

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-EIGHTH YEAR

1687th

MEETING: 29 JANUARY 1973

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1687)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Complaint by Zambia:	
(a) Letter dated 24 January 1973 from the Permanent Representative of Zambia to the United Nations, addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10865);	
(b) Letter dated 23 January 1973 from the Representatives of Guinea, Kenya and the Sudan to the President of the Security Council (S/10866);	
(c) Letter dated 26 January 1973 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Yugoslavia to the United Nations, addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10869)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

SIXTEEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 29 January 1973, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Chaidir ANWAR SANI (Indonesia).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Austria, China, France, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Panama, Peru, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Yugoslavia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1687)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Complaint by Zambia:
 - (a) Letter dated 24 January 1973 from the Permanent Representative of Zambia to the United Nations, addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10865);
 - (b) Letter dated 23 January 1973 from the representatives of Guinea, Kenya and the Sudan to the President of the Security Council (S/10866);
 - (c) Letter dated 26 January 1973 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Yugoslavia to the United Nations, addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10869).

The meeting was called to order at 3.55 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Complaint by Zambia:

- (a) Letter dated 24 January 1973 from the Permanent Representative of Zambia to the United Nations, addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10865);
- (b) Letter dated 23 January 1973 from the representatives of Guinea, Kenya and the Sudan to the President of the Security Council (S/10866);
- (c) Letter dated 26 January 1973 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Yugoslavia to the United Nations, addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10869)

1. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Zambia has addressed a letter to the President of the Security Council in which he asks to be invited to participate in the discussion of this question under the terms of Article 31 of the Charter, without the right to vote. In accordance with the provisional rules of procedure and the normal practice of the Security Council I would propose, if I hear no

objection, that the representative of Zambia be invited to take a place at the Council table and to participate in the discussion.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. P. J. F. Lusaka (Zambia) took a place at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT: A number of other letters have also been addressed to the President of the Security Council containing requests, under Article 31 of the Charter, for invitations to take part in the discussion of the item on the agenda without the right to vote. These requests, in the order of their receipt, are from the following States: Ghana, Morocco, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zaire, Chile, Algeria, Senegal, Egypt and Somalia. In accordance with the usual practice of the Council and with the provisional rules of procedure, I would propose to invite the representatives of the States I have just mentioned to participate in the discussion. As I hear no objection, I take it that the Council agrees with this proposal.

3. In view of the limited number of places at the Council table, these representatives will be invited to take the places reserved for them in the Council chamber, on the understanding that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table when it is their turn to speak.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. Rahal (Algeria), Mr. H. Diaz Casanueva (Chile), Mr. A. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. J. Cleland (Ghana), Mr. M. Zentar (Morocco), Mr. M. Fall (Senegal), Mr. J. Nur Elmi (Somalia), Mr. S. Salim (United Republic of Tanzania) and Mr. B. Bembo (Zaire) took the places reserved for them in the Council chamber.

4. The PRESIDENT: This meeting of the Security Council has been convened to consider the complaint made by the representative of Zambia and contained in his letter dated 24 January 1973 [S/10865]. The representatives of Guinea, Kenya and the Sudan and the representative of Yugoslavia have also requested consideration of this matter in letters dated 23 January [S/10866] and 26 January [S/10869] respectively. In this connexion I should like to draw attention to document S/10870, which contains the text of a communication dated 26 January from the representative of South Africa.

5. The first name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Zambia, on whom I now call.

6. Mr. LUSAKA (Zambia): Mr. President, I should like to express the sincere thanks of my delegation to you for

acceding to our request, contained in document S/10865 dated 24 January 1973, for an urgent meeting of the Security Council. I wish also to thank the members of the Council for their co-operation with you in meeting at such short notice to consider the crisis created by the rebel régime in the British colony of Southern Rhodesia.

7. My delegation considers itself fortunate to have its case heard by the Security Council during the month in which the presidency falls to an eminent son of that great Asian country, Indonesia. The fact that you have occupied the high office of President during your country's first month of membership of the Council is indeed indicative of your personal qualities and a testimony of the respect that Indonesia enjoys not only among the members of the Council but also in the United Nations as a whole. Needless to say, our two countries and peoples have a long history of friendship and our delegations have worked very closely together here at the United Nations, in the non-aligned movement and in other international forums.

8. This august body is meeting to consider an extremely dangerous situation which now threatens the whole of southern Africa. On 9 January this year the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia closed its border with Zambia, demanding that my country abandon its support for the struggle of the oppressed majority of Zimbabwe. That was an act of aggression carried out by a rebel régime which has no legal status or power, whose racist policies have been repeatedly condemned by the community of nations and against which the United Nations has imposed mandatory economic sanctions.

9. I am sure that the members of this Council will appreciate the seriousness of the aggressive acts which have been committed against Zambia. The illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia has declared an economic war against Zambia and supports this war with incidents of the nature of military aggression. It is using economic pressure to hold Zambia to ransom.

10. By closing the border, the Smith régime hoped to inflict serious damage to our economy. The move was an act of desperation to undermine the Zambian economy in order to induce the Zambian people to surrender their rights and freedom and to submit to the authority of a rebel régime. My Government regards the action of the rebels as a sledge designed to gain political concessions, that is to say, to stop Zambia from supporting the liberation movement and reduce it to the status of a puppet government.

11. The Smith régime has for some years faced internal trouble from the 5 million people of Zimbabwe. In 1967, 1968 and 1969 the struggle for independence in Zimbabwe was intensified. The lull in 1970 and 1971 was mistaken by the Smith régime as a defeat of the liberation forces, but the Pearce Commission rekindled nationalism and the people of Zimbabwe have shown their preparedness to make more sacrifices after shedding blood for their liberty during the Pearce Commission's visit.

12. There is a further and more ominous dimension to this crisis. The collusion of the Salisbury and Pretoria racist and

Fascist régimes is well known to the members of this Council. Since the unilateral declaration of independence in 1965, Zambia has warned that the southern African crisis is a threat to international peace and security. Indeed, in 1967 South African troops moved into Southern Rhodesia and have since remained there as an occupation force. Tension has been rising. Vorster has issued threats against Zambia; Smith has issued threats against Zambia; and both of them, that is Pretoria and Salisbury, have from time to time committed acts of aggression against Zambia, including violations of our territory by land, air and water. They have laid landmines on our side of the border and have engaged in acts of sabotage and subversion. Since 1964, some 45 agents of minority régimes have been arrested, tried and convicted by Zambia for espionage. Twenty-three of these arrests took place in 1972 alone. That is the picture that has emerged from the presence of South African forces in Southern Rhodesia.

13. Vorster himself has not denied the presence of South African forces in Southern Rhodesia. The Council will recall that Vorster has consistently declared and only recently reiterated that, when a neighbour's house is on fire, one does not need an agreement to help that neighbour. I might add that the Smith régime has also confirmed this fact by admitting the death of at least two so-called South African policemen and a number of others injured during a confrontation with freedom fighters inside Southern Rhodesia.

14. Thus the presence of South African forces in Southern Rhodesia is an irrefutable fact. These South African troops are now being referred to as "AGF"—that is, Anti-Guerrilla Task Force. The South African Government cannot deceive anybody about the real status of these forces. Evidence in our possession clearly shows that the so-called South African police are in actual fact soldiers. They wear military uniforms; they carry lethal weapons; they use military vehicles; and they have repeatedly carried out military incursions into Zambia. There is no denying that they are troops. There is no denying that a South African occupation force in the British colony of Southern Rhodesia, together with the forces of Ian Smith, now threatens the security and integrity of Zambia.

15. Allow me to enumerate the most recent acts of aggression committed against my country by the rebel Rhodesian forces in collusion with those of Fascist South Africa.

16. First, on 9 January 1973, just before the closure of the border, rebel Rhodesian forces crossed the border at Kazungula in the Western Province of Zambia. They fired shots to scare away peaceful villagers, hence compelling them to run into hiding. Left alone, the rebel forces planted landmines before retreating to the British colony.

17. Secondly, on the same date, 9 January, rebel Rhodesian forces crossed the border at Chirundu in the Southern Province of Zambia and, as at Kazungula, planted landmines before retreating to the British colony.

18. Thirdly, on 11 January, the landmines which the rebel forces had planted at Kazungula on 9 January exploded, killing one man and critically injuring a woman.

19. Fourthly, on the same date, 11 January, landmines planted by the rebel forces at Chirundu exploded, killing a fourteen-year-old girl.

20. Fifthly, on 12 January, a Zambian Army patrol team went to the scene of the death of the girl at Chirundu. The result was that one soldier was killed and four others seriously injured, again as a result of the explosion of landmines planted by enemy Rhodesian forces.

21. Sixthly, on 13 January, enemy forces crossed the border at Chirundu and opened fire on innocent Zambian villagers on the border in order to scare them away so that the rebel forces could plant some landmines. Before they could do that, a Zambian Army patrol team returned the fire, compelling the rebel forces to retreat.

22. Seventhly, on 18 January, enemy Rhodesian forces fired shots and flares into Zambia's territorial waters on the Zambezi River and took away fish from defenceless Zambian fishermen by force.

23. Eighthly, on 19 January, enemy forces again attempted to cross into Zambia in order to lay more landmines. However, a Zambian patrol team scared them away by firing shots into the air.

24. Ninthly, on 26 January, that is three days ago, three Zambian civilians were killed and eight seriously injured by explosions of landmines planted by enemy forces at Kazungula. I regret to say that one of the persons affected was a British national.

25. To date, and during this month alone, four Zambians were killed by landmine explosions and several seriously injured. The numbers are likely to rise since there are landmines still undetected.

26. Those incidents are the most recent acts of aggression against my country. They are deliberately designed to augment the present siege, thereby creating a new and very dangerous situation.

27. Obviously, the presence of South African troops in the British colony of Southern Rhodesia is illegal and this fact in itself provides sufficient ground for their immediate removal. Beyond that, however, we must ask what purpose these troops are supposed to serve along the Zambozi. There is no question of Zambian defence forces crossing the border into Southern Rhodesia. So the South Africans are there not only to protect Smith's illegal régime but also as a threat to us, and that threat is not difficult to know. Smith and Vorster are telling us that if Zambia does not do what it is told, it will run the risk of punitive raids into its territory. This is not speculation on our part. As members of the Council will recall, South Africa has made specific threats of such action against Zambia in the past. The presence of South African troops on our border is clearly meant as an indication that South Africa is now prepared to contemplate carrying out these threats.

28. The threat to use force against us in this way and on this scale represents a major escalation of the conflict in southern Africa. South Africa has clearly taken this step

quite deliberately and with full knowledge of the significance of its actions. This is not simply a threat against Zambia. It is an expression of South Africa's evident determination to use force, at whatever cost, to block the advent of majority rule in the oppressed countries of southern Africa. South Africa is therefore challenging the very principle upon which the United Nations stands. This is a test for the United Nations. There is no doubt that failure of the international community to stand up to the existing threats of the racists and Fascists in Rhodesia and South Africa respectively would give implicit encouragement to Salisbury and Pretoria to intensify their acts of aggression.

