zimbabweans has outraged world public opinion. It has at least aroused the indignation of all freedom-loving and peace-loving nations. But it is just not sufficient to sympathize with the plight of the Zimbabweans. It is imperative that the international community confront this grave challenge on the part of the white racist oppressors with firmness, determination and a clear demonstration of the fact that we not only oppose and condemn these repressions but, above all, we stand together with the heroic people of Zimbabwe. In this context the crucial role of the Security Council need not be over-emphasized.

72. The farce and fallacy of the Anglo-Rhodesian deal has been thoroughly and completely exposed by the Zimbabweans for what it is, though it must be noted with sadness that this has necessitated the supreme sacrifice of Zimbabwean lives. The General Assembly, has set out its position in this regard in no ambiguous terms: no settlement which does not conform strictly to the principle of no independence before majority rule, on the basis of "one man, one vote", will be acceptable [*resolution 2877 (XXVI)*], and that any settlement relating to the future of the Territory must be worked out with the fullest participation of all nationalist leaders representing the majority of the people of Zimbabwe and must be endorsed freely by the people [*resolution 2769 (XXVI)*]. Pending the establishment of a majority rule, and until the rebellious régime is brought down, the imposition of political diplomatic and economic sanctions must continue. Furthermore, such sanctions must be comprehensive, mandatory, effectively supervised, enforced and complied with by all States, particularly by South Africa and Portugal. At its current meetings in Africa the Security Council can do no less.

73. The situation in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) is no less disquieting. The Government of Portugal continues to deny the principle of self-determination as defined by the United Nations, turning a deaf ear to the proposal contained in the Manifesto on Southern Africa, which called for a peaceful transfer of power to the peoples in those Territories. In defiance of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, Portugal, instead, has undertaken to intensify its military operations against the peoples in the Territories struggling to liberate themselves from its oppressive rule, resorting to the indiscriminate bombing of civilians and ruthless and wholesale destruction of villages and property and to the use of chemical substances against those peoples. In so doing, Portuguese armed forces have on several occasions violated the territorial integrity of African States sharing common borders with those three Territories, once again underlining the dangers inherent in the escalation of military operations with the aim of suppressing liberation movements. Indeed the relevant reports of the special missions dispatched by the Security Council to Guinea⁴ and Senegal⁵ in this connexion have borne ample testimony to the gravity of

the situation and the consequent threat to peace in the region as a whole, as a result of the further intensification of Portugal's military operations and other colonialist measures.

74. That Portugal is able to carry on with impunity its policies of colonial oppression and the prosecution of its colonial wars on three fronts is due, of course, to the massive economic and military assistance it receives from certain States, particularly from some of its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and from other trading partners. Despite the repeated appeals addressed to them by the General Assembly and the Security Council, those States continue their supply of weapons, military equipment and material for the manufacture or maintenance of weapons and ammunition which Portugal uses to perpetuate its colonial domination in the African continent. They continue to participate in the Portuguese venture of exploiting the natural and human resources of the Territories, consolidating their financial and economic control and thus impeding the full and speedy implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence with respect to those Territories. One classic example of such assistance being extended to Portugal, which consequently threatens the well-being of the peoples in the Territories, is the agreement concluded in December 1971 in the Azores between the Governments of the United States and Portugal, by which the former will provide the colonialist régime with a sum exceeding \$400 million in all-purpose aid. It is patently clear that, if the process of decolonization is to be expedited without any further delay, an immediate end must be put to all these activities, which, intentionally or otherwise, enhance Portugal's capacity to prosecute its colonial wars.

75. Portugal's intention to entrench further its colonial domination over the Territories is expressively manifested in the constitutional changes introduced by that Government in 1971. Under the guise of the so-called autonomy of the "overseas provinces", Portugal has tightened its rein over the affairs of those Territories. The international community should not and will not be deceived by these antiquated tactics of Portugal. We demand that Portugal immediately recognize the right of the peoples under its domination to self-determination and independence, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. We demand that Portugal cease forthwith colonial wars and all acts of repression against the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), withdraw military and other forces deployed in those Territories and eliminate all practices which violate the inalienable right of the African people, including in particular arbitrary eviction and regrouping of the Africans and the settlement of immigrants in the Territories. We further demand that Portugal restore democratic rights and transfer all powers to freely elected institutions representative of the population, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

76. In the case of Namibia, a Territory for which the United Nations is directly responsible, the challenge to the authority and prestige of the United Nations is especially flagrant, for the Government of South Africa persists in its refusal to comply with the resolutions of the United

⁴ Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Special Supplement No. 4.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Special Supplement No. 3.