29. This danger is in the logic of the situation. The real reason for the moves taken by South Africa and the Smith régime is to stem nationalist feeling which is sweeping through all the oppressed countries of southern Africa. Indeed in Southern Rhodesia it is now stronger than ever before, as the resounding "no" to the Pearce Commission clearly demonstrated in 1972. Freedom fighters have recently achieved important victories in Rhodesia, and the Smith régime has admitted that the freedom fighters are receiving unqualified support from the oppressed masses in their country. This is why it has arbitrarily introduced new and unprecedented inhuman and savage measures against individuals or communities suspected of sympathizing with those who are struggling for the liberation of their motherland. What the Smith régime fears is that the liberation struggle will move from one success to another and that it will become impossible to maintain white minority rule.

30. The Smith régime is looking for a scapegoat because it is finding it increasingly difficult to control the situation within Rhodesia. In the classic manner of Fascist régimes it strikes out against those outside its borders who extend sympathy to those it oppresses. On how many occasions have we seen this happen in this century? And how many times have we seen it bring tragedy? For such a policy flies against the logic of justice and the determination of oppressed peoples to be free. It brings only an ever-expanding area of conflagration against which my Head of State, Mr. Kenneth D. Kaunda, has repeatedly warned since 1966.

31. Only a few days ago, the Zambian Foreign Minister, Mr. E. H. K. Mudenda, echoed this warning of my President when he referred to the fact that a situation very much like the one in Viet-Nam was developing in southern Africa because Southern Rhodesia and South Africa are evidently bent upon using force to maintain the *status quo*. This can bring nothing but tragedy. It would be a tragedy which could involve the whole world.

32. Judging by the present trends, there is no reason to doubt that Southern Rhodesia would contemplate the bombing of targets in Zambia. At this point I want to make it abundantly clear that, in the event of the rebels and/or their allies committing such a mad act, other countries would be involved since Zambia reserves its right to call upon the assistance of friendly nations. I say this because we have a right to exist as a nation and to defend our independence and sovereignty.

33. As can be seen, the present situation is very dangerous. It will become more dangerous since the struggle for the liberation of southern Africa will continue. We would prefer to see change take place by peaceful means. But it is the essence of the white régimes in southern Africa that they will not permit peaceful change. They rejected the peaceful Lusaka Manifesto of 1969.¹ The people of the oppressed countries have therefore no alternative but to seek freedom by all means at their disposal. The United Nations has repeatedly affirmed this right. Southern Rhodesia, a British colony, and South Africa have now said that this legitimate struggle must stop, even though they themselves block the possibility of peaceful change. They have said that if it does not stop, they will use force against independent and peace-loving countries. They are, by acts of sabotage, subversion, espionage and now by economic blockade, already carrying out this threat against Zambia. Is it not obvious that, as the liberation struggle gathers force, these régimes will become more and more desperate? And is it not obvious that their perverted logic will drive them to even more extreme acts of violence? Southern Rhodesia and South Africa must be stopped now. The world cannot afford to allow this violence to continue.

34. At this point, let me turn to British responsibility for the escalation of the situation in Southern Rhodesia. The United Kingdom is the sole legal authority in Southern Rhodesia. Zambia has repeatedly urged the United Kingdom to assert that authority and put an end to the illegal minority racist régime of Smith and his henchmen. As early as 1965, we advised the London Government of the dangers which its toleration of the rebellion would bring. We advised the use of force to quell that rebellion before the situation got out of hand. The United Kingdom, however, has persistently refused to assume its responsibility for re-establishing the rule of law. As a matter of fact, the British Government has replied with a very loud silence on the aggressive activities of its illegal colony.

35. The consequences of the refusal of the United Kingdom to assume its responsibilities are now plain for all to see. Its toleration of lawlessness has led to more lawlessness. The United Kingdom stands condemned in the eyes of the international community since, for the last seven years, Zambia has borne the greatest part of a most undesirable burden of the struggle to end the rebellion against the British Crown.

36. Zambia supports the cause of majority rule in Zimbabwe. The Security Council and the General Assembly have passed numerous resolutions on Southern Rhodesia which explicitly support that cause. Indeed, the sanctions imposed by this Council against Southern Rhodesia—which I shall dwell upon later—were intended to bring the illegal régime to heel. Zambia's support for the liberation struggle in Zimbabwe is, needless to say, in conformity with the commitment of the United Nations. Southern Rhodesia has mounted a siege against my country because Zambia has sought to uphold the principles of the Charter. The present crisis is therefore one which directly involves the United Nations. It is therefore incumbent upon the United Nations

to take effective action in order to achieve the objectives of the Charter and in conformity with the numerous Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, and, in particular, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples contained in resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960.

37. In the past, the British Government has expressed concern about the adverse effects which comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the rebel régime in Southern Rhodesia would have on Zambia. Consequent upon the present siege, my Government decided once and for all to establish permanent alternative routes for its imports and exports and to abandon the southern route altogether as this route could no longer be relied upon. Thus Zambia can no longer be used as an excuse for the non-application of comprehensive mandatory sanctions. There is therefore now a golden opportunity for the international community to tighten the sanctions further in order to bring the Smith régime to heel.

38. Zambia is aware of the rise in costs which will result from tighter sanctions but it is prepared to shoulder its responsibilities and make sacrifices for a just cause—a cause supported by all peace-loving nations of the world. I should like to take this opportunity on behalf of my Government to express our sincere thanks to the member States of the Organization of African Unity, those of the non-aligned movement and many other friendly countries in the world which have expressed support for Zambia and are prepared to assist us, not only morally but also materially, as soon as we have quantified our needs. This is an encouragement to us, for, after all, we are tackling a human problem—a problem of freedom. In the continuing struggle against racism, imperialism and colonialism we shall no doubt rely on the support of our friends.

39. In conclusion, my delegation recommends the following course of action:

(a) The Council should condemn the wanton aggression, including economic blackmail and military threats, of the illegal régime of Ian Smith against the Republic of Zambia.

(b) The Council should condemn the Fascist Government of South Africa for the presence of South African forces in the British colony of Southern Rhodesia.

(c) The Council should demand the immediate withdrawal of South African forces from Southern Rhodesia, since this military presence is one of the major obstacles to the efforts designed to end the rebellion.

(d) The Council should deeply deplore the failure of the British Government to end the rebellion in Southern Rhodesia.

(e) The Council should call upon the British Government, as the administering Power, to convene immediately a constitutional conference representative of all the people of Zimbabwe to determine the political future of the colony.

(f) The Council should call upon the British Government to take effective measures aimed at creating favourable

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

conditions necessary for free expression and political activity by the people of Zimbabwe, including the immediate release of all political prisoners and detainees and restrictions and the repeal of all racist and repressive discriminatory legislation.

(g) The Council should call upon all Member States to implement the sanctions policy fully and should further request the Committee on sanctions² to work faster and complete its report for the purpose of tightening sanctions against Southern Rhodesia under the full force of Chapter VII of the Charter in view of the changed circumstances. The Council should also meet immediately after the submission of the report.

(h) The Council should reaffirm the inalienable right of the people of Zimbabwe to self-determination and independence in conformity with resolution 1514 (XV) and the Charter.

(i) The Council should reaffirm the principle that there should be no independence before majority rule in Southern Rhodesia, as well as call upon the British Government, as the administering Power, to reaffirm its commitment and obligation to that principle.

(j) The Council should reaffirm its principle of non-recognition of the rebel régime by Member States.

(k) In recognition of the serious threats to peace and security on the Zambian borders, the Council should immediately request the Secretary-General to send a special representative to assess the political and military situation in the area.

(l) In recognition of the urgent need of Zambia for economic assistance arising from the situation, the Council should request the Secretary-General immediately to dispatch a team of experts to assess the needs of Zambia in maintaining an alternative system of road, rail, air and sea communications for sustaining its economy in accordance with the relevant paragraphs of Security Council resolutions 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968 and 277 (1970) of 18 March 1970.

40. My delegation sincerely hopes that the Security Council will give its most serious consideration to the recommendations that I have just enumerated. In so doing the Council will identify itself with the cause of peace and justice in southern Africa.

41. The PRESIDENT: The second name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Ghana. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

42. Mr. CLELAND (Ghana): Mr. President, permit me first to thank you and the members of the Security Council for acceding to my request to be allowed to participate, on behalf of the African Group at the United Nations, in the present meeting of the Council.

² Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia.

43. I am highly pleased that this meeting of the Council should be held under your wise guidance, since I know your country's commitment to peace and non-aggression in international relations. My delegation is also particularly delighted that, as its President for the current month, the Council has a son of Asia, that cradle of civilization, which has always provided a shining example of co-operation and dedication to a wide spectrum of issues of significant concern to developing countries. Your presidency inspires us to believe that, given goodwill, we can meaningfully work towards the solution of a nagging problem, a solution which has eluded us for so long.

44. This meeting of the Security Council has been called jointly by the representative of Zambia, the three African members of the Council and the representative of Yugoslavia, for the purpose of considering serious acts of aggression committed by the white, illegal and racist régime in the British colony of Southern Rhodesia. Before I go further, it is my duty to inform you that the African Group, in whose name I speak, deeply deplores these wanton acts of aggression and has vowed to stand solidly behind the brotherly people of Zambia in their hour of trial.

45. In this regard I should like to read out a copy of a telegram of solidarity which the African Group has dispatched to President Kaunda:

"The African Group at the United Nations, having considered the unjustified blockade of Ian Smith and his illegal régime against Zambia, has unanimously authorized me to express to you its unqualified solidarity with the Government and brotherly people of Zambia and to assure them through you of its continued support at all times."

46. The African Group is convinced that nothing can deter the Government and people of Zambia from their determination to maintain their sovereignty and economic integrity, in the face of unjust and unwarranted provocations from the illegal Ian Smith régime.

47. Any country so dedicated and consecrated to the African liberation struggle as Zambia must often face some severe tests of its determination and fortitude. So it is that Zambia is now being made to suffer for the worthy struggle of the gallant freedom fighters of Zimbabwe to liberate their country from a usurping, racist minority régime.

48. One of the manifestations of the unilateral declaration of independence by Ian Smith and his illegal régime was the evolution in Zimbabwe of the operations of the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU), the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) and the Front for the Liberation of Zimbabwe (FROLIZI). Be it noted that most of these militants are operating inside Zimbabwe with the active support of the indigenous oppressed people.

49. The Rhodesian decision to empower provincial commissioners to impose summary collective fines on African communities suspected of assisting or harbouring guerrilla fighters underscores the overwhelming support the militants enjoy. No wonder Ian Smith and his cohorts are panicking.

The white settlers call these activities murder and terrorism. The proud people of Zimbabwe and a sizable portion of the international community call these activities a war of liberation.

50. The Council will recall that the present white settlers went to Rhodesia initially either as traders or evangelists. Having coveted the land and the potential of Rhodesia and attracted by the congenial weather, they employed intrigues, duplicity and, indeed, their superior technology to subjugate and enslave the more than 5 million Africans. The illegal unilateral declaration of independence only heightened the movement of liberation, which was then gathering momentum.

51. One of the salient facts of our contemporary world, we need be reminded, is the emergence of nations into independence, one of whose characteristics has been the intense feeling of nationalism. That phenomenon followed the break-up of the Roman Empire and, taking deep root in Europe, has lately been very much in evidence in Africa and elsewhere. Even in Southern Rhodesia, it was that same feeling of nationalism that moved the white minority racists to make their illegal declaration of independence. If the Africans are now exercising their inherent right in the name of nationalism and self-defence within the requirements of the Charter, which talks of the self-determination of peoples, then why should Zambia be made a scapegoat?

52. The liberation struggle will continue, and it will continue to have the support of Zambia and all Africa because it is a just struggle for peace and human dignity. There can be a lasting peace only when all men are free. The continued subjugation of people in Zimbabwe, as well as in other parts of southern Africa and elsewhere in Africa, therefore constitutes a threat to the peace of the world which can hardly be ignored or condoned. These new aggressive acts of the Smith régime further prove the fact already recognized by the Council that the situation in Zimbabwe poses such a threat, and the Council must consequently resolve that that source of tension must be removed.

53. As I speak, Rhodesian security forces supported by those of South Africa are committing various acts of aggression against the friendly and peace-loving people of Zambia. The unwarranted incursions and the landmining of the Zambian border by Rhodesian and South African forces have killed and injured eight Zambians. The involvement of South African security forces in those naked acts of aggression has been reported in *The Economist* of 13 January, which said that two of the soldiers killed and two of those injured in the skirmishes along the Zambian-Rhodesian border were South Africans masquerading as policemen who were in fact soldiers. The representative of Zambia has already referred to that incident. What further evidence do we need of South Africa's shameful involvement in these acts of aggression? The continued presence and intervention of these South African forces in Southern Rhodesia seriously threaten the sovereignty and territorial integrity of neighbouring African States. This is a situation which poses a threat to international peace and security. The international community, and particularly this Council,

would be failing in its duty if it remained indifferent to this blatant act of provocation.

54. By erecting a border blockade against Zambia the illegal Ian Smith régime has sought to frustrate Zambia's economic efforts by denying access across Rhodesia's borders to more than half of Zambia's imports, including its food supply and urgent equipment for the Kariba North Bank hydro-electric project. Very rightly, the Zambian people have rejected the Ian Smith offer of making an exception in that blockade for Zambian copper. It must be stressed that, far from that exception being a humanitarian act, Rhodesian railways were earning considerable foreign exchange from freight charges for the carriage of Zambian copper. The Rhodesian concession must therefore be viewed in that context.

55. The application of total sanctions against Rhodesia by Zambia, which is landlocked, is a singular act of courage which implies sacrifices in the costly extension of communication systems. In this connexion, my delegation wishes to extend our appreciation to the brotherly peoples of the United Republic of Tanzania, Zaire, Kenya and Malawi for their meritorious act of co-operation in Zambia's hour of need.

56. On the issue of the illegal Rhodesian blockade, my delegation is of the view that the right of landlocked countries to access to the sea must be scrupulously respected by all civilized nations. The erection of the blockade by Rhodesia is a provocative act, and the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, has an obligation to ensure by all means at its disposal that it is rolled back. For the time being, my delegation believes that Zambia is entitled to international assistance in terms of Articles 49 and 50 of the Charter. More than that, Security Council resolutions 253 (1968) and 277 (1970) must now be invoked to assist Zambia because of the deleterious effects on its economy of the application of sanctions against Rhodesia to which it is fully committed. By responding promptly, the Council would be putting into effect an operative paragraph of its own resolutions.

57. The crux of this source of tension is closely related to the present trouble in Rhodesia. The existing deplorable tragedy in Zimbabwe has its origins in a policy pursued actively by the United Kingdom since 1923 and designed to hand over power to the white minority régime. The United Kingdom took further steps in that direction when it decided to transfer to Southern Rhodesia certain attributes of sovereignty at the time of the dissolution of the Central African Federation. Ghana and other African countries pointed out the grave implications of those steps before the Security Council in August 1963 [see S/5382]. We spoke out then against the modalities of the transfer and, indeed, against the transfer of authority to a Government not based on majority rule. At that time, Ian Smith had come to power through the wholly unsuitable Constitution of 1961 and was boasting about seizing independence by force. Yet when Ghana presented to the Council a draft resolution [S/5425/Rev.1] that would have prevented the handing over of any armed forces or military aircraft to the racist régime of Ian Smith, the United Kingdom used its veto to prevent that text from being adopted. Except for the

United Kingdom, no single member of the Council was opposed to the draft resolution, which would have prevented the arming of the Rhodesian settlers. The British, having thus armed the Rhodesian settlers, had offered the latter the physical means they were to use to defy it, to carry out the subsequent revolt against the British Crown, to threaten the African continent with a racial war and to carry out acts of aggression and sabotage against Zambia and other neighbouring independent African States.

58. It is very easy to see from this development that the present treasonable situation in Zimbabwe flows directly from the United Kingdom Government's veto of the Security Council draft resolution in September 1963. The British Government has unfortunately repeated this sad ritual on a number of subsequent occasions in order to block any meaningful action on Rhodesia. For this reason, my delegation must reaffirm its conviction that the primary responsibility for the events in Zimbabwe lies with the British Government. We see in this our justification for calling on that Government to use all means, including the possible use of force, to quell the rebellion in Zimbabwe as a first measure.

59. My delegation further holds the United Kingdom responsible for the events in Zimbabwe on account of its contention that a "Parliamentary Convention" prevents it from exercising its undoubted legal powers to give effect in Southern Rhodesia to the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Because of this British parliamentary fiction, the international community is often lulled into accepting the ridiculous claim by the United Kingdom Government that Southern Rhodesia had never been a "colony" in the accepted and traditional sense of the word, but a "self-governing" Territory. On the basis of this argument, the United Kingdom initially refused to have the problem of Southern Rhodesia discussed at the United Nations. On grounds of this same fiction, the United Kingdom Government still refuses to comply with Article 73 (e) of the Charter which enjoins colonial and administering Powers to transmit each year to the Secretary-General information on their Territories. The illogical circumstances created by this fiction is that the United Kingdom was prepared to supply information about Ghana when it had achieved a large measure of internal self-government comparable to the status of Southern Rhodesia. Are we to understand that the above-mentioned British argument did not apply in the case of Ghana at the time?

60. This argument by which the United Kingdom proclaims its powerlessness to take effective measures against a particular régime which has rebelled against the British Crown and Parliament, to my mind, is strange and unacceptable in the face of the United Kingdom's apparent acceptance of its obligation with regard to Southern Rhodesia. In the view of my delegation, immediately the United Kingdom found itself unable to take the necessary effective measures, it should have given way to the United Nations and the international community, to consider taking action under Articles 41 and 42, for instance. Instead, we have had the curious position of the United Kingdom protecting the racist régime from outside pressure since, under international law, it is a British colony, while the United Kingdom itself excuses its failure to exercise its

legal right, to prevent the oppression and exploitation of the African inhabitants because of British parliamentary fiction. Africans have been continually mystified about this and it is no wonder that they have often concluded that the United Kingdom has been in active collusion with Ian Smith in denying the people of Zimbabwe their inalienable rights.

61. The daily erosion of these inalienable rights causes my delegation the greatest concern. The United Kingdom has stood by and watched Ian Smith and his collaborators pass a series of discriminatory laws against the Africans which have made conditions in Southern Rhodesia no better than those in the *apartheid* régime of South Africa. Large numbers of Africans have been evicted and dumped on to barren lands. In fact, the 5 million African inhabitants are allotted some 44 million acres of the worst agricultural land in the Territory, while the quarter of a million white settlers are allotted about 41 million acres of the best land. African farmers suffer discrimination in the prices paid for their products, in the crops they are allowed to produce and in agricultural loans and credits. African industrial wages are on average less than one tenth of those paid to Europeans; Africans are excluded from all the better paid employment in industry and are also in practice denied any entry into the professions. Africans are not allowed to own or rent property in the central urban areas; they are discriminated against in shops, hotels and places of entertainment and recreation, and every African must carry a pass. Education for the African population is confined to the minimum necessary knowledge required to equip a farm labourer or an unskilled industrial worker. The system of taxation imposed by the racist régime places an undue burden on the African inhabitants and indirect taxes are levied upon the necessities of the poorer classes of the population who are, of course, the Africans. Every avenue for constitutional redress has been closed. African political parties, ZANU and ZAPU, have been proscribed and their leaders detained; almost every type of legitimate political activity by Africans has been declared illegal and there is no political or industrial method by which the inhabitants can make their demands short of violence. Is it surprising then that the ninth Summit Conference of the Organization of African Unity stated in a resolution that the "prevailing situation leaves the African people . . . no other choice but armed struggle" [see S/10741 of 20 July 1972]?

62. We must all recognize that the situation in Southern Rhodesia is particularly grave. Ian Smith continues in power and seems to be perpetuating and strengthening his régime. The rebellion has taken on wider and more serious dimensions; South African mercenaries and armed forces have intervened in Southern Rhodesia and made common cause with the illegal racist régime in order to perpetrate more repressive acts, including political executions, against the African people in Zimbabwe. In fact, as I have stated in considerable detail, the régime grows each day more and more like the abhorrent *apartheid* régime of South Africa. The position of the Rhodesian African is rapidly deteriorating and there is a frightening diminution of his chances of gaining proper education and employment while his chances of improving his social status and holding land have equally suffered a severe set-back. He beholds before his

eyes the shrinking possibility of seeing prevail in the land of his birth the democracy loudly proclaimed by Britain.

63. It is in this context that we viewed the recent proposals for a settlement of the Rhodesian problem between the British Government and the Ian Smith clique. We asked ourselves the question whether the proposals were likely to reverse the downhill trend I have depicted and enable the Africans of Zimbabwe to live under a system of democracy they had been taught to believe in and encouraged to hope for by the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

64. After a critical analysis, it became evident to my delegation that the manner in which the British sought to achieve, for example, the first principle—guarantees of unimpeded progress to majority rule—was designed to avoid giving a categorical and sincere undertaking to enforce the principle of immediate majority rule in the Territory. The proposals spoke of highly complex arrangements which would be made to enable the Africans to proceed to parity of representation in the House of Assembly. However, the United Kingdom surprisingly accepted an initial proposition that a quarter of a million whites would be represented by 50 members while 5 million blacks were represented by eight.

65. Was this not an acceptance of the racist theory that the black man in Zimbabwe was not fit to govern himself? Without going into the details, it became very clear to my delegation that the process which had been laid down for the Africans to reach parity was too cumbersome and too slow. Unimpeded progress to majority rule could never have been brought about by the complex franchise arrangements which included unnecessarily clumsy and difficult hurdles for the Africans. How much easier would it have been if the people of Zimbabwe had been ensured the application of the principle of "one man, one vote", as practised in the United Kingdom and other parts of the world where the operation of democracy is an article of faith. The proposals with regard to the four other principles could be subjected to the same kind of analysis with the same regrettable result.

66. It was for the same reason that my delegation was highly pleased that the African people of Zimbabwe rightly rejected the proposals, and the Pearce Commission was able to confirm this total rejection. A new opportunity has been offered to the United Kingdom to work out fresh effective measures to crush the rebellion in Rhodesia and to secure for the African people of Zimbabwe their just rights.

67. The special responsibility for doing this rests on the United Kingdom since it has always affirmed that it has full authority and responsibility for dealing with the Southern Rhodesian situation. As the administering Power, it has the primary responsibility to restore constitutional government in Southern Rhodesia, but we should like to urge that, in whatever efforts it might make towards finding a solution to the problem, it should adhere strictly to the principle that there should be no independence before majority rule in Southern Rhodesia. Again, it is essential that any settlement relating to the future of that Territory be worked out with the fullest participation of all the

nationalist leaders and be seen to be freely enforced by the people.