Nations and continues its illegal occupation and the administration of the Territory. Moreover, that Government continues to extend to Namibia its notoriously inhuman policies of *apartheid* and racial discrimination and its policies aimed solely at destroying the unity of the people and the territorial integrity of Namibia through the establishment of separate "homelands" on the basis of racial and tribal distinctions. The determination that the suffering of the oppressed African population of Namibia can no longer be tolerated has recently been expressed through the courageous demonstration and protest resistance on the part of more than 13,000 Ovambo workers in Namibia, which has brought the mining industry to a virtual standstill. These workers, despite the extreme danger to their personal safety and security in the face of the racist police repression, have risen to protest against the slavery-type system of labour contract, demanding the right freely to choose their employment and to live with their families without inhuman restrictions.

77. The advisory opinion delivered by the International Court of Justice on 21 June 1971 in response to the request of the Security Council puts the problem in its proper perspective. Not only has the Court confirmed the illegality of South Africa's continued presence in Namibia and its obligation to withdraw its administration from the Territory immediately, but it has affirmed that Member States are under an obligation to recognize the illegality of that presence and administration, and that it is incumbent upon States which are not Members of the United Nations also to give assistance in the action taken by the United Nations with regard to Namibia.

78. Proceeding from these views, we must recognize the urgent need for all States to take effective economic and other measures designed to ensure the immediate withdrawal of the South African presence from Namibia, thereby making possible the full implementation, without further delay, of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) in respect of the Territory of Namibia.

79. The Special Committee of Twenty-four, as the United Nations organ charged with the task of seeking the most suitable means for the immediate and full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, has been requested by the General Assembly not only to formulate specific proposals for the elimination of the remaining manifestations of colonialism but also to make concrete suggestions which would assist the Security Council in considering appropriate measures under the Charter with regard to developments in colonial Territories.

80. In conformity with that request, the Committee has in the past submitted a number of recommendations in that regard to the General Assembly and, through it, to the Security Council, setting out some of the fundamental bases for the effective solution of the acutely critical and explosive situation obtaining in the southern part of Africa—a situation not only incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, but also an impediment to world peace and co-operation. Those recommendations, as members will recall, are embodied in the historic document adopted by the General Assembly on

the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Declaration in the form of the programme of action designed to eliminate all the remaining manifestations of colonialism, as contained in resolution 2621 (XXV) of 12 October 1970.

81. In my capacity as Chairman of the Special Committee—the body which formulated the proposals subsequently approved by an overwhelming majority of Members of the United Nations—I should like once again to draw the urgent attention of the Security Council to the imminent need, among other things, to widen the scope of the sanctions against the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia by declaring mandatory all the measures laid down in Article 41 of the Charter of the United Nations; to give careful consideration to the question of imposing sanctions upon South Africa and Portugal in view of their refusal to carry out the relevant decisions of the Security Council; to give urgent consideration, with a view to promoting the speedy elimination of colonialism, to the question of imposing, fully and unconditionally, under international supervision, an embargo on arms of all kinds to the Government of South Africa and the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia; and to consider urgently the adoption of measures to prevent the supply of arms of all kinds to Portugal, as such arms have enabled that country to deny the right of self-determination and independence to the peoples of the Territories under its domination.

82. Taken together with other measures envisaged under further resolutions, adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session, which the Secretary-General was good enough to bring to the attention of the Security Council in documents S/10520, S/10521 and S/10527, those measures then represent the elements which members of the Special Committee on decolonization are confident will be taken fully into account by the Security Council in finding an early solution to the most inhuman and barbaric measures of oppression being carried out by the racist and colonialist authorities in the southern part of this continent.

83. The eyes of the world are focused on these chambers. The people of Africa, those in both independent and dependent countries, and more particularly the liberation movements, look to the Council for concrete action in support of justice and freedom. The members of the Special Committee, whom I am privileged and honoured to represent today before your august body, fully share these expectations.

84. The PRESIDENT: I now invite the representative of Senegal to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

85. Mr. KAMARA (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): I should like first of all to express the gratitude and warm congratulations of the delegation of Senegal for holding this series of meetings of the Security Council in Africa. I should also like to pay a warm tribute to the members of the Security Council for the promptness with which they decided to hold these meetings.

86. I would add, finally, together with my delegation's congratulations to the Secretary-General on his recent election, our thanks for the important role he has played in

the decision taken by the Council. That decision will unquestionably mark a highlight in history, the inauguration of a mandate, which can be considered only as a good omen.

87. Addis Ababa, the cradle of African unity and the capital of Ethiopia, is thus paid a tribute again today, a tribute due partly to the Organization of African Unity and partly to Ethiopia itself, but particularly to His Imperial Majesty Emperor Haile Selassie I, whose wisdom, political perspicacity and total devotion to African causes deserve emphasis here. Africa, which is the main beneficiary of this event which fills all peace-loving men with hope, can only feel reassured and honoured today.

88. This continent has succeeded in bringing together, despite certain differences and inevitable divergencies, its 41 member States into the Organization of African Unity, but unfortunately it continues to be a backward continent, one which, after having been subjected to the negro slave trade, is now faced with a prolongation of that backwardness, this time on the economic level, in the deterioration of the terms of trade. Africa, whose basic shortcoming in our harsh and implacable century is its weakness, has been reduced for years, despite its vast territory rich in coveted wealth, to appealing to the international community for aid to translate into reality the great ideals, proclaimed everywhere, of freedom, justice, equality and brotherhood.

89. It was in the hope that progress could really be made towards the realization of those ideals that the African States members of the OAU requested these meetings of the Council in Africa. The OAU, as you know—and the agenda of this series of meetings reflects its will perfectly—deliberately limited the topics that it proposed for your consideration. It did so in order to permit on-the-spot attention to be focused on those problems which it wished to clarify as much as possible, and to encourage the Security Council, by supporting its proposals, to work boldly for concrete solutions that will fare better than the other resolutions of the international Organization dealing with African problems. Those resolutions, all of which were the result of praiseworthy efforts, have, unfortunately, almost always remained a dead letter.

90. However, the interest of the General Assembly and the Security Council in Africa has never flagged. The proof of this is to be found in a rapid survey of the agenda of the various meetings of the Council. As the press has emphasized in ample detail, in 1971 alone, the year which has just concluded, the Council held 59 meetings, 11 of which were devoted to the situation in Namibia, eight to the complaint of Senegal against Portugal, eight to the situation in Southern Rhodesia, four to the complaint of Guinea against Portugal and three to the Republic of South Africa.

91. The number and importance of the African problems raised and the slow pace, in our opinion, of the solutions which Africans expected to these problems are the main reasons for the OAU to call for this series of meetings in Africa.

92. The Organization of African Unity, taking its inspiration from the United Nations, has laid down as funda-

mental objectives the rejection of all forms of foreign domination and exploitation, respect for fundamental human rights, the right to self-determination, the right to complete independence—all matters inscribed in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), which contains the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

93. However, these noble ideas, which no one anywhere dares to refute openly, are replaced here in fact by the vilest trend, fortunately condemned by history, for the picture of the situation of the oppressed countries and peoples of Africa, if it is to be painted faithfully, must be depicted against a background of political oppression, racial discrimination and *apartheid*; all these rest on economic exploitation which can never be examined sufficiently and which is the source of all the evil, of all the disparities, which morality and simple wisdom condemn.

94. Two countries are primarily responsible for this situation: Portugal and South Africa. They deny the right of self-determination, that is to say the right of peoples to decide their own fate. They resort to violence and war to keep the peoples of Namibia, Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) under their domination, despite the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, which are in no way ambiguous and are recognized—and indeed how could it be otherwise?—as being strictly in accordance with law and equity.

95. Thus, for example, in the case of Namibia the General Assembly in 1966 put an end to the Mandate of South Africa over that country [*resolution 2145 (XXI)*], and in 1969, the Security Council called upon the Government of South Africa to withdraw from Namibia [*resolution 264 (1969)*], and, finally, in 1971, the International Court of Justice in its advisory opinion declared that South Africa is still duty bound to withdraw its administration from Namibia and that its presence in that Territory continues to be illegal.

96. South Africa, a repeated offender whose very conduct within its frontiers is disputed and challenged, South Africa, which defies the United Nations, continues to trample under foot the principles of the equality of men and respect for the human person. It attempts to build its hegemony on the concept of racial discrimination set up as a basic principle of government. Deaf to the injunctions of the international community, it is equally deaf to those of the African community. Nevertheless, the proposals of Africa contained in the Lusaka Manifesto were moderate and reasonable; they could not have been more so. Indeed as the Senegalese Minister for Foreign Affairs said at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly:

“The Manifesto is not hostile to the South African administration because it is controlled by white men; it is hostile to that administration because it is in the hands of a minority, because its system is based on the inequality of men, exclusively on racial origin.”⁶

⁶ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1950th meeting, para. 145.