68. The recent proposals for a settlement were rejected principally because this factor was overlooked. The proposals were worked out behind the backs of the majority of the African people of Zimbabwe who happen to be black and who outnumber the white settlers by 20 to 1. We should therefore like to warn that any attempt to negotiate the future of Zimbabwe with the illegal racist minority régime or to transfer to it any of the powers or attributes of sovereignty, or to promote independence without the prior establishment of a democratic system of government based on the aspirations of the majority of the population will be totally rejected and will also be fraught with danger in the future. We must insist upon this because, in our view, free consultations with the nationalist leaders and the liberation movements which they lead are vital to the success of any future negotiations. We believe that such consultations, in order to be free from tension, can only take place in a proper atmosphere when Joshua Nkomo, the Reverend Sithole, Bishop Muzerowa and the other leaders are allowed freely to participate in the national life of their own territory. As a first step, therefore, the United Kingdom must secure the release of all the nationalist leaders from imprisonment, detention or restrictions of any kind and encourage the institution of a dialogue between them and the Ian Smith régime. This would be accompanied by a lifting of the ban on political activity to permit free expression of ideas and sentiments, the repeal of all discriminatory legislation and the establishment of full democratic freedom and equality of political rights.

69. When the above conditions are fulfilled, the stage will then be set for the holding of a constitutional conference with the participation of the genuine political representatives of the entire population of Southern Rhodesia, with a view to the adoption of a new constitution guaranteeing universal adult suffrage—that is, one man, one vote—free elections and independence. Ghana and other former British colonies went through a similar process to become independent and we fail to see why it should be different in the case of Southern Rhodesia.

70. Since negotiations with the settlers have not proceeded satisfactorily, the time has come for the United Kingdom Government to consider promoting such a constitutional conference in order to ensure Rhodesia's progress as a whole. It may be recalled that the early convening of this constitutional conference was urged in the draft resolution presented to the Security Council in September 1972 by the African delegations on that Council (S/10805/Rev.1). The same draft resolution contained a number of other measures which had all the elements for contributing positively to the solving of the problem of Southern Rhodesia. We were therefore disappointed that the United Kingdom thought fit to vote against the draft resolution and make its adoption impossible, thus thwarting sincere efforts at securing the enjoyment by the people of Zimbabwe as a whole of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. The main provisions of that draft resolution were repeated in resolution 2945 (XXVII) adopted by the General Assembly on 7 December 1972. Ghana fully supported that resolution,

but the United Kingdom, along with Portugal, the United States and South Africa, again voted against.

71. This British action justifiably gives rise to my delegation's suspicion as to the intentions of the British Government with regard to Southern Rhodesia. This suspicion forces my delegation to the conclusion that the British Government is only buying time. What the British Government desires is that the Smith régime should complete the process begun by it: namely, to establish another white-dominated country in Africa to keep South Africa company.

72. The United Kingdom and other permanent members of the Security Council have an urgent responsibility of ensuring that they and the international community at large put an end to a racist régime whose aim is to keep a black majority in permanent subjugation. We consider this responsibility very grave. They have to help bring about the conditions under which Southern Rhodesia can achieve independence on the basis of the political and social equality of all peoples. They should deny recognition of the illegal régime and ensure its international isolation by a total and sincere adherence to the economic sanctions imposed by the Council.

73. In this regard there is abundant evidence that the sanctions imposed by the Security Council are being breached in many devious ways. The Ghana Government has consistently maintained that, if any economic blockade of Southern Rhodesia is to be effective, this Organization should ensure that all its Members, including Portugal and South Africa, apply the sanctions faithfully and sincerely. My delegation therefore shares the conviction of the Assembly, expressed in its resolution 2946 (XXVII), that these sanctions will not put an end to the illegal racist minority régime unless they are comprehensive, mandatory, effectively supervised, enforced and complied with by all States, particularly by South Africa and Portugal. We must ensure that these conditions are fulfilled so that the desired results are achieved.

74. This Organization must deplore the deliberate opposition and non-co-operation of certain Powers and the refusal of others to co-operate with the United Nations in the effective application of sanctions. It is in this context that we regret the vacillations and hypocrisy of the very countries which, alas, profess only lip-service to anti-colonialism. We also unreservedly condemn the continued importation by the Government of the United States of chrome and nickel from Zimbabwe in open contravention of the provisions of Security Council resolutions 253 (1968), 277 (1970), 288 (1970) and 314 (1972), contrary to the specific obligations assumed by the United States under Article 25 of the Charter. My delegation would like to see those countries actively helping to strengthen the sanctions and extend them to cover South Africa and Portugal, which countries have aided Southern Rhodesia to flout the wishes of this Organization with impunity.

75. The task of the international community with regard to the problem of Southern Rhodesia is clear. We must take effective steps to bring about in Zimbabwe the overthrow

of the illegal régime of Ian Smith and the installation of a Government based on majority rule. The necessary political will has been lacking but we are convinced that it is not too late for the United Kingdom and the great Powers in general to agree to take all the possible steps—ranging from the blockade of ports to extreme exertion of pressure on Portugal and South Africa—if, as the United Kingdom Government suggests, the only method of bringing down the Smith régime is an economic blockade. When the Smith régime has, as we hope, been toppled in this manner, the United Kingdom can then create the conditions necessary to enable the Territory to advance rapidly to independence by a democratic process which will guarantee majority rule. We must all resolve not to let these worthy objectives appear like impossible dreams.

76. I have dwelt at some considerable length on the dangers of the internal situation in Zimbabwe and proposed some measures by which that situation may be remedied. I have done so in the conviction that the present acts of aggression and subversion against Zambia can cease permanently only when the rebellion in Zimbabwe has been crushed. That will require that the racist régime of Ian Smith be eased out and replaced by a Government based on majority rule. In our judgement, therefore, any other solution can only be temporary, since Zambia and the rest of Africa can never accept the Smith régime, by reason of Africa's abhorrence of colonialism and *apartheid*, which are the very negation of freedom and justice.

77. A policy of indecision and unnecessary prevarication will only reinforce the fierce determination of the people of Zimbabwe to shake off the yoke of imperialism. Wars of liberation, as eloquently demonstrated in Indo-China, have a way of building their own momentum. Fed by grass-roots support, they rarely disintegrate before they have accomplished their objectives, reached a settlement or had the circumstances changed. Motivated by love of country, no sacrifice is considered too great. You kill a thousand and a thousand warriors rise to take their heroic places. One cannot suppress the indomitable spirit of such valiant people. A similar situation is being enacted today in Zimbabwe and the act of statesmanship is to come to terms with this situation before it assumes frightful proportions and, like an avalanche, sweeps everything before it. In that event, the bigoted whites in Rhodesia who are still living in darkness will have only themselves to blame.

78. As long as the illegality of Rhodesia remains, so long will the Smith régime continue to seek to frustrate the determination of neighbouring countries like Zambia through border closures and economic blockades such as we are witnessing today. The Smith régime was itself born out of the first aggression that was committed when the United Kingdom, through acts of omission and commission, made it possible for the racist majority régime to impose itself illegally on the indigenous people of Zimbabwe. A régime born out of illegality and violence can hardly be expected to refrain from aggressive acts against its neighbours. It must go. While this illegality remains, the Council has the duty, the solemn and urgent duty, to render it harmless to its neighbours.

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

80. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): Mr. President, I must first of all thank you and all the members of the Security Council for giving me this opportunity to participate in the Council's consideration of the very serious question before it. Before I proceed to the subject before us, however, permit me, Sir, to say on behalf of the Tanzanian delegation how glad we are to see you preside over the Security Council. While in your personal capacity you have demonstrated to us great capabilities, experience and devotion which guarantee our success in the deliberations of the Security Council, we should like to mention also that, represented by your qualities, is the well-known championship of your country, Indonesia, in all questions of the liberation of peoples from colonialism and racist domination. The historical ties of friendship and co-operation that bind the peoples of Indonesia and Tanzania are a matter of record. I am therefore particularly gratified to see you, a worthy representative of the friendly Government and people of Indonesia, preside over the Security Council as it deliberates over a matter of vital interest and concern to our people and Government.

81. The problem upon which the Security Council is called upon to act is an African problem and, as an African State, my country has of course a great interest vested in it. As it is a problem that directly and specially affects Zambia, I need hardly point out why Tanzania is even more concerned, for the intimate brotherly relations between the United Republic of Tanzania and the Republic of Zambia are well known. Nor do I need to mention why the aggressive activities of the minority racist régime of Ian Smith and those of South Africa, with which country the Smith régime is in league, are as much directed against my country as they are against Zambia, for the two sister States share not only the common commitment to the liberation of the subjugated and oppressed peoples in southern Africa, but also physical proximity to the hotbed of colonial and racial strife—southern Africa.

82. My colleague and brother the representative of Zambia, Ambassador Lusaka, has already related to this Council in considerable detail the explosive situation that has developed on the Zambian borders. Once more the illegal minority racist Smith régime is attempting, albeit in a hopeless manner, to wriggle out of its predicament at the expense of a country that is in no way to blame for the consequences of its own rebellion. Propelled by the hopeless illusion that if intimidation is employed they will secure some kind of relief, that if blackmail is used they may get some breathing space and that if a scapegoat is found that could serve the purpose of creating hysteria they will divert attention from the realities inside Zimbabwe, the racist Smith and his fellow outlaws have increased their oppression and terror in Zimbabwe and blockaded Zambia from the Rhodesian borders. In the unholy mutual obligation to defend their bizarre policies of racialism and human exploitation, South Africa has come to the aid of the Salisbury Fascist clique by increasing its military intervention in Rhodesia by some 4,000 South African troops, most

of whom are deployed along the Zambezi border facing Zambia.

83. South Africa's role in assisting Ian Smith in his aggressive acts against Zambia as well as that régime's own unprovoked acts of aggression against that country, have already been brought to the attention of this Council. Indeed, on 12 October 1971, it adopted resolution 300 (1971), calling upon South Africa to respect fully the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Zambia. That resolution was the result of a justified complaint by Zambia against South Africa's violation of Zambia's sovereignty. Yet in spite of the calls by the Security Council and the General Assembly, it is quite evident that the *apartheid* régime in Pretoria has no intention of changing its aggressive policies or, for that matter, repenting its insane and obnoxious *apartheid* policies. Quite the contrary, it is now common knowledge that the Vorster régime is feverishly building up its military power and preparing itself for further acts of aggression against independent African States which uncompromisingly oppose colonialism and racialism. It does not require an expert on southern Africa to recognize that the current desperate measures adopted by the Smith régime have been made possible only by that régime's reliance on the solid support and assistance from the *apartheid* régime. The moves made by the two racist minority régimes present a grave situation in the region and seriously threaten international peace and security.