97. Another scourge of Africa is Rhodesia. Although artificially obscured by legal subtleties, this case, which recent events have forcefully brought to the forefront of current events, clearly exposes certain responsibilities. It derives, obviously, from colonialism, from the refusal of the right of self-determination and, above all, from the domination, by violence, of a black majority by a white minority. Here the responsibility of Great Britain will stand just so long as the African majority, which rejected the Salisbury agreements, does not participate fully in the management of the affairs of that country.

98. In many parts of Africa classical colonialism, that shame of the twentieth century, continues also to reign. Everyone agrees that colonialism is indefensible and unjustifiable. To throw off this yoke and resist repression many African peoples have had to resort to armed struggle. Until a solution other than colonialism is offered to them, our African organization intends to support and help them. What is more, in the face of the colonialist offensive, the OAU decided at its session in June 1971 to increase its support and agreed that it was necessary to double or even quadruple its aid to the liberation movements, as proposed by President Senghor.

99. The European country most deeply committed in the war against the African peoples that are still under domination and in fact the supporter in our continent of the outmoded concept of colonial domination, this country which paradoxically is perhaps the weakest in Europe, is Portugal—which tries to depict its oppressed colonies in advantageous terms under the deceptive title of “overseas Portuguese provinces”.

100. As we have said, Portugal is waging unjust and absurd colonial wars in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). But the colonial war has its consequence and its inevitable developments, particularly as the commitment to a great injustice and to a serious error generally, although not necessarily, opens the way to the perpetration of other injustices and errors in accordance with a process that has become classic in this particular area. This apparently explains the demands of Portugal, which has become a repeated offender in its provocations and deliberate attacks against the African countries that have a common frontier with the Territories that have chosen to opt for armed struggle in order to free themselves from its domination.

101. The Security Council examined Portugal's violations of the territory of Zaire in 1966 and in 1967; it considered Portuguese violations of the territory of Zambia in 1969; it has considered violent aggression by Portuguese forces against the Republic of Guinea; finally, it examined repeated Portuguese attacks against Senegalese territory in 1963, 1965 and 1969 and, recently, in 1971.

102. Allow me, in order better to focus the Council's attention on their gravity, to stress the nature, scope and level of the attacks perpetrated against the people of Senegal, as the Government of my country has brought them before the Security Council, leading this body repeatedly to condemn the aggressor.

103. The missions of inquiry sent out by the Security Council have each time confirmed the accusations made by

Senegal against Portugal of violation of frontiers and airspace, bombardment and burning of villages, murder and kidnapping, and even theft of cattle and crops.

104. We can only be gratified at the positions taken by the Security Council and its four unequivocal condemnations in the form of resolutions adopted on 24 April 1963 [178 (1963)], 19 May 1965 [204 (1965)], 9 December 1969 [273 (1969)]; and finally, 24 November 1971 [302 (1971)]. The last-mentioned condemnation occurred, as we know, after an earlier resolution dated 15 July 1971 [294 (1971)], and following the consideration of the report of the Special Mission of the Security Council to Casamance.

105. All these condemnations were marked by firmness and should have been a sufficient warning to Portugal to reflect. For example, the last resolution—to cite only that one—states the following:

[The speaker read out paragraphs 5 to 10 of resolution 302 (1971).]

106. However, Portugal has not yet taken any account of the condemnations and appeals of the Security Council. Not only does Portugal pursue its acts of aggression against Senegal, but it stubbornly clings to its refusal to take the necessary measures so that [the inalienable right] of the people of Guinea (Bissau) [to self-determination] shall be exercised. Still, let us remember that the President of Senegal, Mr. Léopold-Sédar Senghor, proposed to Portugal a peace plan which could have opened the way to the settlement of the colonial war in that part of Africa. In an interview with the *Agence France Presse* in mid-January 1972 President Senghor recalled that fact:

“In 1970-1971 we set up artillery . . . to respond to Portuguese attacks and overflights in our airspace . . .” he said in reply to a question.

“It is quite true that politically we support the nationalists in their demand for self-determination and financially by making our regular contributions to the OAU . . .”

“However, we proposed a peace plan divided into three stages: first, a cease-fire between the Portuguese army and the PAIGC; secondly, negotiations on internal autonomy between the representatives of the Portuguese Government and those of the nationalist movements of Guinea (Bissau) and, first of all, with those of PAIGC; thirdly, the granting of independence as a final stage and, if possible, within the framework of a Luso-African community with which Brazil could be associated.”

President Senghor added:

“The PAIGC accepted our peace plans . . . After apprising the PAIGC, we had two secret meetings with Portugal to discuss this plan. Not only did these consultations fail to result in anything positive but, the Portuguese army in Guinea (Bissau) profited from them to conduct incursions into Senegalese territory and, on the last occasion, to intensify its work of mine laying . . .”