84. The outrageous acts which the Smith régime is committing and the provocations it is perpetrating against the Republic of Zambia do not come as a surprise to us. A racist minority régime whose very existence is not only illegal but also immoral can perpetuate itself only by criminal and immoral means. The insane acts of these two régimes are simply a manifestation of the popular opposition within Zimbabwe and South Africa against the existence of injustice and tyranny. In Zimbabwe, as well as in South Africa, the masses are displaying with admirable courage their resolute rejection of the two régimes, and the entire African continent has determined to wipe away all vestiges of colonialism and racialism. The world community, through the United Nations and other forums like the Group of non-aligned countries, has expressed its contempt for and opposition to the existence of these shameful régimes in South Africa and Zimbabwe. Thus ostracized from the international community, the two are left faced with the wave of the liberation struggle which will ultimately triumph.

85. Following the decisive rejection of the Anglo-Smith proposals for a settlement, the valiant people of Zimbabwe have intensified their struggle against the Smith régime. Freedom fighters working within Zimbabwe have shaken the power of the rebels who have now been thrown into panic and irrational actions. We now witness repugnant so-called laws which permit collective punishment based on suspicion. Needless to point out, such measures are the height of Fascism. The allegation that the difficulties in which Ian Smith and his fellow rebels find themselves are caused by Zambia has no basis whatsoever, since we all know too well that the Zimbabweans need no one to remind them of their birth and inalienable right to

independence and self-determination. Nor do they need any prompting from without to reject and rise against the tyranny of the racist minority. Mr. Smith himself knows only too well that his problem is not Zambia—and not any other independent African State for that matter—but his own criminal acts of rebellion and lust to dominate and exploit the Zimbabweans.

86. Having failed to contain the popular uprising in Zimbabwe, the racist minority régime is now using scapegoat tactics. Zambia, being in the forefront, is the immediate target. As representatives are aware, the Smith régime, in collusion with South Africa and Portugal, has right from the time of its rebellion imposed a series of economic actions designed to blockade Zambia and strangle its economy. There has been a systematic increase in freight rates, a surcharge on Zambian goods coming through the only railway which exists and sometimes an absolute hold-up of goods coming through ports in the south which Zambia has been forced to use for many of its essential imports. And now there is a complete blockade from the Rhodesian border.

87. All these moves have only one purpose. They are intended to undermine the freedom of Zambia and thus the freedom of Africa. Although Zambia is the priority target now, it is not the final target. The final target is to weaken the liberation struggle and perpetuate colonialism and racialism in Zimbabwe and the rest of Africa. The effect is not only to challenge the ideals, purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations but indeed to undermine the very foundation of our Organization.

88. In this weird ambition, Ian Smith and his cohorts greatly count on, and in fact are always assured of, the active support and collaboration of the Pretoria clique and the Lisbon colonialists, who continue with impunity and in complete disregard of international public opinion and moral ethics to pursue the policies of colonialism and racialism which inflict upon those oppressed masses untold miseries and humiliation.

89. As we know, all these are but vain attempts to prevent the inevitable wind of freedom which will ultimately wipe out the vestiges of colonialism and exploitation in Africa and elsewhere. The issue is no longer whether the Zimbabweans or the South African masses will liberate themselves from the yoke of oppressive racist minority régimes. The issue is whether the international community, rather than deal decisively with these oppressive régimes, will let the situation continue to deteriorate and further threaten international peace and security. For we believe that this explosive situation would not have arisen had all those concerned acted in conformity with their respective obligations at the appropriate time.

90. In this regard we cannot but once again deplore the manner in which the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, has been handling the question of Southern Rhodesia. While the United Kingdom has always maintained, and rightly so, that Southern Rhodesia is its colony, there has been no indication that it is seriously concerned with the people of Zimbabwe, for it must be clearly reaffirmed that the Government of the United Kingdom has been

engaged in activities which have the effect only of strengthening the illegal racist minority régime in Salisbury. Indeed, as we have repeatedly maintained, the British Government's performance has been that of betrayal of the cause of the Zimbabwean Africans. Members of this Council are well aware of the background of the question of Southern Rhodesia and I need not therefore waste their time narrating it. But I feel it necessary to point out again that the United Kingdom cannot be exonerated from the responsibility for the consequences of its failure to discharge its obligations to the Zimbabwean people. And there is not the slightest doubt that it is due to that failure—reflected in numerous acts of omission and commission—that the Republic of Zambia today is made to pay the price of being a faithful and loyal adherent to the decisions and recommendations of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

91. In this connexion we cannot but also reiterate our indignation to those Governments which, under flimsy pretexts, have provided and/or are providing South Africa with moral or material support, in particular those which continue shamelessly to provide it with military equipment. As we have been informed, these weapons are now being used in collaboration with Ian Smith to repress the Zimbabweans and intimidate Zambia. It is all the more deplorable that among the accessories to the crimes committed by the unholy alliance of Lisbon, Salisbury and Pretoria are some of the very members of this Council who do so either through their alliance with NATO or in their individual capacity.

92. This esteemed body, the Security Council, has, under its resolutions, imposed sanctions on Southern Rhodesia in order to bring down the Smith régime. In a display of complete disregard for the Zimbabweans and in violation of the decisions of the Council and the provisions of the Charter, certain Powers, including a permanent member of the Council, have violated the decision on sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. These violations, especially by a permanent member of the Council, could not but have the effect of giving some comfort and encouragement to the racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia.

93. It need hardly be mentioned that the Pretoria régime continues to exist and maintain its arrogance because of the support it enjoys from some Western Powers which allow their citizens to continue to invest in or trade with South Africa. Similarly, it has been said *ad infinitum* that Portugal, economically weak as it is, would not have continued to wage colonial wars in Africa without the assistance of its NATO allies.

94. All in all, the explosive situation which now obtains on the Zambian borders is a direct consequence of the continued existence of the racist minority cliques in Pretoria and Salisbury, which in turn owe their existence to the failure on the part of some of the Members of the United Nations to live up to the principles and purposes of the Charter.

95. That brings me to the measures which my delegation considers should be taken as a minimum by this Council in connexion with the problem under consideration. First, we

must recognize the courage of the Zambian people in faithfully upholding the principles of the Charter and the decisions of the Council, while facing the aggressive provocations by the racist and colonialist régimes of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. Fighting for the rights and dignity of man on behalf of us all, Zambia, under the dynamic and steadfast leadership of President Kenneth Kaunda, deserves the full support of the United Nations. In this connexion, my delegation requests that the Council examine the best ways and means to assist Zambia, in particular the possibility of establishing a special economic assistance fund to that end. Furthermore, this Council should require the United Kingdom to compensate Zambia for the losses which Zambia is facing as a result of the failure of the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, to bring down the rebellion in Her Majesty's colony.

96. With regard to the aggressive designs of the minority régime in Pretoria, we believe that it is high time the Security Council confronted the menace posed by that régime with appropriate action in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter, including those in Chapter VII. At the same time, it is essential for the Security Council, as a matter of the utmost priority, to call once again upon the Government of South Africa to withdraw its military forces from the Territory of Southern Rhodesia and to desist forthwith from its acts of provocation against the Republic of Zambia. It is perhaps worth noting here that these last two demands are simply a reiteration of what the Security Council has already done on previous occasions. In the circumstances, it is important to underscore that, in the interests of international peace and security as well as in the interests of the prestige and effectiveness of the United Nations, and more particularly the Security Council itself, this body must take appropriate measures to ensure the implementation of its own decisions.

97. But, above all, my delegation submits that this is no longer the time for the Security Council and indeed for the United Nations to be contented with half-hearted measures in confronting the challenge imposed on it by the white minority régime. This challenge must now be met with the full force of the international community—morally, politically and otherwise. The Security Council's responsibilities in this are very clear. It must act to reverse the alarming trend towards conflagration in that area. Thus, in considering Zambia's, and indeed Africa's, current complaint against the forces of racism and tyranny designed to strangle the economy of Zambia and threaten its very independence, the Security Council must find the remedy to the root cause of the problem. In the case of the situation of which the Council is currently seized, the problem lies in the continuation of the régime of the white minority in Salisbury. That régime must be brought to its knees. The rebellion must be ended and the people of Zimbabwe must be allowed to exercise their right to self-determination and independence.

98. To that end, we expect that from the present deliberations will come not only an unambiguous Security Council call for the scrupulous enforcement of the current mandatory sanctions against the Smith régime but also a decision to widen the scope of sanctions to include all the

measures envisaged under Article 41 of the Charter. Present circumstances dictate that such steps should be the minimum envisaged by the Security Council if the United Nations is really serious about eliminating tyranny and injustice in Southern Rhodesia, now epitomized in the outlaw régime of Ian Smith. It is the sincere hope of my Government that such measures will receive the support of the United Kingdom Government. For any equivocation on the part of the administering Power will serve only further to confirm our fears that the British Government, while giving lip-service support to the demands to bring an end to the rebellion in Southern Rhodesia, is miserably shirking its responsibilities and particularly treating the interests of the 5 million Africans with indifference. We most earnestly call upon the United Kingdom to shoulder its responsibilities and for once demonstrate its good faith in trying to solve the mess which it has to a very great extent helped to create in that part of the African continent.

99. The African States have on numerous occasions drawn the attention of the Security Council to the very serious threat to international peace and security resulting from the grave situation prevailing in southern Africa. But more often than not the Council has failed to live up to the expectations of the African people, as indeed to the aspirations of peace- and freedom-loving mankind. On too many occasions has the Council been immobilized by the misuse of the powers of some of its members. In attempting to rationalize their positions, these members have at times tried to depict Africa's concern as being unnecessarily alarmist.

100. Yet as things now take a turn for the worse, making a major confrontation no longer a distant reality but an immediate possibility, one would hope that these Powers will re-examine their positions and take their responsibilities under the Charter more seriously and responsibly. The Tanzanian delegation hopes that the Security Council will avail itself of the opportunity of the current deliberations on the Pretoria/Salisbury acts of aggression against Zambia to turn a new page in the history of United Nations action in Southern Rhodesia.

101. Failure to do so could have disastrous consequences for peace in southern Africa, for peace in Africa and indeed for peace in the world. The Council must recognize that the current threats against Zambia are just part of the colonialist, racist and imperialist conspiracy aimed at perpetuating, no matter at what cost, the enslavement of the African people. The blockade against Zambia, acts of aggression committed by Portugal against my own country, the cowardly and shocking assassination of one of Africa's greatest sons—Amílcar Cabral, Secretary-General of the PAIGC [*Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde*],—have all taken place in this month of January. Does this Council really need any further barometer to gauge the explosive nature of the situation in the area brought about by the ruthless, barbaric and criminal monstrosities of the desperate men who currently rule in Lisbon, Pretoria and Salisbury? I submit that failure now to act effectively and decisively could subsequently make the Security Council an unwilling accomplice of a bloody conflagration.

102. The PRESIDENT: The next name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Morocco, I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

103. Mr. ZENTAR (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should like first to discharge a twofold duty. First, I should like to thank you and the members of the Security Council for having allowed me to take part, on behalf of my country, in a particularly moving debate which has been requested by a country occupying a special position in the heart of all Africans. Secondly, I should like to congratulate you on the high position you are occupying at present and express to you the happiness I feel at seeing you in the Chair, especially because of the numerous ties of fraternity which unite your country and mine.

104. We have often had occasion, in the General Assembly or in the Security Council, to express the opinion that African countries cannot consider their independence as genuine or even viable as long as on the continent of Africa there remain colonialist and racist strongholds, no matter what their size or status. We have often expressed this view, not so much because we want to prove our solidarity, a natural and permanent solidarity with our brothers still fighting under foreign domination, but because experience has taught us that any colonial or racist régime, unjust and repressive in essence, inevitably engenders a process of violence which soon spills over the limits of its territory to threaten first the security of neighbouring countries and then international peace as a whole.