107. The defiant attitude of Portugal is obviously not haphazard. Senegal and all Africa understand perfectly well that that country, which we know to be one of the poorest of Europe, could never alone carry out costly wars in Guinea (Bissau), Mozambique and Angola. The war budget for such operations is, as is self-evident, beyond Portugal's means. We know that in Guinea (Bissau) alone—a Territory of barely 36,000 square kilometres—Portuguese troops are estimated at 38,000 men, or at least one soldier per square kilometre.

108. If, as has been said, the dollar difficulties which precipitated the recent world monetary crisis are at least partially the result of the continuing war in Indo-China by no less than the most powerful country in the Western bloc, how can one explain Portugal's ability to pursue its ruinous action, unless it is thanks to the massive aid received from European and North American countries? More precisely, as was indicated by the President of Senegal in his statement to the nation on 1 January 1972:

"The truth is that Portugal is engaged in war-like acts against Senegal and the condemnations of the Security Council are even less a hindrance to it since it is protected by certain NATO Powers."

109. During this time and while the international community seems unable to take action against the multiple demands of Portugal, the efforts of Guinean nationalists, aided by the OAU, are continuing—first of all in the field, to oppose the war forced upon them; and then at the organizational level of their future nation, wherever that is possible. Thus, in the liberated part of Guinea (Bissau) elections are scheduled in the course of this month of January, to set up popular local and national assemblies, and these democratic institutions will be added to the social structures that we know are of long-standing existence.

110. We expect that these Guinean nationalist movements will lead the Security Council to do what is necessary to support their task of emancipation, which we regard as an exemplary lesson by the freedom fighters of Africa. As his Imperial Majesty said yesterday in his statement [1627th meeting], it has always been when those who should have spoken have failed to do so, when truth has failed to prevail, that evils have afflicted peoples. And history gives many examples.

111. It is, of course, our hope that measures truly likely to discourage belligerents in Africa be put into force. To repeat the words uttered by President Ould Daddah, we hope to study ways and means to deal with the challenge launched in Africa to the international community. The Security Council, in its mission of maintaining and restoring peace, can do a great deal to satisfy this wish and thus fulfil the hopes Africans have placed in the United Nations.

112. The PRESIDENT: I invite the Foreign Minister of the Congo to take a place at the Security Council table and to make his statement.

113. Mr. LOPES (Congo) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, permit me first of all to express to you on behalf of my Government our pleasure and pride at seeing

you presiding over these special meetings of the Security Council and to salute your personal efforts to see to it that your non-African colleagues would agree to meet in a continent which by its struggle is transforming the image of the United Nations, each day forcing it to go deeper into and to make more concrete the principles whose range and scope now surprise and embarrass the very authors of the Charter.

114. We should also like to take this opportunity to thank all the members of the Security Council for having agreed to come to the headquarters of the Organization of African Unity. In itself, the fact that the Council has for twenty years always met in New York makes this journey an important event. Coming to this continent, where vast regions are still suffering from the outmoded and unjust yoke of colonialism, we should like to believe that you will renew your commitment to do everything in your power to bring about the concrete realization of the ideals of peace and liberty contained in the Charter, for which you have particular responsibility.

115. For us in Africa, this session is in keeping with reality and constitutes a symbol. The reality is that you, to whom has fallen the primary role in the maintenance of international peace and security, breaking with your habits, are recognizing that this peace is seriously threatened in our continent, which has been the victim of constant aggression on the part of colonialism and imperialism, which refuse to recognize the evidence of the irreversible laws of history. Imperialism is constantly threatening the peoples it wishes to maintain in servitude, just as it makes sustained efforts to attempt to undermine the sovereignty of independent countries that have taken the just and honourable decision to aid the liberation movements.

116. I say this, thinking of the attacks of Portugal every day against one or another village of our neighbours, the countries of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), and particularly the criminal aggression which the Portuguese colonial mercenaries committed in 1970 against the heroic people of Guinea, without mentioning the threats which the same Portuguese colonialists continue to utter against the People's Republic of the Congo from Cabinda.

117. With respect to what your presence here symbolizes, it symbolizes an Africa, exploited and deprived of its rights for centuries, which today is judged worthy of playing host to such an august international body. Our peoples are legitimately proud and genuinely pleased at this appearance of tangible proof of our weight in the United Nations and of the sign that to an increasing extent no major decision concerning our continent can be taken without taking account of the profound aspirations of those whom colonialism relegated to the dim ghettos of history.

118. But we cannot be satisfied with this. If these meetings were to be only a matter of diplomatic success and of satisfying self-esteem, we would not be satisfying the wishes of the masses of Africans who want to change the conditions of their life and who, to that end, are ready to offer, and do offer, every day, their most valuable possession, their blood. How can a meeting even of the wisest men see to it that the arms of the colonialists are put

down and are no longer aimed against millions of men who are kept on the borders between animality and humanity? How can we see to it that after futile resolutions this special series of meetings does not become a mere ceremony but an actual contribution to the liberation and dignity of man? How could we suppress a feeling of shame if suddenly there came into this room not only the liberation movements, but also the men in rags who are being driven out of their lands into reservations and those barefooted mothers whose sons have fallen under the bullets of the racist Ian Smith?

119. We are told that the Africans repeat themselves and that our recriminations lack imagination. But surely the fault for this is to be placed with colonialism, racism and imperialism, which maintain the same situation in Angola, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau), Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa, names which become a refrain in each of our statements. The year 1971, a year proclaimed by the United Nations as "the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination", has just concluded, as had previous years, in deplorable failure.

120. The People's Republic of the Congo, as well as the other independent countries of Africa, make it a point of honour to draw this to the attention of members of the Council, in spite of the euphoria which may be occasioned by such meetings among some, and the routine tedium felt by others in the face of the interminable debate on the grave and explosive situation which prevails in southern Africa, which has been illustrated recently by the extraordinary police repression taking place in Zimbabwe. The illegal annexation of Namibia by South Africa and the constant humiliation of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) are intolerable injustices for us.

121. My country repeatedly and vigorously denounced these acts of barbarism, which are a disgrace to humankind. The arrogance and defiance which meet our repeated appeals have necessarily frustrated independent Africa. But with respect to the essential points, the People's Republic of the Congo believes that our Organization will be judged according to the role it plays in the defence of fundamental rights and human dignity.

122. Africa, humiliated and disillusioned, awaits solutions based on a balanced view of the rights of the African peoples and the realities of our day. Indeed, the Governments of Portugal, Smith and Vorster, the avowed champions of *apartheid*, make it a point of honour to maintain white supremacy in southern Africa, with the total complicity of the NATO countries through economic and military assistance. In this regard, the diversionary tactics of Great Britain are quite familiar to us.

123. However, there was a time when Great Britain, having recourse to its habitual pragmatism and its acute sense of liberty, seemed about to resolve the Rhodesian problem successfully. In fact, it has found a solution to the problem of Anguilla. But, unfortunately, once again pigmentation played a primary role as in most British decisions, and our hopes were dashed.

124. In any case, what is happening in Rhodesia must make it clear to Africans that Africa can only be liberated

by Africans and that the inevitable confrontation between Africa and the white minority is drawing near, so bent are they on reconquering the countries which are today independent. Great Britain has already chosen its side unambiguously. That, at least, is the objective interpretation to which we are led by the agreement between the British Government and Ian Smith.

125. The demonstrations which occurred last week in Zimbabwe and whose reverberations have drawn the attention of the whole world in spite of the gags of the colonialists, have proved that the so-called settlement between Britain and Rhodesia was nothing but a masquerade and that the people of Zimbabwe rejected it. In the face of this popular mobilization even the corrupt and feudal chiefs changed their attitude and kept pace with the masses.

126. But the colonialists are stubborn. After the Cabora Bassa Dam they are building one on the Cunene. Its purpose is not to improve the lot of the African people, but to irrigate land in order to increase the white population and to provide energy for the exploitation of uranium in Tsumele, in Namibia. And here we see them continuing to kill in Angola, Guinea (Bissau) and Mozambique, using the most advanced means of destruction—napalm and defoliants—as if it were a matter of genocide, as indeed it is.

127. We should like to take this opportunity today to draw attention of the international community to the diversionary attempts of Portugal in granting pseudo-autonomy to the colonized territories. The peoples of those colonies are not asking for autonomy; what they want is independence pure and simple.

128. The picture is not complete. We respect the appeal made yesterday by President Ould Daddah when he stated, "I have deliberately chosen not to receive you here with recrimination or condemnation" [see 1627th meeting, para. 35]. But the picture is complete enough to show that the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council unfortunately remain dead letters.

129. At the present time when man is taking giant strides in the field of science and technology, when one year sees more discoveries than had the previous 19 centuries, the feelings of part of mankind towards another part of mankind are still at the same level of brutality and bestiality as those of the caveman towards those who did not belong to his tribe. The difference lies simply in the fact that the Cro-Magnon man of today no longer has a club in his hand but bombs, napalm, defoliants and machine-guns.