105. I remember that, at the time when Ian Smith was preparing his unilateral declaration of independence, when the evil deed had not yet been done, the Organization of African Unity was convening in Accra, Ghana, its annual conference of Heads of State. The representative of the United Kingdom in Accra had established numerous contacts with a view to explaining, since he could not justify, current developments in Rhodesia, developments which were to lead to the present impasse. I must state that the African delegations expressed their viewpoint at that time with a frankness and clear-sightedness that were remarkable. At the time, no shot had been fired, no mine had exploded, not one drop of blood had yet flowed in Rhodesia or in its vicinity; but the African warnings, unfortunately, were at that time in the nature of a prophecy for Rhodesia as well as for other Territories on the continent still under colonial domination.

106. The Security Council has for some years been devoting most of its time to the multiple tragedies occurring on our continent of Africa. The Council has many times been seized of problems concerning African Territories under foreign domination as such. But very often the Council has also had to consider the consequences to neighbouring independent countries of the repressive policies pursued in occupied Territories. I think I can do no better than quote the passage devoted to this question by the Foreign Ministers of Non-aligned Countries in their Declaration adopted at Georgetown last August:

"The colonialist and the racist régimes in southern Africa, aided and abetted by international imperialism,

are promoting conspiracies, provocations, interference and subversions against independent African nations, such as the Republic of Guinea, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia"—the case we are considering today—"the People's Republic of Congo, and Senegal."

Further on the Declaration added:

"The Conference . . . brings to the attention of the United Nations Organization, and particularly to the attention of the Security Council, the aggressive nature of such policies which clearly violate international law and obviously threaten international peace and security."

107. The Security Council has already had an opportunity to consider the complaints of many African countries, Members of the United Nations and victims of clear-cut aggression on the part of repressive colonialist forces. Zambia today is a victim of aggression, economically and militarily. Zambia is an African country enjoying great prestige. Its President, Mr. Kenneth Kaunda, is one of the most highly esteemed leaders of the continent, one of the leaders most devoted to the cause of freedom and dignity. He leads his people in a wise, peaceful and determined manner, with a view to achieving development and prosperity in Zambia. That country does its duty in the best possible way towards Africa and towards the international community as a whole. Thanks to these efforts, Zambia is in the forefront of the fight for freedom and justice in Africa and in the world. Thus, that country and its President are in total harmony with the principles and purposes of the Organization of African Unity, the non-aligned countries and the Charter of the United Nations. On this occasion, I should like to pay a special tribute to the African countries immediately neighbouring Zambia—I have in mind the United Republic of Tanzania, Zaire, Kenya and Malawi—for the understanding and fraternal support they are giving to Zambia in its current trials. By the same token, I should like to recall that His Majesty Hassan II, the current President of the Organization of African Unity, has, in this capacity, expressed to President Kenneth Kaunda the tribute and sympathy of the whole of Africa for the heavy sacrifices accepted by the people of Zambia in its support for the heroic struggle of the Zimbabwe people. The Moroccan Sovereign also assured President Kaunda of the unanimous solidarity of the countries members of OAU and their support for the achievement of the objectives and the affirmation of the rights of that people.

108. The struggle of the Zimbabwe people is in tune with the sense of history. It is complementary to and inseparable from the fight of the peoples of Mozambique, Angola, Guinea (Bissau), South Africa and the Sahara under Spanish domination. The fight of all these peoples is legitimate and consonant with the objectives of our Organization and with our common ideals, and therefore it is entitled to have our understanding and full support.

109. Today Zambia is the victim of economic measures of coercion accompanied by military measures taken in conjunction with the neighbouring racist and colonialist régimes, especially the Pretoria régime, which are just as interested in the fight against the irresistible movement towards freedom in that area and on the whole African

continent. Zambia, its President and its people are ready to face this challenge, a challenge which is also at all Africans and all Members of the United Nations.

110. We must not forget that the Council has already considered the Rhodesian problem and that many constructive resolutions have remained a dead letter. The new dimensions of that crisis today must impel the Council to re-examine the question from the beginning. It serves no purpose to apply balm to the surface when the inner wound is clearly identified. The Government of South Africa must be vigorously condemned for its aggression against Zambia. The illegal Salisbury régime must be eliminated. The Council must adopt the most rigorous and firmest sanctions against the racist régime of Ian Smith. The country mainly responsible for this situation, the United Kingdom, must finally co-operate with the United Nations and use effective and adequate means at its disposal, which we have constantly asked of it, so as to enable the African majority fully to enjoy all its rights on its territory in conformity with the undisputed rights of every people on earth. If, in this tense and worsening situation, the Security Council were to limit itself once again to dealing only with the symptoms without extirpating the roots of the evil, that would only be tantamount to making a new appointment to meet in the Council after once again, alas, things had become more serious in that part of the world.

111. Finally, I should like to express the wish that the United Nations, and especially the Secretary-General, will heed Zambia's appeal and furnish all the necessary assistance to the Zambian Government so as to enable it to pursue its harmonious task of economic development independently of all the obstacles erected on its path by the racist Governments which are trying to break it on an anvil of economic and military measures.

112. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): We have met today to consider the situation that has arisen as a result of recent developments on the border between Zambia and Southern Rhodesia. It was right that we should hear first from the representative of Zambia and from the representatives of other countries which, whether because of geographical location or their office in the African Group and the Organization of African Unity, are most closely involved. We have listened with great attention to all of them. With some of what has been said, particularly about my own Government, I cannot be expected to agree. In this Council we have often been over the ground in relation to the situation in Rhodesia and the role of Her Majesty's Government, and I do not wish to go over it all again on the present occasion. I have not asked to speak at this early stage in order to concentrate on those aspects. We do not want to let this debate degenerate into sterile confrontation and argument. Rather, I should like to speak briefly on certain points on which I think there will be general agreement and which may point the way to a constructive and helpful result from this debate.

113. In the first place I wish to make it clear that my delegation deplores the closure by the Rhodesian régime of the border with Zambia. Perhaps I may quote what the British Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary, Sir Alec

Douglas-Home, said in the House of Commons about it today. He said:

"This is a most regrettable development. I believe it can only make more difficult the search for an acceptable settlement of the Rhodesian problem and increase the level of tension in the whole area."³

Some of the immediate consequences have been tragic. I should like to express the sympathy of my delegation to the representative of Zambia on the tragic loss of life in his country as a result of the explosion of landmines of which he has informed us today.

114. The Government of Zambia finds itself in a difficult circumstance as a result of these developments. It is its right to come to the Security Council. We agree with it that the debate in the Security Council should provide a useful opportunity for members to express their views and, we hope, to bring their influence to bear to put an end to the present deplorable situation.

115. My Government has been following the situation very closely. Both sides have been in touch with the British Government and we have made it clear that we should like to see an end to the confrontation, the re-opening of the border and an early return to peaceful conditions. Again, as Sir Alec Douglas-Home said today, "If we can help, we have told the Zambian Government that we will do so."

116. In a situation like the present one, there is bound to be some confusion before we arrive at the exact facts. There have been reports of incidents of violence on both sides of the border. The representative of Zambia has today given us an authoritative account of events on the Zambian side of the frontier. My Government has consistently condemned the use of violence and intimidation of any kind for political ends, and we deplore incidents which cause harm and suffering to individuals. I am sure none of us will have any difficulty in strongly urging all concerned to do all in their power to prevent further acts of violence across the border.

117. There have been other reports of 4,000 South African troops having recently entered Rhodesia. That has been categorically denied by the South African authorities and in the letter dated 26 January from the representative of South Africa *[S/10870]*. My Government has no evidence to contradict the South African denial of the story, but we have long been aware of the presence of South African police in Rhodesia and the South African Government has been aware of our disapproval and our desire that they should be withdrawn. It is this sort of thing that illustrates the dangers of escalation which can arise from such a situation. It is this danger that must concern us most. If I may again quote from Sir Alec Douglas-Home in the House of Commons today, he said:

"When a Government pursuing racialist policies inside a country finds freedom fighters coming from outside, I am

³ See *Parliamentary Debates (Hansard), House of Commons, Official Report, Fifth Series*, vol. 849 (London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office), col. 931.

afraid that that is a situation which I have warned time and again would be bound to lead to conflict, and my fear all along, through all these years and from long ago, has been that eventually there would be a front on the Zambezi between the southern half of Africa and the north. That is something we must all try to avoid."⁴

118. Whatever may be unclear about the situation, however, certain things are very clear. The first is that it benefits no one. The representative of Zambia has already explained the difficulties his country faces. They were serious enough before the recent developments, and have been intensified by the illegal régime's action and Zambia's reaction to it.

119. As for the future, it is of course for the Zambian Government to decide its policy in regard to the resumption of the movements interrupted by the closure of the Rhodesian border if it should be reopened. If it decides—as it appears from the speech of the representative of Zambia it has decided—that it can now apply the existing sanctions against Rhodesia without exception, there is no doubt that that would contribute to the further effectiveness of sanctions and impose a considerable extra burden on the Rhodesian balance of payments. That, however, would not be a reason for extending the existing sanctions. As we have often pointed out, what is wrong with the existing sanctions is not that they are not wide enough; it is that they are not rigorously enough applied even by all the States which profess to comply fully with them.

120. We have often made our views clear on the question of the extension of sanctions as distinct from making the existing sanctions more effective. The only way in which their application to Rhodesia could in theory be made more comprehensive would be through relatively minor measures, measures which could well have effects contrary to the aims we wish to achieve—for example, a ban on communications would prevent further contacts with all parties in Rhodesia. This point was put very clearly by Ambassador Yost nearly three years ago, on 18 March 1970, when he said:

"Even if it were possible, we should not want to cut off all the inhabitants of Rhodesia, blacks as well as whites, foreigners as well as nationals, from the free flow of information from outside. There might be nothing which would be more agreeable to the minority régime than to have our help in bringing down an iron curtain around its people. Certainly such an act would be totally ineffective in inducing the régime to change its oppressive policies."
[1535th meeting, para. 35.]

121. Those points which I have just quoted are just as valid today as they were three years ago; in fact, in the light of the report of the Pearce Commission⁵, and the reactions to it, I am not sure that they are not even more pertinent today. In any case, the whole question of sanctions has been remitted for study by the Sanctions Committee under Security Council resolution 320 (1972) and it is for that Committee to produce any recommendations necessary.

⁴ *Ibid.*, col. 932.

⁵ *Rhodesia: report of the Commission on Rhodesian opinion under the chairmanship of the Right Honourable the Lord Pearce* (London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1972), Cmnd. 4964.

122. The second aspect of the present situation which is very clear is that it is not conducive to a solution of the longer-term political problem of Rhodesia. There is a great deal at stake. Southern African problems have given the most serious concern to this Council and to the whole United Nations for many years. These problems, especially as regards Southern Rhodesia, are now at a crucial point. There are plenty of reasons to be profoundly pessimistic about the future, and I recall that I described these in some detail when I explained to this Council in November 1971 [1602nd meeting] what might happen if the efforts for a peaceful settlement did not succeed. As it happened, the Pearce Commission later reported, and the British Government accepted, that the proposals then suggested were not acceptable to the people of Rhodesia as a whole.