130. Confronted with this situation one would be tempted to be pessimistic and to hope for nothing more from the United Nations, and Africans have already become aware that there is only one answer to force: violence. The founders of our Organization know this better than we do. They did not free themselves from nazism by dialogue, but, like the child of Victor Hugo, by the rifle, gunpowder and bullets. We know that in the modern liberation struggles those who fight oppression always pay the heaviest tribute

to death. But there is no other choice for them in order to live with their heads held high and free.

131. However, the People's Republic of the Congo feels that the evolution imposed by the progressive masses on history will oblige the United Nations to take account of the wishes of oppressed nations, and we saw the sign of this in the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. We should like to believe that we are witnessing the birth of a new organization which is to become the instrument of the oppressed peoples.

132. It is because this hope remains that we should like to support the following proposals.

133. First of all, the United Nations should take over effective control of Namibia and make all the necessary arrangements to ensure the accession of that Territory to independence.

134. Further, we consider that it is necessary to take into account the demonstrations of the Zimbabwe people against the Anglo-Rhodesian agreement, thus showing its determination to have total independence whatever the price may be. Therefore, the Security Council should recognize the failure of the British diversionary tactic and proclaim the invalidity of the agreement between the Heath Government and the white minority in Rhodesia. In our view, this would be the contribution that the Council might make to the liberation struggle of the peoples fighting for their independence.

135. Along with the Organization of African Unity we support the proposal to create a special aid fund for liberation movements. All things considered, it is only a new step to be taken in the direction already advocated by the General Assembly whereby the specialized agencies may provide assistance to liberation movements. Only UNESCO has subscribed to this so far. This principle should be made to extend to all the specialized agencies of the United Nations and should embrace military assistance since, as we have noted, the will to liberation comes up against the most modern form of weapons.

136. But whatever happens, the outcome of the struggle which is being waged by the Africans leaves no doubt: they will prevail. However, the Governments of the imperialist Powers are liable by their cynical attitude to create a situation where, even after their liberation, the peoples that are struggling will turn their backs on them once and for all. They will build their newly-independent nations only with those nations that will have helped them in a concrete manner to liberate themselves. The socialist world is already taking part in this endeavour, as it is its duty to do. But as was stressed by a speaker yesterday, cracks have appeared in the capitalist pacts, and some of the countries that are parties to them are beginning—by conviction or for tactical reasons—to help the liberation movements.

137. I should like to express the hope that the events now occurring on the continent where the Security Council is meeting will open the eyes of those who are still dreaming of lost empires or empires to be conquered. Anyone who

can hear the heartbeat of history should of course also understand the tumult of the liberation armies, the vibrations of whose footsteps are making the ground on which we are meeting today tremble.

138. The PRESIDENT: I invite the representative of Morocco to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

139. Mr. HARKET (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should like first of all to express my warmest thanks to you personally and to the members of the Security Council for having permitted me to speak at this meeting on behalf of my Government. The Government of His Majesty, King Hassan II of Morocco, is very appreciative of your unanimous decision to hold in Addis Ababa, capital of the Ethiopian Empire and headquarters of the Organization of African Unity, a special series of meetings devoted to the problems of colonialism and racial discrimination in Africa.

140. The Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples aroused, of course, great hope among the African peoples that are under colonial domination. The United Nations has made a great contribution to the process of decolonization throughout the world. We have seen African peoples, after severe trials, recovering their independence and liberty. The Organization of African Unity was created in order to preserve our independence, which was acquired at such great cost, and also to achieve the ideals of our continent, which are those of the international community.

141. However, we should stress once again that if a large part of Africa has been liberated from the colonial yoke it is nevertheless true that other peoples—millions of Africans—are still today under colonial or racist domination. Our African brothers in Mozambique, Angola and Guinea (Bissau) are waging a heroic struggle against Portuguese troops. These heroic fighters have recorded some success, but at the price of heavy sacrifices and suffering.

142. Portugal, in spite of its limited resources, is waging with modern arms, wars of repression against the African peoples. The armaments in the possession of Portugal make it also possible for it often to infringe the security and territorial integrity of independent African States bordering on Territories still under Portuguese domination. In spite of resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, Portugal, which is assured of the means of repression, continues to enslave African peoples and to ignore the rights of these peoples to self-determination.

143. Another Territory, the so-called Spanish Sahara, is still under foreign administration. We know that the General Assembly has asked repeatedly that a referendum be held as soon as possible whereby the people of the Sahara would be provided with all the guarantees necessary to decide freely on their own destiny. The Government of His Majesty the King of Morocco considers that this is the best way to eliminate this remnant of colonialism as quickly as possible. The elimination of this anachronistic remnant will usher in a new age, both for the indigenous

populations and for the Governments concerned, including the Spanish Government. This will also make it possible to bring about closer co-operation with Spain, a country with which we have common interests and traditions.

144. In the Middle East the Palestinian people has been driven out of its national territory and vast Arab territories are still under occupation, including part of the Arab Republic of Egypt, a founding member of the Organization of African Unity.

145. In Rhodesia the illegal minority racist régime of Ian Smith continues its repression against the heroic people of Zimbabwe, whose situation is becoming worse every day. The economic sanctions dictated by the United Nations have often not been complied with and have proved ineffective. We had hoped that the British Government would finally resort to energetic measures capable of bringing the illegal minority racist régime of Ian Smith to see reason. The agreements concluded in spite of the opinion of the people of Zimbabwe between the so-called Rhodesian Government and the Government of the United Kingdom have created a tragic situation in the country. The people of Zimbabwe has manifested its opposition to these agreements clearly and spontaneously. We are convinced that the Pearce Commission should now be enlightened concerning the position of the people of Zimbabwe with regard to the Anglo-Rhodesian agreements. This Commission has had the opportunity not only to observe, to record the categorical no of the people of Zimbabwe, but also to witness the ferocious repression of this people by the forces of the Smith minority régime. Despite this brutal oppression which has already claimed dozens of victims and resulted in hundreds of arrests, the people of Zimbabwe will make still more sacrifices for its survival, its independence and its dignity.

146. We bow to the victims of this atrocious repression and pay a tribute to the heroic people of Zimbabwe. We are convinced that the Security Council will not remain indifferent to this repression whose victims are our African brothers. We are also convinced that the members of the Council will be unanimous in putting an end to this tragic situation. We also hope that the Council will use the necessary means to restore legality. This legality will be restored only if the people of Zimbabwe, who constitute the overwhelming majority of the people of the country, have the opportunity themselves to decide freely their own destiny.

147. In South Africa a racist Government is persisting in waging its inhuman and atrocious policy of *apartheid*, a policy which violates the principles of the United Nations Charter and is repugnant to the conscience of the international community. I should like to recall that on 1 April 1960 the Security Council, following the Sharpeville massacre, appealed to South Africa to take the necessary measures to ensure harmony between the races based upon equality and to abandon its policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination [*resolution 134 (1960)*].

148. Since that time and in the space of 10 years the Security Council has adopted several resolutions based on these same principles. We are all aware of the reception given by South Africa to the resolutions of the Council and the Lusaka Manifesto. The Government of South Africa responds to all these appeals by crueller repression against our African brothers and by a total refusal to hold any dialogue with the African population of this territory. Nothing has made it possible today to believe that the Government of South Africa intends to embark upon any kind of evolution in its attitude which would be designed to put an end to its policy of racial discrimination and segregation, which we denounce and condemn energetically. On the contrary, the Pretoria Government pushes its arrogance so far as to threaten the security and territorial integrity of neighbouring African States. Furthermore, this racist Government is extending the evils of this nefarious policy to the people of Namibia, a territory which South Africa continues to occupy illegally, in spite of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, handed down some months ago.

149. Such are the grave problems which profoundly concern the African continent and for which we should like to see a rapid solution. Our wish is to see the Security Council seeking practical measures which would make it possible for the African peoples still under the Portuguese colonial yoke to recover their independence and freedom. We also hope, above all, that energetic measures will be taken against the racist régimes of Salisbury and Pretoria in order to permit our brothers in Zimbabwe, South Africa and Namibia to decide freely their own destiny.

150. The PRESIDENT: Before adjourning I should like to read out the following text—that has been given to me today—of a message from the President of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan, Major General Gaafar Mohamed Nimeiri, to the President of the Security Council:

“On this historic occasion of the first time that the Security Council is meeting in an African land to discuss the most urgent issues of peace and tranquillity in our continent I wish to extend to you our best congratulations as well as sincere wishes for success in your noble task.

“Africa has spoken to you yesterday with vigour and single-mindedness through two of her most illustrious sons, His Imperial Majesty Emperor Haile Selassie I and His Excellency Mr. Moktar Ould Daddah. The message they conveyed on our behalf was not only a plea for justice but also an expression of hope and an assertion of our dogged determination to restore the dignity of the African man. For this end the African peoples are looking forward to seeing tangible results from your meeting in their midst. The Sudan as a member of the Security Council shall spare no effort to make your first meeting in Africa a success. May God bless you in your endeavour.”

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.