123. For further progress we are dependent, before all and above all, on developments in relations between all parties within Rhodesia itself. There have been some positive signs in this respect, and there have been some that are less encouraging. But we cannot now afford to abandon hope. A just and acceptable political settlement within Southern Rhodesia is what we must all pray for, and on it all else hinges. Many other problems have been referred to today, and more will doubtless be mentioned in the course of the debate, but if we can get a peaceful political settlement those problems will solve themselves. And we must surely make sure that what is said or done in this Council does not hinder the chances of a peaceful solution.

124. The Security Council, as was well brought out in the replies to the Secretary-General's note of 2 February 1972⁶ transmitting the text of General Assembly resolution 2864 (XXVI), disposes of several means of bringing its influence to bear. The passage of resolutions is one, but only one, of these methods, and it may be that in the present instance it is not the most appropriate method. In the present case, at any rate, I very much hope that we can respond to the immediate needs of the moment by concentrating on the agreement that unites us.

125. It would be premature for me to try to summarize this before other members of the Council have spoken, and I look forward to hearing what my colleagues have to say. I think, however, that no one will dispute that recent developments on the Rhodesian-Zambian border are regrettable and that the alleviation of the resulting hardship and the longer-term implications need close attention and careful study. I hope and believe that the expression of such views by the members of this Council will itself exercise a beneficial influence upon developments and will enable us to consider what should be done next.

126. Mr. KOMATINA (Yugoslavia): It was with a feeling of urgency and grave concern over the economic blockade and the military moves undertaken by the illegal racist régime of Southern Rhodesia against Zambia, which constituted an immediate threat to peace and security in the whole area, that my delegation, upon instructions from my Government, joined Zambia and other African States in requesting an urgent meeting of the Security Council.

⁶ A/8847 and Add.1.

127. The resolution of Yugoslavia to the dangerous crisis along the Zambian-Rhodesian border caused by the Smith régime's acts of aggression was swift and unmistakable, as it always has been in such situations. The Yugoslav Government issued an official statement condemning Southern Rhodesia's action and requesting—and, for its part, offering—all possible support and help to Zambia. Together with other non-aligned nations represented in the United Nations, we sent a joint cable to the President of Zambia in which we, *inter alia*, paid a tribute to the determination of the people of Zambia to face the challenges which confronted them and to their readiness to make sacrifices and undergo suffering to safeguard their independence and the cause of freedom. The joint cable stated also that we were following the situation closely and had agreed to meet again to determine a further course of action as circumstances may warrant.

128. There is no need for me, after the exhaustive and detailed rendering of all the relevant facts by the representatives of Zambia and other African States this afternoon, to repeat them. They are all well known and have been widely reported in the international press. Consequently, I would rather attempt briefly to state and underscore those disturbing and disturbingly novel aspects of the crisis before us, as seen by my delegation. I shall also state what in the view of my Government must be done by the Security Council, by the United Nations and by Member States—especially by those which are involved or which bear special responsibility for the state of affairs surrounding the situation there—if we are to protect and effectively assist a peace-loving Member State which is under pressure and blockade and if we are to start dealing meaningfully with the root causes of the festering hotbed of tension, conflict and war in that area.

129. To start with, we have the shocking, impermissible and, for the United Nations, humiliating situation that an illegal racist régime, which the administering Power had the obligation to eliminate and which the United Nations tried to bring down through economic sanctions and isolation, now imposes its own blockades against Charter-abiding Members of our Organization. That is a most negative turn of events which should cause the gravest concern on all sides, because it means that the racist, colonialist and outlaw régimes in southern Africa, the régimes of South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Portugal, in their collusion and conspiracy and aided and abetted by their principal trading and allied partners, are turning to offensive and to bolder and bolder acts of aggression and defiance.

130. The blockade of the Zambian border and the increased repressive measures taken inside Southern Rhodesia by the Smith régime; the defiance of the United Nations constituted by the further dismemberment of Namibia through new "bantustans", and the increased repressive measures taken both inside Namibia and inside South Africa by the *apartheid* régime; the continuation of the cruel colonial war in Angola, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde and the assassination of the leaders of their liberation movements—the most recent being that of Amílcar Cabral—by Portugal; the mutual and joint military activities and co-operation in the military struggle against African peoples by all three of these régimes; their

joint, combined operation for breaking the United Nations sanctions against Southern Rhodesia—these are only some instances and examples of their intent and the challenge which they put before us. It is also their characteristic answer to the attempt to prevail upon South Africa through contacts and talks to stop opposing the United Nations with respect to Namibia; their answer to the Security Council's call in resolution 322 (1972) addressed to the Government of Portugal, asking it to enter into negotiations with the national liberation movements of the so-called Portuguese Territories; their answer to the people of Zimbabwe, after it rejected the Home-Smith proposals, a people that continues to ask and to struggle for its inalienable rights in its own country. It is unfortunate, but unfortunately it is also true, that attempts at dialogue and at contacts can succeed and proceed only in a situation when the other side has fundamentally decided, at least for itself, to change its course which is the cause of confrontation.

131. Furthermore, if there was any need for anyone to have another proof, this latest development, which so quickly escalated into a major crisis and confrontation fraught with great dangers, confirms once more two basic points.

132. One, African problems and crises existing and developing in southern Africa because of racist, colonialist practices and wars waged by South Africa, Portugal and Southern Rhodesia can be treated as local, marginal or "small", and endangering only regional peace and security, only at our own collective peril. The whole international community has just gone through, and is still going through, the consequences of a war, one of the longest, most damaging international crises, which started as another "small, local, colonial" intervention, a war which was initially called the "periphery" of the major strategic interests, somewhere in the developing world.

133. The accumulation of the explosive potential in the whole region of southern Africa, because of attempts of racist colonial régimes to suppress the inexorable march of independence, equality and freedom for all African nations, because of the strategic military interests and involvements of their partners, and because of great-Power rivalries in the strategically important region of the world—all that should not permit anyone here, or anywhere else, to continue deluding himself that what is "small" and "local" today will not, if allowed to continue, become "big" and major and general tomorrow, directly involving us all. As I have said, we had a most frightening experience; we were taught a lesson in another corner of the world.

134. Too, equally, whenever any crisis situation is left unattended, whenever all of us do not do everything for the effective implementation of United Nations decisions in order to remove the causes and consequences of a crisis of which we have been seized for so long, whenever we do not avail ourselves of all the possibilities, powers and measures that the Charter has put in our hands, then a given situation, a crisis, will not go away, but, on the contrary, will fester, accumulate explosive potential and explode in our face.

135. Finally, we have to underscore again, and anew, the root causes that are responsible for or contribute to the creation of the dangerous and threatening crisis of which we are seized today.

136. We have already mentioned—and I shall not elaborate on it—the policy and the strategy of the three remaining racist colonialist régimes, which resort to any method of the cruelest suppression and Nazi-like terror, the most inhuman exploitation and discrimination, colonial wars, aggression against peaceful neighbours, illegal occupation, exploiting the short-sighted interests of others. They do all that in order to keep the whole of southern Africa under their minority colonial rule and to intimidate, from there, the independent and newly liberated States. What they want, and what the latest impudent Salisbury action is intended to achieve, is to harass African States, inflict economic damage on them, bedevil their economic and other development and, by so doing, to prevent them from becoming strong enough to correct the whole situation in southern Africa, in accordance with the Charter, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and all the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions.

137. In his letter requesting an urgent meeting of the Security Council [S/10865], the representative of Zambia, Ambassador Lusaka, most appropriately and opportunely underlines a profound truth when he says:

"This nefarious act was taken on the pretext that Zambia was supporting and harbouring freedom fighters. Smith was therefore, as in the past, bent on finding a scapegoat in Zambia for the actions of freedom fighters within Rhodesia—an inevitable consequence of the imposition of his régime on the people of Zimbabwe."

Indeed, it is an invariably repeated and melancholy experience throughout modern history that all those against whose rule revolutions and independence or liberation wars arose, or all those who, because of power and *Real-politik* interests, did not want those revolutions or wars of liberation to succeed, always claimed that they were either invented from outside or represented only foreign intervention, so that suppressing them is legitimate and possible—as if there were ever any genuine revolution or just war of liberation or independence that was not assisted and supported by brave people from other countries, by all those who have justice and freedom and the equality of all peoples close to their hearts.

138. It suffices here to mention that it was the Security Council which, in several of its resolutions, recognized the legitimacy of the struggle of the oppressed peoples of Africa for their independence and freedom. It was the decision of the General Assembly last year to give to representatives of the liberation movements the status of official observers. It was the Council, in its resolution 321 (1972), dealing with the latest complaint by Senegal, which stated, *inter alia*, that:

"only complete respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Senegal and all the African States bordering the territories of Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozam-

bique, and for the principle of self-determination and independence defined in particular in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) . . . will make it possible to eliminate the causes of tension in those regions of the African continent and create a climate of confidence, peace and security."

It was the Assembly, at its last session, in resolution 2923 E (XXVII)—with respect to the "Situation in South Africa resulting from the policies of *apartheid*"—which, for example, appealed:

"to Governments, specialized agencies, national and international organizations and individuals to provide greater assistance, directly or through the Organization of African Unity, to the national movement of the oppressed people of South Africa."

139. And after all that, the Smith régime has the temerity to justify its acts of aggression against Zambia by the assistance that Zimbabwe freedom fighters may and should receive from the whole international community. The legitimacy, necessity and inevitability of their struggle is solemnly recognized, for it is caused by illegal suppression and exploitation of and racial discrimination against majority by minority.

140. Finally, when speaking of contributory root causes of the crisis, we cannot pass by those actions, or inactions, of certain important States, permanent members of the Security Council, which could not but embolden the illegal Smith régime in its aggressiveness. Here one has only to mention the failure of the administering Power, from the beginning, to employ all means at its disposal and to answer all the obligations it has accepted under national and international law; its persistence in trying to find some accommodation with the Smith régime outside the framework of the United Nations, its decisions and its principles; the persistent vetoing of necessary strong political resolutions of the Council. Equally, one has only to mention the open, official, continued and intensified violation of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia committed by another permanent member in clear violation of the most solemn obligations under the Charter.

141. We have dwelt at some length on the original and contributory root causes because we think that the ways and means of our dealing with the crises caused by Salisbury's action against Zambia must be relevant to them. And we have to bear in mind, too, at least some of the motives that the racists have in this matter. It is perhaps not by accident that the blockade against Zambia has been imposed precisely at the time when that country is going through a process of basic consolidation of its political structure, designed to make it a stronger State and society. Rhodesia's move, in clear collusion with its partners in South Africa and Portugal, is aimed at the same time against Zambia, as a proud, independent and non-aligned State, an important factor in both the struggle of the African peoples for the liberation of their continent, and in the active movement of the non-aligned countries.

142. The non-aligned nations, in their important meetings and activities in the United Nations and elsewhere, have

always drawn the attention of the international community to the universally dangerous state of affairs in southern Africa. They have always been and remain in the forefront of the anti-colonial struggle. The Rhodesian blockade against Zambia is aimed against the liberation movement in Zimbabwe, against all Africa and against all other independent African States, as well as against the anti-colonial and non-aligned movements in general. If not dealt with effectively by the United Nations, it could be a very bad precedent along the lines of hampering the economic development of the developing countries. This situation—and dealing with it—is clearly the responsibility of the United Nations and the Security Council. Everything necessary must be done to eliminate this newest threat to international and regional peace and security—to remove that danger and the danger of further escalation.

143. We have to condemn all acts of aggression by Southern Rhodesia and any assistance it receives in that regard as threatening regional and international peace and security—as this is not only an African but also a general problem.

144. We must request the removal of any foreign military and para-military personnel stationed in or sent to Southern Rhodesia to help the Smith régime.

145. We must rededicate ourselves to strengthening the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and to a more effective struggle against any and anyone's violation of them. All violations must be stopped. More effective measures must be introduced in this respect. All loop-holes must be closed. The Committee on Sanctions which is currently engaged in framing new recommendations for the Council along these lines must quickly accomplish its task. In short we must both strengthen our actions against the diseases of colonialism and *apartheid* as a cause of permanent aggression against African countries and intensify our assistance to the peoples of Zimbabwe, South Africa and the Portuguese colonies in attaining their independence and freedom.

146. Finally the Republic of Zambia cannot bear alone—and could not be expected to do so—the economic difficulties and consequences of battling against Southern Rhodesia's economic aggression, especially taking into account its difficult, special and complicated land-locked and transport situation. Under the Charter's Articles 49 and 50 and Security Council resolutions 253 (1968) and 277 (1970), Zambia is entitled to economic assistance, and that should be a matter with which we must also deal effectively. If it would help for the Council to decide to send a mission or a team of experts or a representative of the Secretary-General to go to see and review on the spot with the Government of Zambia the needs and requirements in that respect, we should do that too.

147. In closing, I should like to stress once again with the utmost conviction that we would do better to deal effectively with this situation now, while there is still time, rather than tomorrow after it has escalated into a major conflagration that we shall all live to regret.

148. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The Security Council has

been convened urgently for the purpose of considering acts of aggression committed by the illegal Southern Rhodesian régime against the independent African State of Zambia.

149. A letter from the Permanent Representative of Zambia to the United Nations, the Ambassador Lusaka, addressed to you, Mr. President, states that the situation that has developed in this area of the African continent as a result of fresh acts of aggression committed by the Southern Rhodesian racists constitutes "a serious threat to international peace and security". [S/10865]

150. We also have before us a letter from the representatives of the African countries members of the Security Council—Guinea, Kenya and the Sudan—which draws the Council's attention to the explosive situation that has developed along the borders of Zambia [S/10866]. This matter is also the subject of a letter from the representative of Yugoslavia [S/10869].

151. Thus the Security Council now has before it three concurrent requests that it consider an extremely serious situation which constitutes a threat to international peace and security on the African continent and has developed as a result of acts of aggression by the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia.

152. For many years now, the Southern Rhodesian racists have been carrying on a hostile policy of provocation with regard to a young, developing, independent African State, Zambia. Diversionary manoeuvres and all kinds of subversive activities, attempts to impair its sovereignty and territorial integrity, threats and blackmail—such are the methods being used by the Southern Rhodesian racists with the help of their South African allies against the Republic of Zambia. Recently, however, the rulers in Salisbury have further aggravated the situation. The representative of Zambia spoke very convincingly of this when he produced irrefutable evidence of the increased aggressiveness of the policy of the Southern Rhodesian racists.

153. The closing of the border with Zambia decreed by the Smith régime and the introduction of what amounts to an economic blockade against that country have been the culminating points in a whole series of acts of gross provocation against Zambia by the colonialist and racist régimes. The Southern Rhodesian racists are moving from brutal oppression of the national liberation struggle of the indigenous African population of Zimbabwe to open attacks on neighbouring African States.

154. The Smith régime is trying to conceal its real motives for closing the frontier with Zambia and for other acts of aggression. As a pretext for their recent acts, the rulers in Salisbury cite the death of two South African policemen who set off a mine allegedly laid by people operating from Zambian territory. Thus Smith and his accomplices are trying to make neighbouring countries, and in particular Zambia, responsible for the serious crisis in their racist policy, and to hide from world public opinion the irrefutable and well-known fact that it is the people of Zimbabwe themselves who are waging the resolute national liberation struggle against their bitter enemy, the Southern Rhodesian racists. Nothing in the world, not the closely-

knit political and military co-operation of the participants in the so-called "unholy alliance", nor the support given to the southern African racists by the forces of international reaction, nor provocation or acts of aggression by the Southern Rhodesian racists, can weaken the determination of the patriots' struggle in southern Africa for their freedom and independence. Proof of this is to be found in such developments as the increased activity of the Zimbabwe African National Liberation Army in Southern Rhodesia (ZANLA).

155. Under the circumstances the Ian Smith régime has taken extreme measures; it has called up reserve troops and mobilized the special territorial units and then proceeded to engage in hostile actions against neighbouring Zambia.

156. Resorting to bullying tactics, the Government in Southern Rhodesia is trying to force young African States to withhold support from national liberation movements and refrain from helping their brothers in their just struggle against the Southern Rhodesian racists.

157. The complete hopelessness of such tactics is obvious. This has been seen once again in the statements made at this meeting of the Security Council by the representatives of the African countries, the United Republic of Tanzania, Morocco and Ghana, who have expressed their fraternal solidarity with the Republic of Zambia. It can also be seen in the fact that participants at the session of the Liberation Committee of the Organization of African Unity, recently held in Accra, which represents various countries on the continent, expressed their determination to achieve, through joint efforts, the final liberation of Africa from racist and colonial oppression. The interests of peace and social progress require that the dangerous hotbeds of colonialism and racism be removed from southern Africa, that all its peoples be granted the right to independence and self-determination, and that the adventurist acts of the rulers in Southern Rhodesia be forcefully condemned.

158. The Security Council's consideration of the question of the acts of aggression committed by the Southern Rhodesian racists against Zambia is very closely linked to the problem which has been on the Council's agenda for several years, namely the situation which has developed in Southern Rhodesia as a result of the seizure of power in that country by Smith's racist clique with the connivance of the administering Power, the United Kingdom.

159. The present situation in Southern Rhodesia is known to everyone. Ian Smith's illegal régime, which has usurped power in a country whose true and only master is the people of Zimbabwe, has not balked at any deed to maintain and perpetuate the racist and colonialist system in that country. The 5 million indigenous inhabitants of Southern Rhodesia, the Zimbabwe people, are being subjected to unprecedented colonialist exploitation and terror. World public opinion knows about the draconian measures decreed by the Smith authorities, including the so-called "collective responsibility" of the population of the various regions of Southern Rhodesia for the legitimate national liberation struggle of the Zimbabwe patriots.

160. World public opinion and the United Nations do not recognize the illegal régime of Ian Smith, and firmly and

sternly condemn its actions. The Organization confirms and supports the main objective in this matter, namely the Zimbabwe peoples' attainment of its inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence. However, the Salisbury régime continues to exist, and it not only oppresses and enslaves the Zimbabwe people, it also commits acts of aggression against African States and poses a threat to international peace and security. That situation is possible only because the Salisbury rulers enjoy the support of Portugal and South Africa and their Western allies and protectors.

161. The close links between the colonialists and racists in southern Africa are no secret to anyone. The major part of the illegal trade with Southern Rhodesia, which is a violation of the mandatory sanctions imposed by the Security Council, goes through Portugal and South Africa. And as you know, one of the permanent members of the Council, the United States of America, is openly violating the Council's sanctions.

162. The Southern Rhodesian and South African racists and the Portuguese colonizers make a living out of the exploitation and oppression of the African peoples. They are united in their common fear of the growing national liberation movement in Africa.

163. The Southern Rhodesian rulers are providing assistance to the Portuguese colonizers and participating in the punitive expeditions in Mozambique, while South Africa, in turn, provides military police units to assist Portugal and Southern Rhodesia, as Ambassador Lusaka, the representative of Zambia, has told us once again today. These are established facts. The Security Council has been forced more than once to consider the acts of naked aggression committed by the members of this "unholy alliance" against the independent and peace-loving countries of Africa. The colonialists and racists of southern Africa have a very long and bloody record. The peoples subjected to inhuman colonialist exploitation and the independent African countries that have frequently been the victims of aggression have a score to settle with that trio. The fascist rulers in Salisbury, Pretoria and Lisbon know that sooner or later they will have to pay for their actions and face the just and stern court of the peoples, for the powerful movement of the peoples of Africa for freedom and independence cannot be held back by the colonizers or the racists or their protectors.

164. Recently the infamous alliance of Portugal, South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, which is used by international imperialism and colonialism to maintain the colonialist stronghold in southern Africa and to fight against the forces of national liberation and progress in Africa, has become more active and has begun to counter-attack against those forces. That is the aim of South Africa's active participation in the punitive expeditions undertaken by Portugal and Southern Rhodesia. It was also the objective of the colonizers in their infamous murder of a prominent freedom fighter of Africa, the Secretary General of PAIGC, the great son of Africa, Amílcar Cabral. The same colonialist and imperialist objectives are being served by the many acts of aggression being committed by South Africa, Portugal and Southern Rhodesia against the

independent African countries. The colonialists and racists are trying to intimidate the peoples of Africa and turn back the progressive development of the continent.

165. Yet whatever perfidious and infamous methods the colonizers and racists may resort to, whatever provocations they may commit, neither they nor their imperialist protectors will be able to halt the process of the final and complete elimination of colonialism, racism and *apartheid*.

166. The removal of the bridge-head of colonialism and racism in southern Africa is the legitimate and noble task set forth in the declaration adopted by the United Nations at the initiative of the Soviet Union, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and in many other international legal documents.

167. The response to the counter-attack being undertaken by the imperialists and colonizers must be, and we believe will be, an even tighter closing of the ranks of the anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist forces.

168. The Soviet Union consistently supports, as it has in the past, the peoples who are struggling for their national and economic independence. In his report on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev, stated:

"We regard it as the goal and function of our international policy to promote the realization by all peoples of their inalienable rights and above all the right to autonomous, independent development in which they can enjoy the fruits of present-day civilization."

169. The Soviet Union most strongly condemns the criminal acts of aggression committed by the colonizers and racists, by South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, against Zambia. The delegation of the Soviet Union considers that the Security Council should take effective measures to remove the threat to peace on the African continent. The racists and colonizers in southern Africa should be curbed and driven back. The Soviet Union takes the position that Ian Smith's illegal régime, which constitutes a threat to international peace and security in Africa, should be brought to an end, that the racists and colonizers should never again threaten independent African countries and that the peoples still under colonial and racist oppression should at last breathe freely after taking their fate into their own hands and commencing to govern their own countries.

170. The Security Council should, in our opinion, expand and strengthen the application of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. It should also take a decision to apply appropriate sanctions against South Africa and Portugal, which are responsible for creating the conditions whereby Ian Smith's racist régime continues to exist and which, through their policies, are worsening the situation in this area of Africa and helping to create a situation which is a threat to peace and security on the continent of Africa. Any other course, which would create the impression that the Council condones Smith's racist régime and his acts of provocation against African States, and in particular against Zambia, and that the Council, instead of taking effective action against the racist aggressors, is prepared to acquiesce in a policy of the *fait accompli*, would be extremely dangerous to the cause of peace.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

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

如何购取联合国出版物

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

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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